

NATIONALISM

A '5 " <] g l c f m
G Y a Y g h Y f ' ! ' ÷
A 5 < = G ! ' % \$ 2



SHRI VENKATESHWARA UNIVERSITY

UTTAR PRADESH-244236

BOARD OF STUDIES

Prof (Dr.) P.K.Bharti

Vice Chancellor

Dr. Rajesh Singh

Director

Directorate of Distance Education

SUBJECT EXPERT

Dr. S.K.Bhogal, Professor

Dr. Yogeshwar Prasad Sharma, Professor

Dr. Uma Mishra, Asst. Professor

COURSE CO-ORDINATOR

Mr. Shakeel Kausar

Dy. Registrar

Authors:

R. P. Tripathy (Units: 3.2-3.4, 3.8.3-3.8.4) © R. P. Tripathy, 2019

Dr Shreeparna Roy (Unit: 3.7) © Dr Shreeparna Roy, 2019

Vikas Publishing House (Units: 1, 2, 3.0-3.1, 3.5-3.6, 3.8-3.8.2, 3.9-3.13, 4, 5) © Reserved, 2019

All rights reserved. No part of this publication which is material protected by this copyright notice may be reproduced or transmitted or utilized or stored in any form or by any means now known or hereinafter invented, electronic, digital or mechanical, including photocopying, scanning, recording or by any information storage or retrieval system, without prior written permission from the Publisher.

Information contained in this book has been published by VIKAS® Publishing House Pvt. Ltd. and has been obtained by its Authors from sources believed to be reliable and are correct to the best of their knowledge. However, the Publisher and its Authors shall in no event be liable for any errors, omissions or damages arising out of use of this information and specifically disclaim any implied warranties or merchantability or fitness for any particular use.



VIKAS® is the registered trademark of Vikas® Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.

VIKAS® PUBLISHING HOUSE PVT LTD

E-28, Sector-8, Noida - 201301 (UP)

Phone: 0120-4078900 • Fax: 0120-4078999

Regd. Office: A-27, 2nd Floor, Mohan Co-operative Industrial Estate, New Delhi 1100 44

Website: www.vikaspublishing.com • Email: helpline@vikaspublishing.com

SYLLABI-BOOK MAPPING TABLE

Nationalism

Syllabi	Mapping in Book
A. Theories of Nationalism: Ernest Gellner, Anthony D. Smith, Anderson, Partha Chatterjee and Others	Unit 1: Theories of Nationalism (Pages 3-35)
B. Socio- economic and political aspects of European Nationalism; Liberalism in England; French Revolution of 1789, 1830 and 1848, their impact on Europe; Rise of nationalism in Russia, and unification of Germany and Italy, the Balkans - pan Slavism	Unit 2: Socio Economic and Political Aspects of European Nationalism (Pages 37-103)
C. Early nationalism stirrings, impact of First World War, Russian Revolution, Kemalist Revolution, Zionism and Palestinian Nationalism, India and China till the 1940s, Japanese Nationalism.	Unit 3: Early Stirrings of Nationalism (Pages 105-171)
D. Second World War and impact on Nationalist movements in Asia and Africa, case studies of Nigeria and Egypt, Indonesia and Vietnam.	Unit 4: Nationalist Movements in Asia and Africa (Pages 173-206)
E. Nation building in Africa and Asia, problems of national integration, social-economic development, ethnicity and continued nationalist upsurges within the newly formed states.	Unit 5: Nation-Building in Asia and Africa (Pages 207-225)

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
UNIT 1 THEORIES OF NATIONALISM	3-35
1.0 Introduction	
1.1 Unit Objectives	
1.2 Definitions of Nationalism	
1.3 Early Nationalism and Nation in Nationalism	
1.4 Historical Context of Nationalism	
1.5 Theories of Nationalism	
1.5.1 Hans Kohn	
1.5.2 Ernest Gellner	
1.5.3 Anthony D. Smith	
1.5.4 Benedict Anderson	
1.5.5 Partha Chatterjee	
1.6 Different Approaches to Nationalism	
1.7 Summary	
1.8 Key Terms	
1.9 Answers to ‘Check Your Progress’	
1.10 Questions and Exercises	
1.11 Further Reading	
UNIT 2 SOCIO ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL ASPECTS OF EUROPEAN NATIONALISM	37-103
2.0 Introduction	
2.1 Unit Objectives	
2.2 The Era of Restoration and Reaction	
2.2.1 Reaction from the Age of Rationalism	
2.2.2 The Romantic Movement	
2.3 The Triumph of Conservatism: Austria and Russia	
2.3.1 The Russian Angle	
2.4 The Bourbon Restoration In France	
2.4.1 Temporary Reaction in Great Britain (1815-22)	
2.4.2 The First Rifts in the Conservative System	
2.5 French Revolution 1789	
2.5.1 Monetary Condition of France in 1789	
2.5.2 Grievances of the Different Class	
2.5.3 The Calling of the States-General	
2.6 The Period of the French Revolution	
2.6.1 The Constitution of 1791	
2.6.2 The Legislative Assembly: Beginning of the War	
2.7 The Second Period of the Revolution—The First Republic	
2.7.1 The Reign of Terror	
2.7.2 Levee En Mass and its Significance	
2.7.3 The Republic of Virtue: Fall of Robespierre	
2.8 The Napoleonic Administration	
2.8.1 Household Achievements of Napoleon	
2.8.2 Wars of Napoleon	

- 2.8.3 The Russian Campaign and the Downfall of Napoleon
- 2.8.4 Character and Achievements of Napoleon
- 2.9 Untrest of 1838
 - 2.9.1 Demeanor of Different Social Classes toward Constitutional Government
 - 2.9.2 The End of the Bourbon Monarchy (1814-1830)
 - 2.9.3 The 'July Monarchy' (1830-1848)
 - 2.9.4 The Revolutions of 1848
- 2.10 Ascent of Patriotism in Russia
 - 2.10.1 The Aftermath of the Crimean War
 - 2.10.2 The Emancipation of the Serfs
 - 2.10.3 Other Reforms of Alexander II
 - 2.10.4 The Spread of Anarchism, Nihilism, and Terrorism
 - 2.10.5 Alexander III and the Policy of Russification
 - 2.10.6 Nicholas II and the Revolution of 1905
- 2.11 Unification of Germany
 - 2.11.1 The Decade of Repression After 1848
 - 2.11.2 The Prussian System
 - 2.11.3 Otto von Bismarck (1815-98)
 - 2.11.4 The Austro-Prussian War
 - 2.11.5 The Franco-Prussian War
- 2.12. Unification of Italy
 - 2.12.1 The National Spirit Stirs (1815-48)
 - 2.12.2 Abortive Revolts
 - 2.12.3 The Political Unification of Italy
- 2.13 The Balkans
 - 2.13.1 The Crumbling Empire of the Sultan (1815-78)
- 2.14 Summary
- 2.15 Key Terms
- 2.16 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 2.17 Questions and Exercises
- 2.18 Further Reading

UNIT 3 EARLY STIRRINGS OF NATIONALISM

105-171

- 3.0 Introduction
- 3.1 Unit Objectives
- 3.2 Nationalism as a Cause and Consequence of the First World War
- 3.3 Russian Revolution
 - 3.3.1 Causes for the Outbreak of the Revolution
 - 3.3.2 Course of the Revolution
 - 3.3.3 Lenin's Leadership
- 3.4 Kemalist Revolution
- 3.5 Zionism and Palestinian Nationalism
 - 3.5.1 Palestinian Nationalism
- 3.6 Growth of Nationalism in India
 - 3.6.1 Growth of Nationalism under Gandhi
 - 3.6.2 Khilafat Movement
 - 3.6.3 Non-Cooperation Movement
 - 3.6.4 Civil Disobedience Movement
- 3.7 Chinese Nationalism till the 1940s
 - 3.7.1 National Crisis
 - 3.7.2 Imperialist Inequity
 - 3.7.3 The Intellectual Response: The New Culture Movement

- 3.7.4 Significance of the New Culture Movement
- 3.7.5 Formation of the Republic of China and Nationalist Government
- 3.8 Japanese Nationalism
 - 3.8.1 Growth of Nationalism in the Meiji Period (1868-1911)
 - 3.8.2 Nationalist Politics
 - 3.8.3 Japan after the First World War
 - 3.8.4 Militarist Parties and Ultra-Nationalism in Japan
- 3.9 Summary
- 3.10 Key Terms
- 3.11 Answers to ‘Check Your Progress’
- 3.12 Questions and Exercises
- 3.13 Further Reading

UNIT 4 NATIONALIST MOVEMENTS IN ASIA AND AFRICA

173-206

- 4.0 Introduction
- 4.1 Unit Objectives
- 4.2 Second World War and Impact on Nationalist Movements in Asia and Africa
 - 4.2.1 Patriotism, Decolonization and Autonomy in Southeast Asia
 - 4.2.2 Patriotism, Decolonization and Autonomy in Africa
- 4.3 Safety and Insurgency in Latin America
 - 4.3.1 The Mexican Revolution
 - 4.3.2 The Cuban Revolution
 - 4.3.3 Insurgency in Nicaragua
 - 4.3.4 Revolutions in Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador
 - 4.3.5 Reliance, Military and Transformation in South America
- 4.4 Decolonization and Arab Patriotism
- 4.5 Nationalist encounters in East Asia
 - 4.5.1 Nationalism in Japan
 - 4.5.2 Progressive Patriotism and the People’s Republic of China
- 4.6 Nationalistic Development in Europe and the United States
- 4.7 Summary
- 4.8 Key Terms
- 4.9 Answers to ‘Check Your Progress’
- 4.10 Questions and Exercises
- 4.11 Further Reading

UNIT 5 NATION-BUILDING IN ASIA AND AFRICA

207-225

- 5.0 Introduction
- 5.1 Unit Objectives
- 5.2 Post-Freedom Processes: Nation-Building and National Integration
- 5.3 Nation-Building in India
- 5.4 Summary
- 5.5 Key Terms
- 5.6 Answers to ‘Check Your Progress’
- 5.7 Questions and Exercises
- 5.8 Further Reading

INTRODUCTION

Nationalism is an ideology based on the premise that the individual's loyalty and devotion to the nation-state surpasses other individual or group interests. Nationalism involves national identity which includes the social conditioning and personal behaviours that support a state's decisions and actions. From a political or sociological perspective, there are two main viewpoints on the origin and basis of nationalism. One is the primordialist perspective that describes nationalism as a reflection of the ancient and perceived evolutionary tendency of humans to organize into distinct groupings based on an affinity of birth. The other is the modernist perspective that describes nationalism as a recent phenomenon which requires the structural conditions of modern society for existence. Nationalism was a significant cause for World War I. Before the occurrence of this War, many Europeans nurtured a firm belief in the cultural, economic and military supremacy of their nation, a belief that justifies Europe's failure to recognize the perils of war. The reactions to European dominion changed manifold after the two World Wars, comprising nationalistic fervour in frontier domains, which, in the long-run, gained independence, like India, to the progressive developments in the post-war period that toppled conventional rulers while dislodging European as well as other outside forces, like some previous settlements in Africa and Southeast Asia.

This book, *Nationalism*, has been designed keeping in mind the self-instruction mode format and follows a simple pattern, wherein each unit of the book begins with *Introduction* to the topic followed by *Unit Objectives*. The content is then presented in a simple and easy-to-understand manner, and is interspersed with 'Check Your Progress' questions to test the reader's understanding of the topic. A list of *Questions* and *Exercises* is also provided at the end of each unit that includes short-answer as well as long-answer questions. The *Summary* and *Key Terms* section are useful tools for students and are meant for effective recapitulation of the text.

This book is divided into five units:

Unit 1 deals with the different theories of nationalism.

Unit 2 discusses the socio-economic and political aspects of European nationalism.

Unit 3 examines the early nationalism stirrings and the impact of the First World War

Unit 4 Explain the impact of the Second World War on nationalistic movements in Asia and Africa.

Unit 5 discusses the problems of national integration and nation building in Asia and Africa.

NOTES

UNIT 1 THEORIES OF NATIONALISM

NOTES

Structure

- 1.0 Introduction
- 1.1 Unit Objectives
- 1.2 Definitions of Nationalism
- 1.3 Early Nationalism and Nation in Nationalism
- 1.4 Historical Context of Nationalism
- 1.5 Theories of Nationalism
 - 1.5.1 Hans Kohn
 - 1.5.2 Ernest Gellner
 - 1.5.3 Anthony D. Smith
 - 1.5.4 Benedict Anderson
 - 1.5.5 Partha Chatterjee
- 1.6 Different Approaches to Nationalism
- 1.7 Summary
- 1.8 Key Terms
- 1.9 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 1.10 Questions and Exercises
- 1.11 Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Nation is state-oriented, whereas nationalism is an ideology that simply promotes an individual's identity against another. Despite the appearance of globalization and internationalization on the world front, nationalism continues to be an integral part of politics. The world today is divided into nations, comprising people who share a common political history and public culture, and have some common rights as well as duties. Despite the nations and people having multiple identities, the idea of a nation and the ideology of nationalism continue to be a potent factor in modern day politics. These are legitimized principles of nationalism and show that there have emerged only greater efforts to achieve, aspire and propagate Nationalism throughout the world.

In this unit, we will discuss various theories of nationalism with reference to the theories propagated by Ernest Gellner, Anthony D. Smith, B. Anderson, Partha Chatterjee among others.

1.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Define Nationalism
- Explain early nationalism and nation in the context of nationalism

- Examine the historical context of nationalism
- Describe the different theories of nationalism
- Discuss the different approaches to nationalism

NOTES

1.2 DEFINITIONS OF NATIONALISM

Although 'Nationalism' is a well-known concept, it still proves to be a complex and complicated subject for social scientists. There are many approaches and definitions of nationalism which social scientists have put forward for their analysis. These are, however, working definitions that suit the many frameworks within which nationalism is analysed, making the concept more complex. Nationalism, in one such working definition, can be defined as 'an ideological movement for the attainment and maintenance of autonomy, unity and identity on behalf of a population deemed by some of its members to constitute an actual or potential nation'.

The *International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences* contends the complex nature of the concept of nationalism, and, at the same time, makes some broad agreements on its rise as a phenomenon and an ideological movement. The first agreement it draws attention towards is that nationalism is a process which is historically specific; therefore, it is contextual in the case of each nation-state. Nonetheless, the growing literature on nationalism has altered the terms of debate and discussion on nationalism.

We can trace the emergence of nationalism to eighteenth century Europe, followed by the North and with the South America. Exception of the American Colonists, who are said to have revolted against the nation of their origin, England, and formed the United States of America, all countries were swept by the wave of nationalism. Even in the nineteenth century, nationalism erupted in numerous countries which later took the shape of a vigorous movement in the twentieth century. In fact, the nationalist movement in Africa is also associated with the movements of the twentieth century. However, in most non-European countries, where nationalism emerged, it was associated with their experience of colonialism. Thus, nationalism is often used in the context of the anti-colonial struggle of a state. As a movement of mobilizing political support, the debates on nationalism have emerged in a variety of contexts and settings across the world.

It is also widely believed that nationalism was essentially representative of an ideological movement. This movement, it was argued, was aimed at promoting and securing the autonomy, unity and sovereignty of those 'gathered in a single territory.' Citizens of a nation, i.e., those legitimate residents who together constituted a nation while living in a specified territory, are conjoined not only by the bonds of ethnicity but also by a unique and homogenous public culture and shared political goals that fostered increasing allegiance to national identities, which were projected to be in danger of foreign domination. Nationalism was also associated with the evocation and invocation of a strong collective sentiment. The first steps towards evoking the sentiments have been traced to the emergence of the ruling elites. However, it was argued that these sentiments undergo a gradual dissemination and all citizens slowly

experience a shared collective identity adopting a common national purpose. All these developments have been important in identifying the affect nationalism has had on people across different states and regions. This unit discusses all these political and social discourse within which different paradigms of nationalism developed.

Notwithstanding its diversity and despite its wide usage, the first time the word ‘nationalism’ was used in the English language was only in the 1840s, even though it was being used as a concept for a longer time. Moreover, it is believed that the word had deep theological meanings. In his book, *Nationalism*, Anthony Smith has pointed out that etymologically, the use of the concept in European parlance could be traced to German philosopher, Johann Gottfried Herder, as well as the French counter-revolutionary cleric, Abbe Augustin de Barruel, who used it towards the end of the eighteenth century. The usage of nationalism can also traced back to Rousseau, who wrote on the importance of political nationalism. He argued that there were key differences between people that had to be accounted for while thinking about principles that should underpin the design of different political systems. For any healthy political system, its citizens had to take pride in their polity and sustain a sense of patriotism, said Rousseau.

The definitions of nationalism are several and myriad. For instance, nationalism is also the belief by the citizens of a nation that their land and people are unique as well as superior to all others. It is also understood as a policy that is systematically advantageous to one’s own nation. On the other hand, the Oxford English Dictionary defines nationalism as ‘devotion to one’s nation, national aspiration, a policy of national independence.’ As one can see, central to the understanding of nationalism is the concept of ‘nation’. The nation is defined by the Oxford English Dictionary as ‘an extensive aggregate of persons so closely associated with each other by common descent, language or history, as to form a distinct race or people usually organized as a separate political state and occupying a definite territory’.

An interesting definition of nationalism is the one offered by K.W. Deutsch, who relates nationalism to a group of people linked communicatively as a community, seeking to control its members. Therefore, as a concept, nationalism is underlined with multiple ideas. Referring to this multiplicity, K. R. Minogue, in *Nationalism* (1967), pointed out that the character of nationalism is such that there are no clearly defined boundaries within which it can be encapsulated. Similar ideas are reflected in the writings of scholars such as Ernest Renan (1882), Carlton Hayes (1931), Hans Kohn (1944), Anthony Smith (1971) and (1998), Earnest Gellner (1983), Benedict Anderson (1983) and Partha Chatterjee (1986) and (1993). Smith and Gellner have been the prime movers of the debate not only on nationalism but also on nations and their emergence. All these scholars tried to explore nationalism within a certain theoretical framework but despite this, could not ignore the multidimensionality of the phenomenon of nationalism. Hence, nationalism by Sudipta Kaviraj has been defined as ‘... while a number of people advance what they regard as “theories” of nationalism, different authors mean different things by “theory”’. It is not clear if authors are advancing explanatory theories, which would seek to explain why nationalism arises and where, or historical observation directing patterns in what might appear disconnected phenomenon...’ in the *Oxford Companion to*

NOTES

Politics in India. Thus, the diversity of scholarship over nationalism can also be introduced.

NOTES

A set of scholars have thus examined nationalism in its varied dimensions and reflected on the role that this phenomenon played in the construction of the modern world. In its global and regional dimensions, nationalism has received extensive treatment from historians and other social scientists, but in recent years, questions have been raised against attempts to create a grand theory of nationalism. It is often argued that most of these theories were mere explanations of the European experience. In contrast, others have tried to offer an explanation, locating them in the Asian and African experience. Scholars such as Sudipta Kaviraj have pointed out that most of the European scholarship is inadequate to understand anti-colonial nationalism.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-I

1. What is K.R. Minogue's view on the character of nationalism?
2. What did nationalism represent?

1.3 EARLY NATIONALISM AND NATION IN NATIONALISM

Historically, the usage of the concept of nationalism—which was also understood as a movement against colonialism—can be traced to even half a century before it was formally coined in the English language. For the anti-colonialists in America, nationalism meant resisting all efforts by their mother country, England to impose taxes on them. The anti-colonists then raised the slogan 'No Taxation without Representation,' before launching the war for freedom in 1776. It was followed by the formalization of the Republican Constitution at Philadelphia. By the close of the eighteenth century, popular nationalism movements were also emerging in other countries. In France, the Declaration of the Rights of Man in 1789 was drafted by the revolutionaries. However, despite popular sentiments in the favour of nationalism, many nationalistic aspirations were quashed in the face of the rising conservative and authoritarian regimes. Slowly, these only served to add to the beliefs of the forces of nationalism who received a new impetus in the face of adversities. As the strength of pro-nationalists grew, the governments of the day, including the one in Europe, recognized nationalism as the most powerful ideological force and started to engage with it. By the beginning of the 1860s, 'nationalism played a crucial role in the growing authority of the nation state.' The nineteenth century was also witness to what European scholars called romantic nationalism in Asia. This nationalism was built around feelings that celebrated the 'glories of nationhood' broadly and also accepted the efforts to nationalize.

In more recent years, ethnic assertions from the South and South East Asia as well as the Eastern Europe have brought the attention of scholars to the concept

of ethnic nationalism. These are movements, often national, which are sustained for a long time and are accompanied by large-scale violence and ethnic cleansing of a particular community. Global attention has been on this kind of 'nationalism' which is underlined by the belief in the homogeneity of a country and its people.

As can now be understood, there is a varied nature of nationalist expression that exists across the world, in turn, contributing to its amorphous character. The issue of the modernity or antiquity of nations has become central to the study of nationalism over the last few decades. The recent upsurge of ethnic nationalism in many parts of the world has only made more acute the questions about origins, nature and consequences of nationalism. In turn, there has been a surge in the studies on nationalism in the academia, coinciding with the practice as well. Since the break-up of the Soviet Union in the late 1980s, nearly twenty new nation-states have been created, on the claims of representing the 'nations' which had been suppressed within empires or federations. In the former Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Ethiopia, one can witness both peaceful and violent examples of national secession, and in several more states there remains the distinct scope of further successful partitions and secessions. Even in India, especially in the North-East, a score or more movements of ethnic protest have generated insurgencies and violent conflicts.

It is not difficult to find many other situations of uneasy coexistence of ethnic communities in both old and new states in many places around the globe. In fact, ethnic nationalism has only grown and taken violent forms since the Second World War. In turn, it has also contributed to an increase in the number of investigations into the phenomena of ethnicity, nations and nationalism.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-II

3. What did nationalism mean for the anti-colonists of America?
4. What do you understand by romantic nationalism?

1.4 HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF NATIONALISM

While there has been a surge in the studies on nationalism and its varied forms since the 1950s and 1960s, decolonization across many countries of Africa and Asia has only added to the interest of the academicians to study it in present times as well. As mentioned above, there have been sustained efforts to develop a cohesive approach to nationalism. Thus, varied theories have emerged, centring around the various definitions of nationalism. For instance, nationalism has been defined as a 'state of mind', or a 'form of consciousness,' and even 'a set of ideas.' In his, book *The Idea of Nationalism*, Hans Kohn has explored the idea of nationalism as 'a state of mind, permeating the large majority of a people and claiming to permeate all its members; it recognizes the nation state as the ideal form of political organization and the nationality as the source of all creative cultural life and economic well being. The

NOTES

NOTES

supreme loyalty of a man is therefore due to his nationality, as his own life is supposedly rooted in and made possible by its welfare.’

Going by his definition and those given by many other political scientists, nationalism emerges as an ideology which recognizes the nation state as the ‘ideal form of political organization.’ Therefore, as Suntharalingam points out, ‘[clearly] within the broad process of historical evolution, beginning in Europe in the seventeenth century, and then spreading elsewhere, the rise of nationalism has been accompanied by the questioning of, and then a more frontal challenge to the legitimacy of the older forms of political organizations, be they the city state, the multilingual empire, the feudal principality, the monarchial state of the Sultanate. As these older political systems were viewed to be the creation of oligarchies, conquerors, local barons and kings, they were consequently seen to be lacking the legitimizing principle endowed with the idea of the popular or the general will and as such ‘unnatural’ systems which ought to be torn down and replaced by a new order founded upon the ideal of the nation state.’

In the context of England and France as well as the rest of Europe, the nineteenth century must be interpreted in terms of complex combination of many forces which shaped people in their social life and public culture—the most powerful of these were the forces of nationalism and the nation-state. However, in contrast to England and France, it became more assertive by clear and unambiguous assertions of common traditions and popular assumptions.

It is important to understand the political and social context of the nineteenth century as it has been fundamental in shaping the common traditions and popular perceptions towards nationalism. For instance, the identities of the East Prussians and the Venetians came under attack in the face of the rule by the Germans or Italians, which was part of the political process of that time. The German and the Italian war of unification shaped the identities of the people of these two nations, further assisted by the idea of liberalism that swept Europe in the nineteenth century. In countries like England and France, the surging middle classes helped in the construction of national consciousness around sentimental artifacts and national traditions. In other parts of Europe as well, the liberal ideology and the middle class assisted in the celebration of ‘the people of a nation’ and their supposed win over tradition and hierarchy. Thus, the liberal ideology in the nineteenth century helped in creating the idea of nationalism with an appreciation of the past and demands of individual sacrifices in the face of nation building. By appreciating the past, the idea was to gain a common ground towards understating the present as well as plan for the future.

One such movement in this age was the French Revolution, which became a celebration of popular nationalism. Before the French Revolution, the national loyalty Centred around the monarch and was led by the elite upper ruling classes, who were the chief participants in the government. The French Revolution proved to be a political watershed and ‘gave birth to a new and more virile nationalism.’ *History of the Western Civilization*, Vol 2, p. 582

It gave the call for equal rights of citizens, establishment of a popular representative government and the collapse of the old provincial boundaries. An immediate result of these radical political developments was the ‘partnership of the great masses of people into a direct partnership with the national government.’

The impact of this movement was significantly reflected in the literature of other countries. Nationalism and the feeling of belongingness were being created through popular literature and story-telling. One such attempt was in *Grimm’s Fairy Tales*, wherein the author travelled across Germany and collected folk tales from the remote countryside. It was published as part of the ‘national heritage’ in 1812, and was a pioneering contribution to the construction and articulation of national identity in Europe. *William Tell* by poet Friedrich Schiller, was also a rallying point of the German national consciousness. The retelling of the history of Scotland by Sir Walter Scott and the celebration of the beauty and virtue of the countryside by William Wordsworth in his *Lyrical Ballads* became the platform for the celebration of British national culture. Therefore, the literature of some important nations was constructed around this time, centring chiefly on the ideology of belonging to a nation. The society for the publication of ‘Monuments of German History’ or the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* in 1819, the French *Ecole des Chartes* in 1821 and the English Public Records Office in 1838 are all products of this time. Nationalist sentiments also found expression in the works of painters like Eugene Delacroix whose *Liberty Leading the People* was not only a mere proclamation of liberty but also an expression of the courage of the French nation. It also found expression in music and operas; a special mention could be made of Richard Wagner. Architectural constructions of that time were also swayed in nationalism.

Thereafter, European scholars began to actively engage in the idea of nationalism. One of the earliest scholars who worked on nationalism was Ernest Renan, who delivered a lecture at Sorbonne on 11 March 1882, on the idea of a nation. Titled, ‘What is a Nation?’, Renan argued that ‘a nation is a soul, a spiritual principle, the outcome of a long past of efforts, sacrifices and devotions; a nation is therefore a great solidarity constituted by the feeling of sacrifices made and those one is still disposed to make. A nation’s existence is (please excuse the metaphor) a daily plebiscite, just as an individual’s existence is a perpetual affirmation of life...’, Anthony Smith, in his *Nationalism and Modernism*, points out that Renan combined in his analysis ‘a sense of ethno-cultural formation in Europe over the *longue duree* with a belief in the active political commitment of members of the nation.’

NOTES

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-III

5. What does nineteenth century England and France represent?
6. What was the role of the French Revolution in the spread of nationalism?

1.5 THEORIES OF NATIONALISM

NOTES

We will now discuss some of the important theories of nationalism propagated by social and political thinkers.

1.5.1 Hans Kohn

Besides Carlton J. H. Hayes, the most significant theoretician who has analysed and explored the concept of nationality was an early scholar, Hans Kohn. He emerged as one of the best known historians through the magnum opus, *The Idea of Nationalism*, in 1944. Kohn defined nationalism as 'a state of mind, permeating the large majority of a people and claiming to permeate all its members. It recognizes the nation state as the ideal form of political organization and the nationality as the source of all creative cultural life and economic well being. The supreme loyalty of a man is therefore due to his nationality, as his own life is supposedly rooted in and made possible by its welfare.' His definition became an important tool for modern scholars to explore the idea of nationalism. It is interesting to note that it was Kohn who first referred to nationalism as a 'state of mind'. This idea was fully developed by Benedict Anderson who espoused nationalism as a product of the 'imagination' of the citizens who constitute the nation'. Kohn provided a striking link between the 'romantic understanding' of nationalism which was underlined by passions and its modern, succeeding philosophies. However, he did not raise doubts over the deep bonds between the emotions of the people who constituted a 'nation' and the idea of nationalism at the time when he provided the first definition. Therefore, for Kohn, nationalism grew out of 'some of the oldest and the most primitive feelings of man,' captured by one's deep bonds with the place of birth, one's preference for his own language and customs as well as deep attachment for one's religion and race.

It is Kohn who explored the relationship between religion and nationalism. Such interconnectivity became fundamental in the understanding of nation-states conceived on religious grounds, for instance, the Jewish movement which led to the realization of Israel and the movement for Pakistan in the Indian subcontinent. While Kohn called these factors objective and natural in the emergence of nationalism within a particular context, he was also aware that these conditions alone would not produce nationalism on its own. These objective factors, according to Kohn, became elements out of which 'nationalism' could emerge, take deep roots and flourish. In support of his argument, Kohn said that the idea of pride in ones territory or language did not capture popular imagination nor did it initially become part of political or cultural struggle. With this, however, he did not mean that people in the age of antiquity did not have any consciousness about their language or territorial identity. The Greeks, with their idea of city states, are the earliest examples of the evidence of the criticality of these emotions. Kohn said that in itself, however, they do not constitute the evidence of nationality consciousness.

He further contended that these elements were never endowed with the prestige they have received in the modern times. In his opinion, the moment of change was brought in the sixteenth century when the rise of centralized states

propounded loyalty towards the nation state, which was identified as the motherland or the fatherland in different contexts. This was assisted by the increased use of vernacular language replacing Latin, a language which till then had received official patronage. Along with the spread of popular education and the dissemination of new ideas, the printing press was used to further the causes of nationalists and provide the impetus for the development of pride in one's own language and territory.

Therefore, Kohn perceived nationalism as a product of the growth of social and intellectual factors at a definite moment of history. The 'nation' that these sentiments produced was thus determined not by objective factors but also by subjective ones. His emphasis on nationalism as a state of mind was more than a passive feeling or dormant consciousness. It was an idea which filled human heart and mind with new thought and sentiment and drove human beings to translate this consciousness into 'deeds of organized actions.' It was this sentiment that moved human beings into becoming citizens through various shades of actions, whether through the formation of associations, launching of agitations or even breaking into bouts of violence.

The framework within which such human action would take place, in Kohn's understanding is the nation state which is born either by defending the old nation state or by assisting in the birth of new ones. According to Kohn, groups acting under the impulse of nationalism attempt to '... find its expression in what it regards as the highest form of organized activity—a sovereign state. As long as a nationality is not able to attain this consummation, it satisfies itself by some pre-state organization, which, however, always tends at a given moment, the moment of "liberation", to develop into a sovereign state. Nationalism demands the nation-state; the creation of the nation state strengthens nationalism.'

An important element of Kohn's work was its engagement with the evolution of the nation-state in Europe and in highlighting the cardinal importance of the nation-state in the emotions and activities of the nationalists. History of the nation-state is an important part of his work. Kohn pointed out that '... in olden times the city, or the fief or the multilingual state held together by dynastic ties was the most accepted form of political organization and was frequently regarded as the "natural" or ideal form.' As mentioned earlier, Kohn identified the sixteenth century as the moment of change in the history of European nationalism, led by England and France. Since the sixteenth century, England and France were under their respective monarchical governments but had started to emerge outside the shadow of Christian universalism. Protestants gained popularity. Different states started to consolidate their power over large territories and draw them into their fold. Therefore, imposition of uniform tax levies, implementation of common laws and the raising of a national armed force were all attempts by the nation-state towards fostering this national identity. It was a conscious attempt to constitute the state-people partnership, which was fundamental to the construction of a nation-state entity.

With the emergence of the middle class, there was intense criticism against excessive international military campaigns or economic extravagance of their respective monarchies. This middle class called for a re-appraisal of the relationship between the state and the people. This revised relationship, according to Kohn, was

NOTES

NOTES

built around three basic pillars. These were the concepts of 'liberty, humanity and patriotism'. The middle class propagated the idea that the well being of the individual—indicated to mean the citizen of the nation state—could only be secured through the transfer of the sovereign power from the monarch to the people or the nation state.

The new age therefore called for the emancipation of the state from the hands of the absolute monarchy. Thus, welfare of people came to be identified with the nation-state.

According to Kohn, this new arrangement of unity between the state and the nation gave life to the concept of people's sovereignty. There was a belief that sovereignty rested with the people and not with the monarch. Kohn claimed that 'nationalism as an ideology involved the acceptance of the notion of popular sovereignty'. He wrote: 'Nationalism is inconceivable without the idea of popular sovereignty preceding—without a complete revision of the position of the ruler and the ruled, of class and castes.' Kohn asserted that irrespective of the class that would actually spearhead the struggle for nationhood, it would act on behalf of society as a whole. He further asserted that nationalism created its unique kind of loyalties which was novel. This novelty arose from the primacy that the citizen, as a member of a society espousing multiple loyalties, attached to his loyalty to the nation-state. In case of any conflict between different loyalties, the ones to the nation-state would stand supreme. Kohn said that prior to the emergence of the nation-state, man's loyalty was dispersed among various forms of social authorities, political organizations and other ideological groups such as the clan, tribe, the city state, the feudal lord, the church or the dynastic monarch. With the coming of the nation state, 'the supreme loyalty was accorded to the nation state.' He added: 'The modern period of history, starting with the French Revolution, is characterized by the fact that in this period, and in this period alone, the nation demands the supreme loyalty of man. Thus, nationalism and modernity have an intimate relationship.' Therefore, for Kohn, nationalism was a modern phenomenon with origins in the English Revolution in the seventeenth century. It acquired mature characteristics with the American and French Revolutions in the subsequent centuries. While the Renaissance and Reformation put in place conditions favourable for the germination of the idea of nationalism, it acquired its real form in France with the French Revolution setting 'the pace for the whole continent.'

The comprehensive nature of Kohn's writings and its foundations with deep historical insight influenced numerous historians who came after him. His influence can be witnessed on Anthony Smith, as he went on to write that: 'The nation state is the almost undisputed foundation of world order, the main object of individual loyalties, the chief definer of Man's identity.'

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-IV

7. What was nationalism according to Kohn?
8. What is the highlight Kohn's work on nationalism?

1.5.2 Ernest Gellner

Born in 1925 and being a professor of Philosophy, Logic and Scientific Method at the London School of Economics and Political Science since 1962, Ernest Gellner was one of the most prominent theoretician on the nationality since Kohn. Gellner's theory is considered to be one of the most important contributions towards the understanding of nationalism. With *Thought and Change*, which was published in 1964, Gellner made the most significant contribution to the understanding of nationalism after Kohn. This work was acknowledged by scholars as 'the most important and influential recent study' on nationalism. With the publication of *Nations and Nationalism* in 1983, his position as an unassailable theoretician on nationalism was confirmed. Anthony Smith, an important voice on the complexity of nationalism, considered Gellner's theory to be 'one of the most complex and original attempts to come to grips with the ubiquitous phenomenon of nationalism'. In his introduction to the second edition of *Nations and Nationalism* in 2006, John Breuilly pointed out that 'Gellner's work still represents the single most important attempt to provide a theory of nationalism as a whole.'

His engagement with nationalism was both academic and personal. Born in the inter-war period, when the minority question kept the embers of nationalism alive, the circumstances of his life made it impossible for him to have neglected nationalism or not engage with it. John A. Hall, while writing his Introduction to *The State of the Nation*, a collection of essays on Gellner's theory of nationalism, points out that, 'the circumstances of Gellner's life made it impossible for him ever to have neglected nationalism...' Writing about this personal engagement with nationalism and its practice, Gellner observed that, 'I am deeply sensitive to the spell of nationalism. I can play about thirty Bohemian folk songs (or songs presented as such in my youth) on my mouth organ. My oldest friend, whom I have known since the age of three or four and who is a Czech and a patriot, cannot bear to hear me play them because he says I do it in such a schmaltzy way, 'crying into the mouth organ.' I do not think I could have written the book on nationalism which I did write, were I not capable of crying, with the help of a little alcohol, over folk songs, which happen to be my favourite form of music.' And again when he wrote, 'The intensity and depth of the feeling is not denied, or even spurned. On the contrary it constitutes one of the key premises of the entire position. It is precisely this which is fully recognized, and it is this which must be explained...the explanation to be offered may or may not be valid; that is another matter, to be left to the judgment of others. But it is simply not the case that the intensity and genuineness of the feeling of nationalism is denied...'

Compared to the earlier arguments on nationalism, the originality of Gellner's analysis lay in its range of engagement with the phenomenon and its broad theoretical sweep. It was in the seventh chapter of his book, *Thought and Change*, that Gellner first dealt with nationalism and yet surpassed its predecessors in both scope and detail. In Gellner's words, his work ensured that 'a theoretical model is available which starting from generalizations that are eminently plausible and not seriously contested, in conjunction with available data concerning the transformation of society in the nineteenth century, does explain the phenomenon in question.'

NOTES

NOTES

Gellner's ideas can be understood within the traditions of scholars like Emile Durkheim and Max Weber, who developed their theories based on the recognition of distinction between 'traditional societies' and 'modern society'. It is within this framework that Gellner located his theory of nationalism. He divided human history into three distinct phases—the hunting-gathering, the agro-literate and the industrial. He presented this three-fold division of society as an alternative to four other dominant schools of thought on nationalism.

Gellner rejected the idea of the nationalist school that nationalism was a natural, self-evident and self-generating phenomenon, and criticized the arguments of Kedourie who said that nationalism was an artificial consequence of ideas which did not need ever to be formulated and only appeared as an accident. His ideas were also a reaction to what he called 'the wrong address theory' favoured by Marxists, which held that 'the awakening message was intended for classes, but by some terrible postal error was delivered to nations,' and the 'dark Gods theory' which regarded nationalism as 'the re-emergence of the atavistic forces of blood or territory'. Gellner argued that 'nationalism is primarily a political principle which holds that the political and the national unit should be congruent'.

Gellner identified nationalism as a product of the modern world, arguing that in no other phase of human history were political units organized along nationalistic principles or lines. This can be conceded as true as in early societies, as the boundaries of city states, dynastic empires or feudal organizations did not coincide with that of the nation. Gellner further argued that in pre-modern times, the nationality of the ruler was not important for the ruled. However, in modern times, nationalism became a 'political necessity' and 'the purpose of a theory of nationalism was to explain how and why it happened.'

Gellner started by tracing the absence of nation and nationalism in the pre-modern period without engaging much with the first stage, i.e., the stage of the hunter-gatherers, arguing that states did not exist at that time. In Gellner's scheme, an elaborate engagement with the hunting-gathering stage is not necessary as absence of states leaves no room for nationalism which 'intends to endow national culture with a political roof'. While theorizing nationalism, he explored the relationship between 'power' and 'culture'. Gellner argued that agro-literate societies were characterized by fairly stable status systems. In such societies, power and culture, the two potential partners to facilitate nationalism, had no scope for interplay as the ruling class—comprising warriors, priests, clerics and administrators—used culture to construct a hierarchy in society. Culture became the significant tool through which the ruling class was able to differentiate between themselves and the vast majority of direct agricultural producers who were confined to local communities where 'culture is almost invisible.' Thus, this kind of a society was marked with conflict between high and low culture and fostered difference between the two. The rulers, therefore, had no incentive to impose cultural homogeneity on the ruled. On the contrary, the ruling class enjoyed the benefits of this diversity. The only class that could derive some benefits by introducing this homogeneity was the clergymen but they did not have the necessary means to incorporate the masses into a higher culture. Therefore, in agro-literate societies, since there was no cultural homogenization, there was no nation.

In the context of industrial societies, Gellner postulated a power-culture relationship which was starkly different from the earlier two stages. Shared culture was not a sine qua non for the preservation of social order in agro-literate societies since the individual's status in such societies was ascriptive. In these societies, in Gellner's conception, culture reinforced existing loyalties. Conversely, culture played a more aggressive role in industrial societies as these societies were characterized by a high degree of social mobility and high culture pervaded the whole of society. Thus, a polity was needed to sustain it. In industrial society, Gellner points out that the nature of work was different from agro-literate societies. Here, 'physical work in any pure form has all but disappeared. What is still called manual labour... involves controlling, managing and maintaining a machine with a fairly sophisticated control mechanism...' This, according to Gellner, had a direct impact on the power-culture relationship in the system. The system could no longer tolerate the dependence of meanings on 'local dialectical idiosyncrasy' and looked forward to an impersonal, context-free communication as well as a high level of cultural standardization. In this new age, culture 'does not so much underline structure; rather it replaces it'. Industrial societies, which are founded on the idea of 'perpetual growth', facilitated the standardization of culture. The demands for sharp technical skills required to sustain an industrial society paved the path for introduction to meritocracy in contrast to a stable system of ascribed roles that characterized the agro-literate societies. The demands for social mobility gave an impetus to a certain culture of egalitarianism and inequalities were camouflaged.

An important category of people in agro-literate societies were clerks who transmitted literacy. The industrial society was a contrast in this regard as here education became the norm. Gellner pointed out that 'the employability, dignity, security and self respect of individuals, typically, and for the majority of men now hinges on their education; and the limits of their culture within which they were educated are also the limits of the world within which they can morally and professionally, breathe. A man's education is by far his most precious investment, and in effect confers his identity on him. Modern man is not loyal to a monarch or a land or a faith, whatever he may say, but to a culture... No important link binds him to a kin group; nor do they stand between him and a wide, anonymous community of culture.'

In an industrial society, said Gellner, culture was no longer 'merely the adornment, confirmation and legitimization of a social order... but 'the necessary shared medium, the life blood or perhaps rather the minimal shared atmosphere, within which alone the members of the society can breathe... some organization must ensure that this literate and unified culture is indeed being effectively produced, that the educational product is not shoddy and sub-standard. Only the state can do this....' In this background, Gellner pointed out that it was necessary for the coming together of culture and the state. Therefore, in his words, 'The imperative of exo-socialization is the main clue to why state and culture must now be linked. It becomes unavoidable. That is what nationalism is about, and why we live in an age of nationalism.'

NOTES

NOTES

Thus, according to Gellner, nationalism was the product of the industrial social order. This location also determined the weaknesses and strength of nationalism. It became weak in the sense that the number of potential nations exceeded manifold and also the number of nations that actually claimed it. Most cultures entered the age of nationalism without making the 'feeblest efforts' to benefit from it. They preferred to remain as 'wild cultures', producing and reproducing themselves spontaneously, without conscious design, supervision or special nutrition. On the other hand, the strength of nationalism lay in the fact that it determined 'the norm for legitimacy of political units in the modern world.' Gellner contended that nations could only be defined in terms of the age of nationalism. Nations could only emerge when the pervading social conditions gave way to standardized, homogeneous, centrally sustained high cultures, which reached the entire population and not just elite minorities. Hence, 'it is nationalism which engendered nations, and not the other way round.' Gellner concluded: 'Nationalism is, essentially, the general imposition of a high culture on society, where previously low cultures had taken up the lives of the majority, and in some cases the totality, of the population. It is the establishment of an anonymous impersonal society, with mutually substitutable atomized individuals, held together, above all by a shared culture of this kind.'

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-V

9. On what kind of framework is Gellner's theory of nationalism based?
10. How has Gellner divided human history?

1.5.3 Anthony D. Smith

A contemporary of Gellner and also his student, Anthony D. Smith, completed his PhD under Gellner's supervision in 1966. As the Emeritus Professor of Ethnicity and Nationalism in the Department of Government at the London School of Economics and Political Science, Smith is known as the last representative of a chain of scholars who contributed to what Gellner called 'the London School of Economics debate on nationalism.'

Even though he was the worthy successor to the tradition dominated by scholars such as Kedourie, Minogue and Gellner, Smith fundamentally differed from his predecessors, especially on his arguments on nationalism. While the former were the proponents of the modernist paradigm, Smith based his approach on the critique of modernism. In his work *Nationalism and Modernism*, Smith pointed out: 'I accepted the modernity of both nations and nationalism, as befitted a student of Ernest Gellner. However, the initial sketch of the origins of ethnic nationalism which I offered stressed the role of political and religious, rather than social and cultural factors.' The central argument of his work was that it was not possible to understand the emergence of modern nations without taking into consideration the former or the pre-existing ethnic components. A lack of understanding of these components, argued Smith, could cause a serious impediment to the understanding of the process of 'nation-building.'

Smith argued that it was the rich ethnic heritage of each nation which was carried forward in the form of revival of 'dim memories' and 'alleged ancestry' that formed the basis for the construction of a modern nation. Thus, for Smith, the rise of contemporary nations should be studied in the context of their ethnic backgrounds. He further pointed out that any exploration of modern nationalism had to be grounded in history but at the same time involving considerable time spans. The purpose of such an exercise was to determine the extent to which the themes and forms of nationalism could be traced to an earlier period and also how deep a connection with earlier ethnic ties and sentiments could be established. Smith contended that if one was to move beyond the sweeping generalizations of both modernism and primordialism, it was necessary to formulate clear definitions of key terms in these studies such as 'nation' and 'nationalism'.

Critiquing the modern theorists of nationalism, Smith said that what they did was define a particular kind of a nation, i.e., the modern nation and not the nation per se. Most of the definitions, in his understanding, reflected the characteristics of eighteenth and nineteenth century nations in Western Europe and America, 'hence they were partial and Eurocentric.' Smith, therefore, proposed a new definition of nation trying to accommodate the concerns, images and assumptions of most nationalists. According to Smith, a nation is, 'a named human population sharing a historical territory, common myths and historical memories, a mass, public culture, a common economy and common legal rights and duties for all members'. He argued that such a definition revealed the complex, abstract and multi-dimensional nature of national identity. His concern with 'nation' led him to ponder on their origins and nature. He concentrated on three major research questions: who is the nation; why and how does a nation emerge; and finally, when and where did the nation arise. For Smith, the answer to the first question should be sought in earlier ethnic communities since pre-modern identities and legacies form the foundation of many contemporary nations. (Preferring to use the French term *ethnie*) Smith locates six major attributes for such communities—a collective proper name, a myth of common ancestry, shared historical memories, one or more differentiating elements of a common culture, an association with a specific homeland and a sense of solidarity of significant sectors of the population. Most of these attributes have a cultural and historical content along with a strong subjective component.

Smith identified two main patterns for ethnic formation – coalescence and division. By coalescence, Smith referred to the coming together of separate units, which, in turn, could be broken down into processes of amalgamation of separate units such as city-states and of absorption of one unit by another as in the assimilation of regions. By division, he meant 'subdivision through fission as with sectarian schism or through proliferation,' which is, meant to indicate the process of a part of an ethnic community, leaving it to form a new unit. Smith observed that ethnicities, once formed, were greatly durable though not without undergoing changes in their demographic composition or cultural contents. He observed that certain events generated profound changes in the cultural contents of ethnic identities and singled out events such as wars, conquests, exile and enslavement, the influx of immigrants and religious conversion. He further argued that even the most radical changes

NOTES

NOTES

within a nation will not be able to destroy the sense of continuity and common ethnicity due to the presence of numerous external forces that only contribute to crystallize ethnic identities and ensure their persistence over a long period of time. Some of these external forces identified by Smith were state-making, military mobilization and organized religion.

With this as the framework for his theoretical conceptualization, Smith began to identify some of the commonly identified mechanisms of ethnic self renewal, the most powerful of which was religious reform. Smith delved into the history of the Jews as supporting example for his argument. He said that groups which could not overcome the bindings of religious conservatism attempted to turn to other forms of self renewal. The Greek case of turning to secular ideological discourse was a major effort to overcome the dilemma of the Orthodox hierarchy failing to respond to popular aspirations. The third mechanism was 'popular participation'. The popular movement seeking greater participation in the political system, according to Smith, saved many ethnies from withering away by generating a missionary zeal among the participants. The final mechanism of ethnic self renewal is the 'myth of ethnic election'. According to Smith, ethnies that lack such myths get absorbed by others after losing their independence. In his formulation, these four mechanisms ensured the survival a certain ethnic community across centuries despite changes in their demographic composition and cultural contents over time and helped in the gradual formation of what Smith calls the 'ethnie cores'. These ethnie cores formed the basis of states and kingdoms over the ages. Smith argued that by locating the ethnie cores one could answer the question 'who is the nation,' as most modern nations were constructed around the dominant ethnie, which would annex or attract other ethnic communities into a state that is founded by the dominant ethnie, giving it a name and cultural character.

This analysis was, however, not sufficient to explain the origin of nations in the pre-modern time or the relationship between modern nations and ethnic cores of the pre-modern times. In support of his formulation, Smith further argued that early nations were formed on the basis of ethnic cores. Being powerful and culturally influential, these nations provided the models for later nation formation. According to Smith, the ethnic model that he built up was 'sociologically fertile.' He said that even at the time when there were no ethnic antecedents, the need to fabricate a coherent mythology and symbolism were significant to ensure national unity and survival. Yet, the problem persisted because while the existence of pre-modern ties helped in determining those units of population that were likely to form a 'nation', it did not explain how this transformation would be achieved.

To answer 'why and how does a nation emerge', Smith tried to identify the main patterns of identity transformation and factors that triggered this development. He divided ethnic communities into two groups—the 'lateral' (aristocratic) and the 'vertical' (demotic). Smith argued that these two groups gave rise to different patterns of nation formation. In his understanding, 'lateral' ethnies generally composed of aristocrats and the higher clergy, and in some cases, the bureaucrats, high military officials as well as the richer merchants. Smith pointed out that the word 'lateral' was consciously chosen to indicate that lateral ethnies were confined to the upper

strata and were spread to form close links with the upper echelons of the neighbouring lateral ethnies. As a result, their borders were ‘ragged’ and lacked social depth. In contrast, vertical ethnies were popular and compact. Their culture spread to other sections of the population as well. Cultural differences did not underpin social differences. On the contrary, a different culture, which was historical in nature, united different classes on issues such as common heritage and tradition. This was relevant, especially when these heritages and traditions came under threat from external forces.

Therefore, these two types of ethnic communities followed different trajectories in the process of becoming a nation. The first group attempted the nation building process by, what Smith referred to as ‘bureaucratic incorporation’. For their survival, the aristocratic ethnic communities depended largely on their capacity to incorporate other strata of the population within their cultural orbit. This could be commonly realized in Western European nation states such as England, France, Spain and Sweden, where the dominant ethnies were able to assimilate the middle classes and the peripheral regions into the ‘elite culture’. According to Smith, this process was engineered primarily by the new and emerging bureaucratic state. Through a series of ‘revolutions’ in the administrative, economic and cultural spheres, the state was able to diffuse the dominant culture down the social scale. The state was able to push this bureaucratic revolution through doles like extension of citizenship rights, conscription, taxation and building up of an infrastructure that linked distant parts of the state. These developments were complimented by ‘parallel revolutions’ in economic and cultural spheres.

Smith identified two processes as primarily relevant to nation formation—movement towards the market economy and the decline of ecclesiastical authority. The second, i.e., the decline of ecclesiastical authority, was especially important as it contributed to the development of secular studies and university learning, leading to a ‘boom’ in popular modes of communication—novels, plays and journals. The second route of nation formation was vernacular mobilization, set out from the vernacular ethnies. Organized religion was the key mechanism for this form of mobilization. It was through myths of closeness, sacred texts and scripts as well as the prestige of the clergy that the survival of communal traditions was ensured. However, such communities were not free of issues which surfaced only during the process of nation formation as ethnic culture overlapped with the wider circle of religious culture and loyalty. Moreover, these communities assumed that they had already constituted themselves to form the nation, even though they had no political representation. Under these circumstances, the primary task of the secular intelligentsia was to alter the basic relationship between ethnicity and religion. The community of the faithful had to be distinguished from the community of historic culture. Thus, they tried to mobilize a passive community into becoming a ‘nation’ around the newly discovered vernacular historical culture. In each case, this group of intelligentsia had to provide ‘new self-definitions and goals’ and ‘construct maps and moralities out of a living ethnic past.’

This could be done in two ways. One was by a return to ‘nature’ and its ‘poetic spaces,’ which was the historic repository of the people’s memory, and the

NOTES

NOTES

other was by constructing a cult of golden ages. Both methods were used by the 'educator-intellectuals' to facilitate a national revival. Smith also identified a third method nation formation, which involved immigrant nations that were formed out of the fragments of other ethnies, particularly from overseas migration. This idea was especially relevant in the case of nation-states such as the United States, Canada and Australia, where colonist-immigrants created a 'providentialist frontier nationalism', encouraging a plural conception of nation which encouraged and recognized ethnic as well as cultural diversity, though within the framework of political, legal and linguistic national identity.

Smith argued that while his analysis of nationalism did not help identify the precise unit of population that was eligible to form a 'nation,' it played an important role in determining when and where the nations would emerge. It was based on his detailed analysis of ethnosymbolism that Smith tried to define nationalism. He identified five different ways in which the term was used. These were: (i) the whole process of forming and maintaining nations; (ii) a consciousness of belonging to the nation; (iii) a language and symbolism of the 'nation'; (iv) an ideology including a cultural doctrine of nations; and (v) a social and a political movement to achieve the goals of the nation and realize the national will. Based on these categorizations, Smith defined nationalism as 'an inclusive and a liberating force. It broke down the various localisms of region, dialect customs and clans, and helped to create large and powerful nation states, with centralized markets and systems of administration, taxation and education. Its appeal was popular and democratic. It attacked feudal practices and oppressive imperial tyrannies and proclaimed the sovereignty of the people and the right of all people to determine their own destinies, in states of their own.'

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-VI

11. What are the two patterns identified by Anthony Smith for ethnical (ethnic) formation?
12. How has Smith divided ethnic communities?

1.5.4 Benedict Anderson

Anderson's book, *Imagined Communities: Reflection on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, published in the year 1983, remains one of the most influential recent works in the academia on the questions surrounding nationalism. His ideas were different from the older debates on nationalism and gave a fresh vigour to the understanding of the phenomenon. The influence of the text has been such that 'imagined communities' has become proverbial with any academic discussion of nationalism. Anderson has described his engagement with nationalism in an interview: 'I must be the only one writing about nationalism who doesn't think it ugly. If you think about researchers such as Gellner and Hobsbawm, they have quite a hostile attitude to nationalism. I actually think that nationalism can be an attractive ideology. I like its utopian elements...you follow the laws because they are your laws...'

Anderson's initial impetus towards conceiving his ideas on nationalism came from the conflict that ravaged Vietnam in the 1970s and involved countries like China, Vietnam and Cambodia. Writing around the time, Anderson observed: 'These wars struck me as clear evidence that transnational socialism was being trumped by nationalism and that this was an ominous portent for the future.' He felt nationalism was becoming a stronger force towards 'nation-building' in the post-modernist era. Anderson's arguments were also a response to the work, *The Breakup of Britain*, by Tom Nairn and an attempt to point out that nationalism was not in any way idiosyncratic but characterized by liberal and conservative accounts of time as well. Most importantly, it was an attempt to 'de-Europeanize' the study of nationalism. Therefore, the focus of his work was non-European societies such as Indonesia and Thailand.

The point of departure for Anderson's arguments on nationalism, as compared to other contemporary scholars, was that for him, nationality and nationalism were cultural artifacts of a particular kind and it was not important to trace their emergence to understand them. He argued that it was instead important to understand their changed meanings over time and reasons why they were successful in commanding the profound influence and 'emotional legitimacy.'

Anderson contended that nationalism emerged towards the end of the eighteenth century. For him, it was the result of the contemporary complex historical forces that came together and created different models, which could be emulated in numerous and differing social terrains aided by a correspondingly wide variety of ideologies. For Anderson, any persuasive explanation of nationalism should not be confined to specifying the cultural and political factors that facilitate the growth of nations. He argued that the real challenge was to explore as well as show reasons and ways in which these specific cultural artifacts were able to arouse a sense of deep attachment despite 'shrunk imaginings of recent history (scarcely more than two centuries old) and generated colossal sacrifices.' Anderson established his study within this framework, and started by attempting a workable definition of the term 'nation'. He argued that there was a terminological confusion surrounding the concept of nation, partly caused by the tendency to treat nation as an ideological construct. Instead, he said nation should be located in the framework of family from which kinship and religion are explored. With this as vantage point, Anderson proposed the definition of nation. He said nation was an 'imagined political community—imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign.'

In Anderson's formulation, the nation was imagined because 'members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow members, meet them or even hear of them, yet in the mind of each lives the image of their communion.' It is imagined as 'limited' because each nation has restricted boundaries after which those of other nations start. It is also imagined as 'limited' and sovereign because the phenomenon was conceived in the age when the revolution was at its peak and the process of enlightenment was underway. That was also the time that the idea of democracy and development was replacing those of the hierarchical dynastic realm and more and more nations were vying to be free of foreign rule. Anderson finally said that a nation was imagined because 'regardless of the actual inequality and

NOTES

NOTES

exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship.’

According to Anderson, it was this sense of fraternity that made it possible for millions to sacrifice their lives for the ‘nation’ they imagined was their own. In sharp contrast to the ideas of Ernest Gellner, Anderson’s imagination is not the same as fabrication and falsity. The nation is an ‘imagination and a creation’; for him, it was also important to understand how a community and the sense of belongingness to the community is imagined. The focus of Anderson’s work was on trying to explore and explain the emergence of this imagination. He started with exploration of the cultural roots of nationalism, arguing that nationalism has to be understood by ‘reading’ it but not with political ideologies that are self-consciously held but by understanding the large cultural systems that preceded it. Anderson argued that nationalism emerged as a product both of and against these systems. He cited examples of the religious community, of religion and dynastic system which held strong influence over the sixteenth century Europe. The rise of nations and of nationalism was, according to Anderson, a product of the gradual decline of these systems in the seventeenth centuries. The decline of the ‘great religiously imagined community’ was also a significant development, caused by two identified factors. The first was the effect of the widening of the non-European world, which in turn expanded the general geographical and cultural horizon. The second was the decline of Latin, which was the sacred language till the sixteenth century. Later, however, most books were published in the vernacular languages and by local enterprises.

For Anderson, however, another significant factor was the transformations in modes of comprehending the world. This change pertained to the medieval Christian conception of time. In contrast to the Christian concept of time based on the notion of simultaneity, i.e., the past prefiguring the future, the shift was in favour of the idea of homogeneous empty time, which was understood as transverse, cross time, marked by temporal coincidence and measured by clock and calendar. This new conception of time made up the conception of the nation as a sociological organism, moving up the path of history as a definite possibility. To illustrate this idea, Anderson took help of two popular forms of imaginings—the novel and the newspaper. But of the two, Anderson argued that the newspaper was more powerful because of its mass consumption. He argued, ‘the newspaper can be considered as an extreme form of the book’, ‘...a book sold on a colossal scale. We know that particular morning and evening editions will overwhelmingly be consumed between this hour and that, only on this day, not that. This is, in a way a mass ceremony—Hegel observed that newspapers serve modern man as a substitute for morning prayers—a ceremony performed in silent privacy, yet each communicant is well aware that the ceremony he performs is being replicated simultaneously by thousands (or millions) of others whose existence he is confident, yet of whose identity he has not the slightest notion.’

Anderson argued that it was almost impossible to visualize a more vivid picture for what was the historically imagined community. Both novels and newspapers helped in creating a ‘remarkable confidence of community in anonymity which is the hallmark of modern nation.’ Anderson argued that it was possible to imagine a nation historically when ‘three fundamental cultural conceptions of great antiquity lost their ‘axiomatic

grips' on men's minds.' The three conceptions that he referred to were 'the idea that a particular script language offered privileged access to ontological truth; the belief that society was naturally organized around and under high centres-monarchs who ruled by some form of cosmological (divine) dispensation; and that the conception of temporality in which cosmology and history were indistinguishable.'

Anderson also referred to the commercial publication of books on an expanding scale. He called it the 'print capitalism'. He argued that this publication of books on a large scale gave way to people thinking of themselves in newer ways. Taking recourse in history, Anderson said that the early market for printed books was thin but since capitalism was based only on profit, the search for new markets began. The logic of profit forced them to produce cheap editions of their books in the vernaculars with the aim of reaching the masses.

The discovery of pre-Christian literature by the Humanists generated new interests in sophisticated writing styles of the ancient. With Reformation, a major new culture towards books was cultivated. In turn, the culture of print capitalism highly influenced the success of Reformation and this coalition between Protestantism and print-capitalism created large reading publics and mobilized them for political purposes. The adoption of some of the vernaculars as administrative languages contributed to the decline of Latin, created readers in vernaculars and laid the basis for national consciousness. The emergence of the print languages created unified fields of exchange. This led to the standardization of vernacular language, and, in turn, contributed to the construction of a golden, shared past, which was central to the construction of the idea of a nation and its belongingness. These languages and the power of the printed word contributed to the imaginations of a community. According to Anderson, what made these new communities imaginable was a 'half fortuitous, but explosive interaction between a system of production and productive relations (capitalism), a technology of communications (print) and the fatality of human diversity.'

Anderson argued that all these developments created increasing political problems for dynasties in the nineteenth century, as the legitimacy of most of them did not rely on their 'nationalism.' Thus, dynasties and aristocrats were threatened with marginalization as these new and 'imagined communities' emerged. This gave way to what was referred as 'official nationalisms,' which combined naturalization and yet retained the dynastic power... 'a willed merger of nation and dynastic empires.' Anderson cited the example of Russia to support his argument.

With this background, Anderson turned his focus on Asia and Africa. He asserted that official nationalisms developed in these continents in the aftermath of, and as a reaction to, popular national movements. In Europe, for instance, these official nationalisms emerged after 1820, and yet, they were not confined to Europe alone. Similar developments could be witnessed among both subjected and non-subjected Asian as well as African territories in the nineteenth century. This nationalism was inspired by examples of similar movements, witnessed in Europe and the Americas. Anderson's ideas remain pioneering till date towards the study of nationalism due to his breakaway from the traditional frameworks and the ideas of imagined communities.

NOTES

NOTES

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-VII

13. How were Anderson's arguments on nationalism different from the contemporary scholars?
14. According to Anderson, when did official nationalisms develop in Asia and Africa?

1.5.5 Partha Chatterjee

Most of the scholars discussed earlier were engaged in nationalism from a Western perspective, whether adopting a bourgeoisie-rationalist or the Marxist opinion. However, all these understandings of nationalism failed to dwell upon the complexities of nation-building in the post-colonial world. In the westernized discourses, nationalism did not constitute an autonomous discourse for the non-European world. It is here that the contribution of Partha Chatterjee, one of the founders of the Subaltern Studies Collective, becomes significant. He questioned the Western paradigms of and reinterpreted the histories of the South-Asian societies from the vantage point of the subordinated.

Chatterjee's case study was of India. The conceptual framework of his theoretical framework on nationalism started with the critique of the Benedict Anderson claim that nationalisms were imagined communities and that 'third world nationalisms were modular in form drawing on more than a century and a half of European experience and European models of nationalism.' Anderson argued that nationalism in the Third World countries were based solely on the European model. This led Chatterjee to ask that 'if nationalism in the rest of the world have to choose their imagined community from certain modular forms already made available to them by Europe and the Americas, what do they have left to imagine?' With this, Chatterjee was able to rescue nationalism and its treatment in the academia from the monopoly of western intellectual tradition. He went on to say: 'History, it would seem, has decreed that we in the post-colonial world shall only be perpetual consumers of modernity. Europe and the Americas, the only true subjects of history, have thought out on our behalf not only the script of colonial enlightenment and exploitation, but also that of our anti colonial resistance and post-colonial misery. Even our imagination must remain forever colonized.'

Therefore, the most critical element of Chatterjee's discourse on nationalism was his rejection of those forms of national society that had been propagated by the western scholarship. He argued that the treatment of nationalism that emerged from the academic discourse in Third World countries was creative because it was based not only on the issues of identity but also on the difference with the 'modular' forms of the national society 'propagated by the modern west.

Chatterjee put his interpretation of nationalism in the non-European world around three stages or 'moments'. The first was the moment of departure, the second the moment of manoeuvre, and the third, the moment of arrival. The moment of departure started with the encounter of nationalism with the framework of

knowledge as created by the post-enlightenment rationalist thought. This framework gave the awareness and acceptance of the cultural difference between the East and the West. It argues that the modern European culture comprises attributes critical to development and progress while the traditional Eastern cultures lack in them, which is why they suffer poverty and subjugation. The nationalists, however, claimed that this backwardness was not historically immutable and could be overcome by adopting the said modern attributes of the European culture. To prepare the traditional society to adopt modern attributes, the nationalists divided social institutions and practices into two parts – material and spiritual. The material, stated Chatterjee, was the domain of the ‘outside,’ of economy and of statecraft and science and technology. This was the area where the West had proved its superiority while the East had failed. Therefore, the accomplishment of the West in these areas needed to be not only accepted but studied and replicated. On the other hand, the spiritual aspect was part of the inner domain which bore ‘the essential marks of cultural identity’ Chatterjee argued that if the East was successful in replicating the success of the West in the material domain, the need to preserve its own distinctness of spiritual culture only increased. Thus, according to him, nationalism was the part of the spiritual; it was here that nationalism declared itself to be sovereign and did not allow the colonial power to interfere with it. However, the spiritual domain does not remain fixed. With the onslaught of the colonial experience, Chatterjee argued that nationalism brought in changes in the spiritual sphere wherein it sought to produce a more modern national culture which was distinct from that of the western world. Thus, the nationalists had to address people who constituted a nation but also the colonial masters. This was because nationalism sought to expose the false claim of the colonialists that people in the Third World did not have the culture to rule themselves as per the conditions set by the modern (i.e., Western) world. This aspect of nationalism thus denied the inferiority of the colonized people, as alleged by the colonizers and went on to assert that any underdeveloped nation could ‘modernize’ itself by retaining its cultural identity.

Chatterjee further argued that the nationalists’ claim that people of the Third World were capable of ruling themselves could be put in danger if elitists were to take control of this argument. For nationalist transformation, therefore, the nationalists’ believed initiating a passive revolution with the aim to create a politically independent nation state. ‘This required a series of alliances with the organizational structure of a national movement and the mobilization of mass support of the subordinated classes,’ said Chatterjee. Therefore, the nationalists did not attempt to denounce or transform those structures of ‘rational’ authority that had been set up during the colonial rule (bureaucracy can be one example of such an institution). The nationalists also did not attack the dominant classes. Instead, they tried to limit the influence of such institutions and make them ‘subsidiary allies.’ This was achieved in the ‘moment of manoeuvre,’ which Chatterjee felt was a crucial phase beset with contradictory possibilities. It was a phase of ‘consolidation of the ‘national’ by decrying the ‘modern’, the preparation for capitalist production through an ideology of anti-capitalism.’ Chatterjee pointed that the ‘moment of arrival’ was achieved when the nationalist thought came to the full circle by becoming a discourse of order and

NOTES

NOTES

rational organization of power. At this stage, Chatterjee said that ‘the discourse was not only conducted in single, consistent, unambiguous voice, it also succeeds in glossing over all earlier contradictions, divergences and differences. It actualizes ideological unity of nationalist thought in the unified life of the state.’ In the colonial challenge, the nationalist objective was to retain the inner spirituality of indigenous social life.

Thus, the success of Partha Chatterjee lay in the fact that he succeeded in proving that the Universalist claims of western interpretations of nationalism were limited by the contingencies of empire and global power.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-VIII

15. In Chatterjee’s interpretation of nationalism, when does the moment of departure begin?
16. What is the critical element of Chatterjee’s discourse on nationalism?

1.6 DIFFERENT APPROACHES TO NATIONALISM

A reading of some of the important thinkers on nationalism reveals that not only does it remain a complex phenomenon, it has also produced a spectrum of theorists who sought to grapple with it. Two opposing schools of thought have mostly been at play on nationalism in the western school of thought. The first was dominated by scholars who supported the western liberal democratic school while on the other hand was the Marxists. Within the liberal persuasion, thinkers approached nationalism in different ways, including enthusiasm and alarm and also optimism and pessimism. Liberals welcomed nationalism but there were others who condemned it, worried that it would threaten the existing social order. There were other liberals who sought to increase the power of nationalism even as they enthusiastically supported it. One of the important liberals advocating nationalism was Italian thinker, Giuseppe Mazzini, who divided the world into a federation of democratic and republican nation states, all existing harmonically. He argued that there was no difference between humanity and nationality and a day will come when everyone will exist together. This positivist view was criticized by other liberals who called it a menace to individual liberty and power. Even in the present day, no consensus has emerged between the liberals on nationalism.

Such paradox was also reflected in the Marxist school of thought, which is discussed in detail in the following paragraphs. The Marxist scholars led by activists like V.I. Lenin and J. Stalin were extremely critical about the liberal school which they called bourgeoisie democracies. Leon Trotsky, a key figure with Lenin in the Russian Revolution, explained a national struggle as ‘one of the most labyrinthine and complex but at the same time extremely important forms of the class struggle.’ The nationality question was a vexed one and Marxist scholars and activists engaged with it to produce their unique understanding of it. Stalin, in his book, *Marxism and the National Question*, began his arguments by asking the fundamental question: ‘What is a nation?’

This is where his arguments on nationality began. Stalin went on to argue that ‘a nation is primarily a community, a definite community of people. This community is not racial, nor is it tribal. The modern Italian nation was formed from Romans, Teutons, Etruscans, Greeks, Arabs, and so forth. The French nation was formed from Gauls, Romans, Britons, Teutons, and so on. The same must be said of the British, the Germans and others, who were formed into nations from people of diverse races and tribes.’ Therefore, for him, a nation was not a racial or tribal community but a historically constituted community of people. A nation ‘is not a casual or ephemeral conglomeration, but a stable community of people.’ At the same time, he argued that not all stable communities could form a nation. At the time he was writing, Austria and Russia were also stable communities yet they were not referred to as nations but states. He then went on to distinguish between a national community and a state community. Stalin wrote that a national community could not be imagined without a common language while for a state, it was not important to have one language. For instance, the Czech nation in Austria and the Polish in Russia will cease to exist if they did not a common language each while at the same time, the existence of Russia and Austria is not affected by the presence of different number of languages within their mandated borders. It is important to note here that by languages Stalin was referring to the spoken language of the citizens and not the official government languages of the state. Thus, for the Marxists, the existence of a common language was one of the pre-requisites for the existence of the nation. However, this perception ceased to consider the fact that different nations always have different languages or that all people who speak a common language constitute a nation. For instance, the British and the Americans can speak a common language yet they do not constitute one nation. To constitute a nation, one of the pre-requisites is also to live in one territory for a long period of time, thereby forming community relations and indulging into a systematic as well as a lengthy relationship with people living in the same territory. A difference of territory also is required for the formation of a nation.

However, this in itself does not contribute to nation formation. A common economic link between the people of the nation contributes in bringing its fragmented parts together and into a complete whole. Thus, since no such common economic bond exists between England and America, they are two different nations. Even the United States of America, which is constituted of different states, is called a nation because of the economic bond that makes them stick together. Therefore, Stalin also recognized a ‘common economic life and economic cohesion’ as another key characteristic of a nation.

However, there are other features as well and no one characteristic can exist without the other in nation formation. The spiritual complexion of people who constitute a nation is another important factor. The spiritual complexion of people of a nation is revealed in the national culture as well. For instance, countries like England, America and Ireland speak one language but are differentiated also by the culture of their people which is learnt generations over generations due to existence of similar conditions of life. Such conditions are not fixed and keep changing from time to time as they are influenced by other changes around them. However, they exist in

NOTES

NOTES

every given moment wherein the composition of nation and nationalism are being explored. Thus, a shared culture is also one of the characteristic features of a nation. 'We have now exhausted the characteristic features of a nation,' said Stalin. However, it is important to remember that a nation is never a fixed entity and changes with time and all the characteristics mentioned above have to exist in support of the other to be able to constitute a nation.

In the Marxist conception, nation building was also closely related to the rise of capitalism. The Marxists argued that a nation was also a historical category that belonged to all epochs of time, for instance, even when feudalism was being replaced by capitalism people were coming together to form a nation. An example can be Western Europe, where the French, British, Italian and Germans formed their nations when they were advancing into capitalism and had achieved victory over feudal powers.

Tying up nationalism within the framework of political economy only undermines the heterogeneity of the concept. This is a problem that goes beyond the theories of Marxism and can be explored in all other social sciences theories. Marxist theory's most vocal comments on nationalism came from Marx and Engels, who wrote on the national question even though it was developed in greater detail later by Lenin and the Bolsheviks. In 1847, in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Marx and Engels argued that nations were formed as a result of the class struggle, especially after the working class attempted to overthrow institutions of the former ruling class and form new ones based on economic, social and political conditions conducive for their class needs. Marxists argued that before capitalism, there were no nations.

A criticism of Marxist argument has been that it cannot be generalized. This argument contends that nation formations are based on their own logic, which cannot be used in case of the others. The essence of this argument is that there is no one question around nation formation but multiple questions. Thus, it directly puts Marxist determinism—that social classes are the only agents of social transformation—to question. Therefore, both the plurality and contextualization of nation formation has to be taken into account to ascertain the process of nation making and of nationalism. For instance, Marx and Engels were writing on the national question when great revolutions were sweeping Europe, when France became a republic after its people rejected the power of the king. Following this, protests broke out in Vienna, Berlin, Austria, Italy, and even Rome. These protests were the results of contradictions between capitalism and the dying feudal order. Thus, Marx and Engels believed that the social class would contribute solely to nation formation.

Later, Lenin and the Bolsheviks developed the modern, scientific Marxist theory of nationalism. This theory was developed in the backdrop of the Russian Revolution in 1917. Lenin regarded a nation as being closely connected to its territory, the class structure and the economy. Stalin summarized Lenin's definition of a nation as 'a historically evolved, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture.' Lenin identified a nation with the material conditions that led to its formation and argued that to develop a nation, those material conditions needed

to be changed. Stalin, working on Lenin's thoughts pertaining to the material conditions, identified them as more necessary for nation's formation than simple ideology. Lenin called for a more instrumental approach to nationalism, arguing that in a capitalist world, all nations had the legitimacy to self-determination which would change in a socialist world where nations may not want to exercise this right.

The formation of class or classes was also key to the formation of a nation in the Marxist theory. The Marxists contended that without the formation of classes, there will be no nations. For them, nation formation was integral to the internal class formation which takes place during the course of foreign capitalist penetration. Later Marxists were also against nationalism because for them it was concomitant to the development of capitalism. Thus, they felt nationalism promoted the capitalist ideology. They believed that the capitalists sought after the working classes and promoted the good of the nation in order to break their class interests. Instead of nationalism, the Marxists called for the development of working-class internationalism, i.e., the unity of workers of all nations against exploitation of the capitalists. However, the Marxists recognized that nationalism which emerged in poor nations or colonies was a result of the struggle of the colonized against foreign oppression. They felt their struggles contained some democratic content and thus supported this form of nationalism.

Nationalism in the twenty-first century took on different forms, away from all deterministic frameworks which were used to examine it. After the collapse of the Soviet Union and the demise of global ideological bi-polarity, the forces of nationalism emerged even stronger than before. Nationalism became a means to counter the tendency of growing hegemonic forces. In the globalized world, the nationalist success was not about the reassertion of the old national identity but of also re-imagining a political community with specific aims in mind. One of such aims has been to control the resources of an independent nation. While it is suggested that in the face of globalization, it is difficult for a nation state to act independently or take autonomous actions, Michael Mann has suggested that nation-states are also strengthening.

There are many factors at play within the nationalism debate at present, which have further given it a complex character. They become more complex in a situation where economic integration is accompanied by effort to achieve political uniformity in the name of democracy. Issues of economy and politics apart, there is also now a very substantial global mobility where people are moving across borders in greater numbers than before. While this always existed, the nature of global mobility and its scale has taken unprecedented forms. The reasons for this mobility are itself complex and go beyond the usual political and economic debates. Migrants, therefore, constitute new identities and new communities in foreign nations. These communities have added a new dimension to the study of citizenship and nationalism. Thus, the range of issues is only expanding – gender, ethnicity, radicalization and minority rights. All these have gathered momentum in the last few years and shifted the earlier discourse of nationalism towards a new paradigm and perspective. They have also raised the possibility of going beyond nationalism of the earlier times and also heightened the awareness that nationalism had on the history, politics, culture and economy of a society. Thus, nationalism acquires a hydra-like proportion with multiple dimensions. It is important to understand this transformation within nationalism itself as we negotiate with the complexities of our age and time.

NOTES

NOTES

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-IX

17. Why is nation building closely related to the rise of capitalism in Marxism?
18. According to Lenin, what was nation connected to?

1.7 SUMMARY

- Nation is state-oriented, whereas nationalism is an ideology that simply promotes an individual's identity against another. Despite the appearance of globalization and internationalization on the world front, nationalism continues to be an integral part of politics.
- We can trace the emergence of nationalism to eighteenth century Europe, followed by the North and with South America the exception of the American Colonists, who are said to have revolted against the nation of their origin, England and formed the United States of America, all countries were swept by the wave of nationalism.
- The nation is defined by the Oxford English Dictionary as 'an extensive aggregate of persons so closely associated with each other by common descent, language or history, as to form a distinct race or people usually organized as a separate political state and occupying a definite territory'.
- For the anti-colonialists in America, nationalism meant resisting all efforts by their mother country, England, to impose taxes on them. The anti-colonialists then raised the slogan 'No Taxation without Representation,' before launching the war for freedom in 1776.
- In the context of England and France as well as the rest of Europe, the nineteenth century must be interpreted in terms of complex combination of many forces which shaped people in their social life and public culture—the most powerful of these were the forces of nationalism and the nation state. However, in contrast to England and France, it became more assertive by clear and unambiguous assertions of common traditions and popular assumptions.
- Kohn defined nationalism as 'a state of mind, permeating the large majority of a people and claiming to permeate all its members'. It recognizes the nation state as the ideal form of political organization and the nationality as the source of all creative cultural life and economic well-being.
- It is Kohn who explored the relationship between religion and nationalism. Such interconnectivity became fundamental in the understanding of nation states conceived on religious grounds, for instance, the Jewish movement which led to the realization of Israel and the movement for Pakistan in the Indian subcontinent. While Kohn called these factors objective and natural in the emergence of nationalism within a particular context, he was also aware that these conditions alone would not produce nationalism on its own.

- Ernest Gellner was one of the most prominent theoreticians on nationality since Kohn. Gellner's theory is considered to be one of the most important contributions towards the understanding of nationalism. With *Thought and Change*, which was published in 1964, Gellner made the most significant contribution to the understanding of nationalism after Kohn. This work was acknowledged by scholars as 'the most important and influential recent study' on nationalism. With the publication of *Nations and Nationalism* in 1983, his position as an unassailable theoretician on nationalism was confirmed.
- According to Gellner, nationalism was the product of the industrial social order. This location also determined the weaknesses and strength of nationalism. It became weak in the sense that the number of potential nations exceeded manifold and also the number of nations that actually claimed it. Most cultures entered the age of nationalism without making the 'feeblest efforts' to benefit from it. They preferred to remain as 'wild cultures' producing and reproducing themselves spontaneously, without conscious design, supervision or special nutrition.
- According to Smith, a nation is, 'a named human population sharing a historical territory, common myths and historical memories, a mass, public culture, a common economy and common legal rights and duties for all members.' He argued that such a definition revealed the complex, abstract and multi-dimensional nature of national identity. His concern with 'nation' led him to ponder on their origins and nature. He concentrated on three major research questions – who is the nation; why and how does a nation emerge; and finally, when and where did the nation arise.
- It was based on his detailed analysis of ethno-symbolism that Smith tried to define nationalism. He identified five different ways in which the term was used. These were: (i) the whole process of forming and maintaining nations; (ii) a consciousness of belonging to the nation; (iii) a language and symbolism of the 'nation'; (iv) an ideology including a cultural doctrine of nations; and (v) a social and a political movement to achieve the goals of the nation and realize the national will.
- Anderson also referred to the commercial publication of books on an expanding scale. He called it the 'print capitalism'. He argued that this publication of books on a large scale gave way to people thinking of themselves in newer ways. Taking recourse in history, Anderson said that the early market for printed books was thin but since capitalism was based only on profit, the search for new markets began. The logic of profit forced them to produce cheap editions of their books in the vernaculars with the aim of reaching the masses.
- Chatterjee's case study was of India. The conceptual framework of his theoretical framework on nationalism started with the critique of the Benedict Anderson claim that nationalisms were imagined communities and that 'third world nationalisms were modular in form drawing on more than a century and a half of European experience and European models of nationalism.'

NOTES

NOTES

- Chatterjee put his interpretation of nationalism in the non-European world around three stages or 'moments.' The first was the moment of departure, the second the moment of manoeuvre, and the third, the moment of arrival.
- In the Marxist conception, nation building was also closely related to the rise of capitalism. The Marxists argued that a nation was also a historical category that belonged to all epochs of time, for instance, even when feudalism was being replaced by capitalism people were coming together to form a nation. An example can be Western Europe, where the French, British, Italian and Germans formed their nations when they were advancing into capitalism and had achieved victory over feudal powers.
- The formation of class or classes was also key to the formation of a nation in the Marxist theory. The Marxists contended that without the formation of classes, there will be no nations. For them, nation formation was integral to the internal class formation, which takes place during the course of foreign capitalist penetration. Later, Marxists were also against nationalism because for them, it was concomitant to the development of capitalism. Thus, they felt nationalism promoted the capitalist ideology. They believed that the capitalists sought after the working classes and promoted the good of the nation in order to break their class interests.
- Nationalism became a means to counter the tendency of growing hegemonic forces. In the globalized world, the nationalist success was not about the reassertion of the old national identity, but of also re-imagining a political community with specific aims in mind. One such aim has been to control the resources of an independent nation.

1.8 KEY TERMS

- **Nationalism:** It is an ideology based on the premise that the individual's loyalty and devotion to the nation-state surpasses other individual or group interests.
- **Ethnosymbolism:** It is a school of thought in the study of nationalism that stresses the importance of symbols, myths, values and traditions in the formation and persistence of the modern nation state.
- **Ethnies:** These are named units of population with common ancestry myths and historical memories, elements of shared culture, some link with a historic territory and some measure of solidarity, at least among their elites.
- **Marxism:** It is a system of economic, social and political philosophy based on ideas that view social change in terms of economic factors.
- **Subaltern studies:** The Subaltern Studies Group (SSG) or Subaltern Studies Collective is a group of South Asian scholars interested in the post-colonial and post-imperial societies with a particular focus on those of South Asia while also covering the developing world in general sense.

1.9 ANSWERS TO ‘CHECK YOUR PROGRESS’

1. K. R. Minogue in *Nationalism* (1967) pointed out that the character of nationalism is such that there are no clearly defined boundaries within which it can be encapsulated.
2. Nationalism, as is widely believed, was essentially representative of an ideological movement. This movement, it was argued, was aimed at promoting and securing the autonomy, unity and sovereignty of those ‘gathered in a single territory.’
3. For the anti-colonialists in America, nationalism meant resisting all efforts by their mother country, England, to impose taxes on them. The anti-colonialists then raised the slogan ‘No Taxation without Representation,’ before launching the war for freedom in 1776.
4. The nineteenth century was also witness to what European scholars called romantic nationalism in Asia. This nationalism was built around feelings that celebrated the ‘glories of nationhood’ broadly and also accepted the efforts to nationalize.
5. In the context of England and France as well as the rest of Europe, the nineteenth century must be interpreted in terms of complex combination of many forces which shaped people in their social life and public culture—the most powerful of these were the forces of nationalism and the nation state.
6. The French Revolution is considered to be a celebration of popular nationalism. Before the French Revolution, the national loyalty, centred around the monarch and was led by the elite upper ruling classes, who were the chief participants in the government. The French Revolution proved to be a political watershed and ‘gave birth to a new and more virile nationalism.’ It gave the call for equal rights of citizens, establishment of a popular representative government and the collapse of the old provincial boundaries. An immediate result of these radical political developments was the ‘partnership of the great masses of people into a direct partnership with the national government.’
7. It was Kohn who first referred to nationalism as a ‘state of mind’. This idea was fully developed by Benedict Anderson, who espoused nationalism as a product of the ‘imagination’ of the citizens who constitute the nation’.
8. The highlight of Kohn’s work was its engagement with the evolution of the nation-state in Europe and in highlighting the cardinal importance of the nation-state in the emotions and activities of the nationalists. History of the nation-state is an important part of his work.
9. Gellner’s ideas can be understood within the traditions of scholars like Emile Durkheim and Max Weber, who rested their theories based on the recognition of distinction between ‘traditional societies’ and ‘modern society’. It is within this framework that Gellner located his theory of nationalism.

NOTES

NOTES

10. Gellner divided human history into three distinct phases—the hunting-gathering, the agro-literate and the industrial. He presented this three-fold division of society as an alternative to four other dominant schools of thought on nationalism.
11. Smith identified two main patterns for ethnic formation – coalescence and division. By coalescence, Smith referred to the coming together of separate units, which, in turn, could be broken down into processes of amalgamation of separate units such as city-states and of absorption of one unit by another as in the assimilation of regions. By division, he meant ‘subdivision through fission as with sectarian schism or through proliferation,’ i.e., meant to indicate the process of a part of an ethnic community leaving it to form a new unit.
12. Smith divided ethnic communities into two groups—the ‘lateral’ (aristocratic) and the ‘vertical’ (demotic).
13. The point of departure for Anderson’s arguments on nationalism, as compared with other contemporary scholars, was that for him, nationality and nationalism were cultural artifacts of a particular kind and it was not important to trace their emergence to understand them. He argued that it was instead important to understand their changed meanings over time and reasons why they were successful in commanding the profound influence and ‘emotional legitimacy.’
14. Anderson asserted that official nationalisms developed in Asia and Africa in the aftermath of and as a reaction to popular national movements. In Europe, for instance, these official nationalisms emerged after 1820, and yet, they were not confined to Europe alone. Similar developments could be witnessed among both subjected and non-subjected Asian and African territories in the nineteenth century. This nationalism was inspired by examples of similar movements, witnessed in Europe and the Americas. Anderson’s ideas remain pioneering till date towards the study of nationalism due to his breakaway from the traditional frameworks and the ideas of imagined communities.
15. The moment of departure started with the encounter of nationalism with the framework of knowledge as created by the post-enlightenment rationalist thought.
16. The most critical element of Chatterjee’s discourse on nationalism was his rejection of those forms of national society which had been propagated by the western scholarship. He argued that the treatment of nationalism that emerged from the academic discourse in Third World countries was creative as it was based not only on the issues of identity, but also on the difference, with the ‘modular’ forms of the national society ‘propagated by the modern west.
17. In the Marxist conception, nation building was also closely related to the rise of capitalism. The Marxists argued that a nation was also a historical category that belonged to all epochs of time, for instance, even when feudalism was being replaced by capitalism people were coming together to form a nation. An example can be Western Europe, where the French, British, Italian and

Germans formed their nations when they were advancing into capitalism and had achieved victory over feudal powers.

18. Lenin regarded a nation as being closely connected to its territory, the class structure and the economy. Stalin summarized Lenin's definition of a nation as 'a historically evolved, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture.'

NOTES

1.10 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. Define nationalism.
2. What is Rousseau's view on political nationalism?
3. How can nationalism be associated with the evocation and invocation of a strong collective sentiment?
4. Characterize agro-literate societies.
5. Why were later Marxists against nationalism?

Long-Answer Questions

1. Trace the evolution of early nationalism and nation in nationalism.
2. Discuss the historical context of Nationalism from its origin.
3. Analyse the concept of nationality as propounded by Hans Kohn.
4. How is Anthony Smith's theory of nationalism different from his predecessors? Elucidate.
5. 'Nationalisms were imagined communities and that third world nationalisms were modular in form drawing on more than a century and a half of European experience and European models of nationalism.' Comment on this statement.

1.11 FURTHER READING

Harris, Erika. (2009). *Nationalism: Theories and Cases*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Ozkanlı, Umut. (2010). *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction*. England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Harris, Erika, Jonathan Joseph. (2003). *Social Theory: Conflict, Cohesion and Consent*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Smith, Anthony D. (1983). *Theories of Nationalism*. New York: Holmes & Meier.

Gellner, Ernest. (2008). *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Cornell University Press.

UNIT 2 SOCIO ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL ASPECTS OF EUROPEAN NATIONALISM

*Socio Economic and
Political Aspects of
European Nationalism*

NOTES

Structure

- 2.0 Introduction
- 2.1 Unit Objectives
- 2.2 The Era of Restoration and Reaction
 - 2.2.1 Reaction from the Age of Rationalism
 - 2.2.2 The Romantic Movement
- 2.3 The Triumph of Conservatism: Austria and Russia
 - 2.3.1 The Russian Angle
- 2.4 The Bourbon Restoration In France
 - 2.4.1 Temporary Reaction in Great Britain (1815-22)
 - 2.4.2 The First Rifts in the Conservative System
- 2.5 French Revolution 1789
 - 2.5.1 Monetary Condition of France in 1789
 - 2.5.2 Grievances of the Different Class
 - 2.5.3 The Calling of the States-General
- 2.6 The Period of the French Revolution
 - 2.6.1 The Constitution of 1791
 - 2.6.2 The Legislative Assembly: Beginning of the War
- 2.7 The Second Period of the Revolution—The First Republic
 - 2.7.1 The Reign of Terror
 - 2.7.2 Levee En Mass and its Significance
 - 2.7.3 The Republic of Virtue: Fall of Robespierre
- 2.8 The Napoleonic Administration
 - 2.8.1 Household Achievements of Napoleon
 - 2.8.2 Wars of Napoleon
 - 2.8.3 The Russian Campaign and the Downfall of Napoleon
 - 2.8.4 Character and Achievements of Napoleon
- 2.9 Untrest of 1838
 - 2.9.1 Demeanor of Different Social Classes toward Constitutional Government
 - 2.9.2 The End of the Bourbon Monarchy (1814-1830)
 - 2.9.3 The 'July Monarchy' (1830-1848)
 - 2.9.4 The Revolutions of 1848
- 2.10 Ascent of Patriotism in Russia
 - 2.10.1 The Aftermath of the Crimean War
 - 2.10.2 The Emancipation of the Serfs
 - 2.10.3 Other Reforms of Alexander II
 - 2.10.4 The Spread of Anarchism, Nihilism, and Terrorism
 - 2.10.5 Alexander III and the Policy of Russification
 - 2.10.6 Nicholas II and the Revolution of 1905
- 2.11 Unification of Germany
 - 2.11.1 The Decade of Repression After 1848
 - 2.11.2 The Prussian System
 - 2.11.3 Otto von Bismarck (1815-98)

NOTES

- 2.11.4 The Austro-Prussian War
- 2.11.5 The Franco-Prussian War
- 2.12. Unification of Italy
 - 2.12.1 The National Spirit Stirs (1815-48)
 - 2.12.2 Abortive Revolts
 - 2.12.3 The Political Unification of Italy
- 2.13 The Balkans
 - 2.13.1 The Crumbling Empire of the Sultan (1815-78)
- 2.14 Summary
- 2.15 Key Terms
- 2.16 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 2.17 Questions and Exercises
- 2.18 Further Reading

2.0 INTRODUCTION

In Europe, nationalism and the rise of national identity movements were important for the development of what is presently the European society. The European continent came under the wave of Romantic nationalism in the 19th century, which led to the transformation of its countries. Romania, Italy, and Germany were some of the countries that were formed under the wave of nationalism. Their national identities were constructed in this period. Then, the French Revolution swept the European continent, bringing with it fresh ideas of nation and national identity. The modern nation-state as we know it today was born in the immediate aftermath of the French Revolution. The ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity are all important aspects of nation and nationhood and were constructed as part of the formation of European nationalism. The ideas of liberalism and self-determination, which brought several nations to revolt and seek independence, were ideas that belong to this period of history. The notion of national identity was emphasized in Enlightenment and put into practice in this era. This was also a period of revolutions and revolts against the traditional forms of government, the monarchy, and the establishment of democratic states. In this unit we will study about all these movements, revolutions and formations of modern states.

2.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Identify the socio-economic and political aspects of European Nationalism
- Examine the growth of Liberalism in England
- Discuss the French Revolution of 1789, 1830 and 1848 and their impact on Europe
- Outline the rise of Nationalism in Russia
- Describe the Unification of Germany and Italy
- Explain the movement of Pan Slavism and its impact in the Balkans

2.2 THE ERA OF RESTORATION AND REACTION

In striving to rewind the chain of time, broken by a fatal interlude (i.e., the French Revolution), we have expunged from our memory—as we would that they might be expunged from History—all the evils which have afflicted the country during our absence.

Louis XVII, Preamble to the Charter of 1814.

‘Yet Freedom! Yet thy banner torn but flying,
Streams like the thunder storm against the wind;
Thy trumpet voice, though broken now and dying;
The loudest still the tempest leaves behind.’

Lord Byron (1818)

Influenced by the reforms brought in by the French Revolutionists, the unprivileged classes in other European nations sought changes in their socio-economic lives especially during the time between 1789 and 1815. After the success of the French forces, unrest gripped Europe. The French people were said to be deeply nationalist as they sought to protect their sovereignty and broaden the goals of their state.

Even as Napoleon’s foreign policy promoted helpful changes, it attracted criticism of Germans, Dutch, Spaniards and others. When the Progressive Period came to a close with Napoleon’s topple, it left behind what is called a strengthened patriotism to the nineteenth century Europe. People also found a new faith in liberalism, which did come under the scanner with the Restoration, but was eventually restored and spread like wildfire. With people taking to streets and revolutions guiding the society, they only led to overwhelm nineteenth-century legislative issues and inspire their perspectives and values on nineteenth-century society.

2.2.1 Reaction from the Age of Rationalism

Edmund Burke (1729-97), was one of the first statesmen to sound a note of caution on the advancements in France. He argued that the French Revolution had ‘assaulted’ the standards on which the progressive ideologists assembled their trusts. ‘They failed,’ Burke submitted, ‘in their conviction that society could be fundamentally changed in a concise period and that old organizations could be renovated overnight.’ In their eagerness with the old and their enthusiasm for the new, he further said that ‘the Revolutionists had permitted themselves to be diverted by the conviction that it was possible to remove the jotted pages of the past and begin humankind anew with a clean sheet.’ In the backdrop of this criticism of the Revolution, Burke offered the calm rule of the progression of history. Every era, he said, is only one connection in a long chain. Therefore, it was not for the humankind of the said period to choose a legacy to protect, or what part of it they will choose to redesign or wreck. ‘We are not the holders, however just the custodians, of humankind’s things. It would be assumption on our part to dispose of old customs and foundations in light of the fact that their motivation is not clear to us; no era ought to set itself up as judge of society’s future needs, the ties which weave together a state or an individuals have

NOTES

NOTES

an otherworldly sacredness, and the realist who strikes right and left in an over the top craving for advancement may end by destroying the essential however immaterial powers which safeguard a human progress.' To Burke, 'reason' did not appear an altogether sheltered aid. He argued that men should revere where they were incapable to appreciate. He questioned the Progressives on the grounds that they conceived man; that they were ideologists who anticipated that individual temperament will consummate itself to fit their equations. In the face of rising protests and unrest, the preservationist classes of Europe found Burke's contentions persuading, and used his arguments to counter the reactionaries.

2.2.2 The Romantic Movement

An alternate response to the Age of Rationalism took shape in the form of an artistic and innovative vitality movement known as the Romantic Movement or the Sentimental Revival. There was more than one dimension to this movement as it comprised revolutionary and reactionary components, therefore enhancing its quality from numerous sources.

In many ways, it was a rebellion against the formal traditional style of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Artists belonging to this school of thought intentionally drew away from the traditional structures, turned over to Shakespeare with his 'colossal irregularities' and to the creators of medieval melodies for persuasion. They celebrated the delights and distresses of the regular man and the excellence and glory of nature as the true subjects of extraordinary verse. The value of being earnest was celebrated against style, for scholars and artists of this school engaged with the feelings of the mind. 'For all great verse,' declared William Wordsworth, one of the first of the English sentimental artists, 'is the spontaneous flood of capable emotions.' Wordsworth picked characters from 'unassuming and provincial life' and explored their lives with a basic, unadorned style on the ground that 'my motivation was to mimic, and, the extent that this would be possible, to embrace the very dialect of men.'

The sentimental rebellion had its basis in the eighteenth century when stories of secrets and creative energy were being celebrated and when its European people, who had worshiped the negativity of Voltaire, enthusiastically appreciated the middle class of Rousseau. The age of Romanticism was about the heart than the overwhelming realism. People of nineteenth century abandoned the grandiose tributes and 'shaking stallion meter' of the classicists for the 'unpremeditated craftsmanship' of the fresher versifiers. The democratic flavours of the literature of this century were also appreciated by the working class.

The spread of the Romantic Movement was in tune with the ascent of the bourgeoisie to social and political strength. Even as it asserted the rights of the common man, sentimentalism harmonized with the political precepts of the revolutionary age. In Germany, a great part of the early work of Johann Friedrich Schiller (1759- 1805) and Johann Wolfgang Goethe (1749- 1832) reverberated progressive assumptions, and the English artists, George Gordon, Lord Byron (1788- 1824), and Percy Bysshe Shelley (1792-1822), were vigorous champions of political freedom.

There was also a reactionary side to the Romantic Movement. In the books of Sir Walter Scott, the old administration and the Middle Ages existed again under a cloak of sentimental excitement, for Scott had a 'primitive soul' and discovered much to appreciate in the alleged 'Dull Ages.' Victor Hugo, often called the extraordinary French sentimentalist, also re-enacted the notable shows over a hundred years old and suffused their characters with colour, power, and overcast magnificence suggestive of the astounding shapes, foggy points of view. This was also seen in paintings, where colour was introduced by sentimental painters like JMW Turner in England or Kaspar David Friedrich in Germany. The neo-established specialists had demonstrated an inclination for the sharp forms and unshadow splendor of the afternoon, but painters of the sentimental school supported puzzles of night, the enchantment of sunrise and nightfall, or the shadows of an approaching storm.

In music too, the taste turned to more passionate creations, verses and energetic party, while in symphonies and musical shows the more formal examples of the eighteenth century respected the originalities of Ludwig van Beethoven (1770- 1827) and Richard Wagner (1813-1883). For his subjects, Wagner turned to the old Teutonic myths and the stories of crusading knights, an inversion to legends and to medieval topics, which was a manifestation of the Romantic Movement.

The Middle Ages was also being celebrated in construction. This was evident with the building of Gothic true, to the restoration of Gothic craft and Gothic structure. The medieval style had never before been appreciated but much of the nineteenth-century construction modeling was carried out on the houses of prayer, mansions, and town corridors of the later Middle Ages. This was particularly evident in England, where writers of this school were amusing the sentiments of valour and stories of noble deeds.

The extensive variety of the Romantic Movement, its scan for new topics and novel structures, its furious force and emotionalism, attacked and advanced all divisions of workmanship and hypothesis. The Utopian communists of the first half of the nineteenth century, reformers and pioneers of fervent factions imparted much of its enchanted longing and hopeful urge, and the restoration of religious energy among Catholics reflected an alternate part of the same common state of mind. From the second quarter of the nineteenth century the Romantic Movement started to be diffused into different channels. From Russia to Spain, scholars and artists were onto a new school so much so that the Romantic Movement came to be positioned with the Renaissance and the Intellectual Revolution.

NOTES

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-I

1. What was the affect of the French Revolution on the other underprivileged classes in Europe?
2. What was Edmund Burke's view on the affects of the French Revolution?
3. What do you understand by the Romantic Movement?

2.3 THE TRIUMPH OF CONSERVATISM: AUSTRIA AND RUSSIA

NOTES

On April 20, 1792, France declared war on Austria, which was contradictory to the earlier claims of the revolutionaries who had argued in the favour of Jean-Jacques Rousseau's assertion that wars of conquest were for the kings and not for the free people. This principle was reflected earlier in the policies too, as France rejected the request of Spain for assistance against Britain during the Nootka Sound crisis. The Nootka Sound Crisis was an international incident and political dispute between the Kingdom of Great Britain and the Kingdom of Spain, triggered by a series of events that took place during the summer of 1789 at Nootka Sound. However, some of the most contradictory features of the French Revolution were reflected in the area of foreign policy itself. The new French constitution was adopted in 1791, which pledged that 'the French nation renounces to undertake any war with a view to make conquests, and will never employ its forces against the liberty of any people.' However, the principles failed in practice and led France towards war.

France was able to defeat the Austro-Prussian invasion at Valmy in northeastern France and Jemappes in Belgium in 1792. This was followed by a rapid offensive into Belgium and the Rhineland. It ended the dream of the revolutionaries to liberate the people of Europe from the tyranny of monarchies and create a new order where states will not have confrontational relationship. Thus, France declared in 1792 that it would assist all people who wished for liberty. However, the expansion of France provoked Britain and Spain into making the first coalition and thus Austrian and Prussian armies succeeded in stopping the advance of France into Germany. In 1799, the French army was estranged from its nation and this resulted in the first military coup, led by Napoleon Bonaparte. His two victories saved France from invasion. His further victories in 1805 and 1806 against Austria and Prussia pushed the boundaries of effective French power into Germany and Italy.

The doubt of 'French ideas' after 1815, the restoration of religious ideologies, and the movement towards more religious lines were most vivacious expressions of the reclamation governments. In this turnaround towards the right-wing ideologies, Austria and Russia turned into the capitals of conservatism. As the French revolutionary and Napoleonic wars continued, the French government became radicalized and in the process, also radicalized its stance towards its enemies. This meant crisis for countries like Germany and Austrian Netherlands. The Austrian Netherlands possessed the Hapsburgs since 1714. While the Hapsburgs required racial, topographical, and even phonetic solidarity, their primary bonding which held many of its different areas together came from their loyalty to the royal crown, i.e., the monarchy. Hapsburg rulers had 'a practically inexhaustible impact and resistant prestige,' while they treated their subjects with a filial consideration, they protected the benefits of their administration with liberal hands and overlooked many of their shortcomings. Even in the nineteenth century, Austria stayed a medieval state as opposed to a national state, with the monarchy being influential and favoured, a

white-collar class few in number and impact, and a detached proletariat. The extraordinary particular power of the ruler, the haughty and slow soul of the authorities, the disconnected and unwieldy apparatus of organization proposed an oriental state instead of a European one. Metternich had been known to whine that 'Asia starts on the Landstrasse,' the eastern suburb of Vienna. Regardless of these shortcomings of the monarchical state, Austria had more power than its foes acknowledged. However, Austria could not immune itself from revolution of progressive ideas in the case liberal agitation were to start again in neighbouring states. The restriction of books and other published material of revolutionary ideas and the most cautious investigation of baggage and papers of foreigners could not keep the monarchical plans from going haywire. Keen to prevent its historical past and its monarchy, the Austrian government was driven to urge the constraint of radical developments everywhere, and Metternich, as the staunch supporter of conservatism, worked to unite all the rulers of Europe against progressive progressions. He served to dissuade Frederick William III from giving the Prussian people the constitution which they had been directed to expect, and he constantly cautioned the other German sovereigns, through their delegates in the Diet of the Germanic Confederation, to be perpetually on the watch for revolutionary upheavals.

Minor breakouts in Germany soon gave Metternich a reason to further issue constraints on his people. In colleges, students had sorted out ties that promised the development of German freedom solidarity. These societies, or *Bur Schaften*, held a congress at the Wartburg 1817. The date was the fourth celebration of the skirmish of Leipzig and the palace been made renowned by Martin Luther at beginning of the Protestant Reform three centuries earlier. After protests, the students imitated Luther's smoldering of the ecclesiastical bull, and put into a campfire the duplicates of a few reactionary books, the Code Napoleon, and a corporal's staff, to demonstrate their hatred of political and military oppression. They called for a unified Germany, which was till then just a unification of many other states. The ideas of liberalism and nationalism drove these students as they sought to popularize patriotism. Its motto was 'honour, freedom and fatherland.' Nothing more was required to persuade the German rulers than what this sort of insurgency did.

All such students' organizations were banned and termed as revolutionary and radical. The Metternich of Austria launched an all-out attack on the liberal-minded teachers from the universities while a chamber of pastors meeting at Carlsbad (1819) limited the laws of oversight and impelled the police on their chase for radicals. This Carlsbad Decrees were introduced following this, in reaction to the students' protests. They marked the high tide of suppression in Germany, legalized removal of university teachers and extended the censorship of the press. This served to only further the grievances of the discontented masses.

In the similar manner, in Russia the pendulum swung to response after 1815. While Alexander I (1801-25) was a benevolent ruler yet he failed to offer the patient and rigid character required in executing the changes of kind which he imagined. With the help of Pastor Michael Speranski, he opened his rule by uniting the divisions of government and even drafted a constitution for Russia. Eye to eye with fundamental issues of change, his decision failed him soon. The complication of

NOTES

NOTES

Russian issues, and the corruption of the authorities for which he could discover no cure, emptied away his energy. He turned his consideration from local troubles to the long and retaining duel with Napoleon. The extension of Finland (1809), Bessarabia (1812), and further parts of Poland (1815) satisfied the wily side of his nature, which believed it had some supernatural powers that could write Napoleon's destruction.

2.3.1 The Russian Angle

However, a little bit of progressivism remained in Alexander's unpredictable nature to cause Metternich minutes of uneasiness at the Congress of Vienna. The Holy Alliance—it was also seen as a conspiracy of non-faithful—initially reflected on ousting the monarchy and relied on the Juliana Baroness von Krüdener, a German religious mystic, to bring a more compassionate argument to the political issues. The Holy Alliance was also called the Grand Alliance, was the coming together of the then monarchical powers, Austria, Prussia and Russia. This alliance was formed after Napoleon lost the war with Alexander I of Russia. However, the weight of occasions was heavy for Alexander's temperamental enthusiasms. The ingratitude communicated by the Poles at the constitution which he allowed them, a rebellion in the supreme regiments, and the homicide of his operator Kotzebue, cured him of his liberal fancies. At the Congress of Troppau (1820) he admitted his transformation to Metternich. 'You are not adjusted. I am. You don't have anything to lament. I have.' Thenceforward, until his death in 1825, Alexander adjusted himself to the heroes of response. The Grand Duke Constantine, authentic successor to Alexander I, wanted to leave his throne to the most youthful of (1825-55) the three siblings, Nicholas.

In the brief disarray of the interregnum, a gathering of Russian armed force officers sorted out a rebellion at Saint Petersburg for 'Constantine and the Constitution' (December 26, 1825). Nicholas effortlessly squashed this uprising of the 'Decembrists' and rebuffed the radicals with death or detainment. Compared to Alexander, he did not have the sensitivity for radicalism. Since he was raised to be an officer, he based his confidence upon order and despotism and succeeded all through a thirty-year rule in keeping political movements in Russia stagnant. To guarantee this end he made the celebrated 'Third Section', an extraordinary division of the magnificent government sorted out to battle unsettling and discontent. Nicholas could support changes in administration and governance, as his codification of the Russian law (1832) and change of the finances validate. He was able to protect the framework of the totalitarian rule as he appreciated the reverence of conservatives and spread the hatred of liberals throughout Europe.

Political stagnation, however, could not stop the popular thoughts of the time. The Russian journalists let go of their prior dependence upon French and German displays and created in the nineteenth century writing that was particularly national. Wherever the radicals gathered, they presence evoked in-depth examination. New books were carefully scrutinized and censured unapologetically. In the hands people like Gogol (1809-52), Turgenev (1818-83), Tolstoy (1828-1910) and Dostoyevsky (1821-81), the Russian novel offered outflow to the intense political and social hypothesis of the day. Questions which could not be discussed in Parliament and at

the same time not be disclosed in the everyday press due to control, discovered voice in the works of fiction. They were also discussed in political leaflets. Allowed to enjoy their lunacy for talk, numerous Russian people created radical and progressive organizations, all the more so in light of the fact that they were denied the chance to influence the administration to entertain ideas of liberalism and equality. When the middle classes come together to be against the government and become unfriendly towards the administration, it is a warning sign for any government. In Russia, as in the eighteenth-century France, the relentless discussions and philosophical age were to be the prelude to a revolution.

NOTES

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-II

4. What is the Nootka Sound Crisis?
5. Why were the Carlsbad Decrees introduced?

2.4 THE BOURBON RESTORATION IN FRANCE

The French Revolution gave the people of France many symbols to celebrate its nationalism. All national symbols of France—the tricolour flag, Marseillaise, Bastille Day—all come from this period of the French Revolution. While the latter World Wars displaced the reference to the French Revolution and the role of Napoleon as defining moments in national stories, yet reference to them persist all over the world. Abbe Sieyes, who is considered to be one of the brains behind the Revolution, gave a statement which illustrated the concept of national sovereignty: ‘The nation exists before everything; it is the object of everything. Its will is always legal, it is the law itself.’ In keeping with the political ideas of the French Revolution, Sieyes argued that the farmers, craftsmen and merchants, which constitute the Third Estate, were the nation because they alone were productive. It was on the basis of this that the Third Estate formed the national assembly in 1789.

Note: Prior to the French Revolution, the French society was divided into three estates, namely: (i) First Estate or the clergy, (ii) Second Estate or Nobility and, (iii) Third Estate or commoners.

While the monarchy tried hard to restore to its former days, the accomplishments of the French Revolution were many. Particularly in France, an excess of pivotal progressions had interceded for Louis XVIII to see his wish understood that all the indecencies of the past twenty years may be ‘cancelled from history.’ Being an adroit man, Louis perceived the situation and was ready to bargain. Napoleon’s sneer that the Bourbons ‘had adapted nothing and had overlooked nothing’ was just halfway genuine. The contract that Louis allowed his subjects in 1814, encapsulated the best of the progressive additions and made France the most liberal government in Europe, for it guaranteed a bicameral assembly comprising a Chamber of Peers and a Chamber of Deputies, the last to be picked by about one hundred thousand voters. The best of Napoleon’s accomplishments were similarly protected;

NOTES

his concentrated organization still worked easily, the Bank of France kept on stabilizing the exceptional monetary framework, the schools were much as the same as he exited them, the concordat stayed in power. Most critical of all, the code Napoleon guaranteed all nationals equity in the eyes of the law and all the children in a family an offer in their father's possessions.

Not even the congregation terrains which had been taken and sold and the domains of the nobles which had passed into different hands could come back to their previous holders. The revolution had made a robust class of labourer proprietors, men who held their ranches free of medieval levy, moderate subjects fancying peace and request. The law of primogeniture had beforehand saved homes by exchanging them in place to the eldest child or next male beneficiary, yet the progressive legislation held that all younger siblings must also receive a part.

By subdividing the area into more modest and smaller property, the new laws of legacy incited a sudden decline in the French conception rate. For a tradesman or labourer, whose patrimony would scarcely accommodate one family, could not divide it among a few children and leave everyone a satisfactory method for employment. The simplest solution was to have one or two children, and for this and others reasons, large families became less popular in France. That is the reason that in the next 100 years, population growth became stationary in France. Along these lines, the French managed to accomplish social solidarity and conservativeness that could not be achieved by any other country. Liberated from the issues of an expanding populace, France did not have to ship her children to the provinces nor do numerous Frenchmen had to immigrate to different grounds.

In this way the significant social and financial results of the insurgency demonstrated strikingly compelling and stable, yet political security was an objective more hard to achieve. All through the nineteenth century, the French people swayed between the contradicting goals of an imperious government and an equitable republic. Despite the fact that Louis XVIII tried to guide a centre course as a sacred ruler, the ultra-royalists (devotees more royalist than the lord) drove him to an arrangement of response. In 1820, the Duke of Berry, the lord's nephew, who remained in the line of progression to the throne, fell and ensued the wave of mainstream resentment that brought the ultras into force. They continued to shackle the press and amend the appointive laws in order to fortify the gathering of the Right, and having secured a mind greater part in the Chamber of Deputies, they proclaimed that the Chamber ought to stay in office for seven years.

With the promotion of the Count of Artois as Charles X (1824), the radicals discovered a ruler after their own liking. More legit than Louis XVIII, Charles was likewise all the more determined and authoritarian. The privileged people never accommodated to the misfortune of their reallocated bequests and started to press for repayment to the degree of a billion francs (1826). By changing over the rate of enthusiasm on the national obligation from five to three for every penny, the legislature proposed to spare twenty-eight million francs a year and apply it to this reimbursement. Capitalists and working class holders of national bonds had to relinquish two-fifth of their wage from this source to profit an undeserving honorability.

A proposal to re-make primogeniture in resistance of the Charter of 1814 expanded the hatred of the bourgeoisie to the risk point. However, Charles X endured in his course, ignorant concerning the indications of well-known discontent. In 1829, he endeavored to over-ride the parliamentary restriction by appointing as head the headstrong and unpopular Prince de Polignac, along these lines damaging the guideline of capable government. The results of his habit—the French Revolution of 1830—will be explained later in the unit.

NOTES

2.4.1 Temporary Reaction in Great Britain (1815-22)

In England, which the Britons considered the noteworthy home of political freedom, the period after 1815 was a time of response. With the return of peace after the Seven Years' War, came financial melancholy and the problem of unemployment. The parliamentary framework had stopped to be illustrative, owing to the movements among the masses. The masses were critical of the monarchy and were inspired by the 'French thoughts.' They feared that their government was unwilling to change. This led to riots against the monarchy by those people who the administration felt were in support of the parliamentary reforms. After the violence fizzled out in 1816, the state suspended the Habeas Corpus Act, which originally granted a person detained by the authorities protection of the law and the power to seek a lawyer. The government also introduced some gagging laws which banned meeting of more than fifty people in public places and also instructed magistrates to arrest those who were suspected of spreading revolutionary ideas. The government also hastened to draft the Six Acts (1819), which were severe enough to have satisfied even dictators. It checked people's right to speech, gagged the press, and constrained the degree and motivation behind open gatherings.

It was only by 1822 that the violence could melt away and more liberal approaches towards governance started to be entertained. This was the time when the conic correctional code was revived, which originally prescribed capital punishment for such offenses as steering a sheep or picking five shillings from a pocket. It was then improved as per the more empathetic soul of the age. Another decision that was due for a long time pertained to the taking back of religious handicaps. Till a few years ago or the eighteenth century in England, it was mandatory for paramount business locales in the state to be a part of the Church of England, a guideline which prohibited Roman Catholics and dissidents (parts of Protestant factions other than the Anglican) from an offer in the legislature. The abolition of these limitations in 1828 and 1829 gave the English individuals, who had claimed of religious flexibility since 1689, the more extensive tolerance of religious equity. The Catholic Emancipation Bill (1829), passed reluctantly by the intolerant English Tories, was a specific aid to the Irish, for it empowered this prevalently Catholic individuals to choose delegates of that faith to the English Parliament.

Despite these incidents, Britain was largely considered the champion of progressivism in the world. The inconsistency between the local and remote approaches of an incredible force is not unprecedented, and statesmen who tried to check the well-known requests in England really supported the populace of Greece and Belgium and South America to oppose the governments that administered them.

NOTES

As an exchange Britain picked up the appreciation — and the exchange — of the freed states, however disappointed conservative forces like Russia and Austria. It was, indeed, Britain's refusal to co-work with her late associates in smothering progressive flare-ups that presented the first genuine break in the chambers of the Quadruple Alliance and arranged the route for the disturbance of Metternich's system.

2.4.2 The First Rifts in the Conservative System

Driven underground by the repression of the administration, European liberals after 1815 arranged new revolts for the sake of liberty and vote based system. The monarchs watched uneasily from their thrones, and recalled the fate of Louis XVI in France. They ordered the police to torch progressive leaflets and chase radicals. These were not orders out of fear but from examples set in other parts of the world.

In Italy, the acclaimed Carbonari (or Charcoal Burners) who were huge in number promised to overthrow dictators and make a free and united Italy. In Spain, the endeavour of the restored Bourbon ruler, Ferdinand VII, to reconquer his insubordinate American colonies, prompted a rebellion among the troops embarking for that reason. Frightened, Ferdinand hurriedly issued agreement to write a constitution and guaranteed a liberal administration. Taking heart from this example, revolutionists in Naples propelled Ferdinand I of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies to acknowledge a constitution. The accompanying year, the liberals of Piedmont won a more modest concession—driving King Victor Emmanuel I of Sardinia to leave the throne to his sibling Charles Felix.

Without wasting time, the worried rulers united for a counter hostile. At the Congress of Troppau (1820), to which all the then world powers sent their delegates, those of Russia, Prussia, and Austria swore themselves to mediate, by equipped of power if essential, in any state lease by a threatening rebellion, and to restore the genuine government to power in the event that it had been ousted by a transformation. The same year, at the Congress of Laibach, the Austrian government was charged to stifle the Neapolitan liberals, and Ferdinand I, was restored to outright power. As the Sardinian government had neglected to stifle the rebellion in Piedmont, an Austrian armed force attacked that state likewise and quenched disobedience. As a method for battling progressivism, while maintaining the old systems of governance, these guidelines of well-planned intervention to contain radicalism against the monarchy worked in the favour of Metternich. Because of its enthusiasm in hurrying to smother revolts, the Austrian armed force was contemptuously named 'the Blaze Unit of Europe.'

Though the Great Britain declined to endorse the worldwide practice of intervention, the Congress of Verona (1822) chose to stretch out the standard to Spain. This time France got the order of the forces to mediate, for France had been confessed to the chambers of the Quadruple Alliance in 1818 at the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle. To show that the French had let go of their progressive debase and had been changed over to moderate beliefs, Louis XVIII dispatched an armed force over the Pyrenees to stifle the Spanish liberals. In 1823, the French caught Cadiz and Ferdinand VII of Spain, revoking his guarantees and denouncing many of his

subjects towards execution who had rebelled. The king of his own house again he asked the forces to help him further to bring Central and South American states, which had split far from Spain amid the Napoleonic Wars, once more under his control.

The British government had dissented expanding power at the energetic promptness with which the united hurried troops crosswise over Europe and neglected the national wildernesses. Overlooking the British attitude, the dictators had their will upon the Continent, yet to transport an armed force. Moreover, the new force of the world, the United States of America, respected an endeavor of the united rulers to stretch out their abusive measures 'to this mainland as a danger to all republics.' In 1823, President James Monroe made it clear in a message to the Congress that interference with the freedoms of any free American republic by a European force would be understood 'as the appearance of an unfriendly air around the United States.' In the face of British and American restriction, the absolutist forces did not dare to continue.

The fracture opened in Europe expanded. The revolts could not be exorcized, and the erratic flare-ups of 1820 and 1821 had barely been suppressed when another uprising debilitated. Embittered by hundreds of years of abuse, Greeks opened a ferocious war in 1823, the French caught Cadiz, and Ferdinand VII, improperly revoking his guarantees, censured many his subjects, who had been embroiled in the rebellion, to outcast or execution. With renewed energy, he asked the forces to help him bring his Central and South American states, which had split far from Spain amid the Napoleonic Wars once again under the span.

The possibility of having their own war from the revolutionaries and republicans in the New World was not displeasing to the associated rulers. When the British mediated, it encountered an unequivocal check. The British government had challenged it by its expanding power. The British troops crossed over Europe. Overlooking the advance of the British, the czars had their will upon the Continent, yet to transport an armed force.

At this time, the United States of America respected an endeavour of the partnered rulers to stretch out their severe measures 'to this mainland as a danger to all republics.' In 1823, President James Monroe made it clear in a message to Congress that intervention with the freedom of any free American republic by a European force would be interpreted 'as the indication of an unfriendly mien around the United States.'

The Greek Revolution represented the key shortcoming of the Concert of Europe. Russia, as a signatory to the Protocol of Troppau, ought to have been eager to suppress the Greek revolt. However, Russia was traditionally dedicated to the arrangement of hastening the dismantling of the Turkish Empire. Britain again supported the conservation of Turkish trustworthiness, but their traditional instruction, sympathized with the Greek radicals and English saving money and delivery premiums remained to benefit if Greece got to be free. The result of this division of thought processes and crash of national approaches was an arrangement of botches and half-measures at the end of which Greece rose as a free state.

NOTES

NOTES

The managing guideline of the moderate framework, the joint activity of every last one of forces against any individuals which looked to transform its legislature by progressive means, had broken down. The result of the Greek War of Independence disappointed strict legitimists; however, they discovered some reassurance as the Greeks were not allowed to set up a republic. They acknowledged a monarchy with a Bavarian ruler mounting the new throne as Otto I of Greece. The framework had endured a serious blow, and the occasions of the year 1830 were to strain it even more severally.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-III

6. How was the French society divided prior to the French Revolution?
7. What decision was taken at the Congress of Troppau in 1820?

2.5 FRENCH REVOLUTION 1789

The American War of Independence had a deep impact on the French political scholars. This was also because the American War of Independence was additionally an insurgency. The war was an answer to opposition of taxes imposed by the British government on its American colonies. It had led to the overthrow of a government that was considered tyrannical and replaced it with a democratic and constitutional government which had been formed by the pioneers of the American war. The leaders of the American War of Independence, like George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, John Howe, and John Adams gave complete thought towards establishing a government that will work for the people and be right for the new country now that it had adopted a different form of government. The Fathers of the American Constitution, like George Washington and James Madison, were educated persons who were well-versed in the political hypotheses of the Enlightenment. They knew of the legendary 'social contracts' of Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau, and their Declaration of Independence had been positively focused around the hypotheses of Locke and his perspectives on the common privileges of men, including the right to topple a ruler who did not secure them for his kin. The Philadelphia Convention, where the Constitution was finally adopted, series of compromises were worked out so as to make a social contract acceptable to all and one which was representative of the people of America.

The American constitution was an illustration of how democratic values could change the lives of people, if the leaders could sit together and devise a government that was more suitable to their needs and to that of a large country. The influence of this was not lost on the leaders of Europe and particularly that of the French. The French had joined the American War of Independence to take revenge from Great Britain for its losses in the Seven Years' War. Historians believe that France had joined the American War of Independence as an afterthought and after Benjamin Franklin, who was the then American ambassador to France, influenced the French

people to aspire for a new social order. Louis XVI who was the then ruler of France is believed to have given the nod for supporting the American to weaken the British forces and not out of inspiration from the writings of John Locke or the republicanism aspired for by the American leaders. However, some French intellectuals had supported the stand of the American thinkers on ideological grounds. Before the French entered the war, French general and political leader Marquis de Lafayette had battled on the American side against the English and picked up much support from the Americans for his valour. From then on, his views and support for the Americans were much respected throughout France. Influential Frenchmen were forced to look with more dissatisfaction than at any time in the past on their own unenlightened administration after they had seen that it was conceivable to supplant a reactionary government with a legislature whose establishments were emphatically focused around the best thought about the Enlightenment. It was also additionally clear to the politically minded working class Frenchmen that it was their low numbers in America who were hence to administer the new Republic and that the Church and the state had been successfully differentiated. The English premiers who had held power before the Revolution had been sent pressing over to their nation of origin, in the wake of having been soundly crushed in war by outcasts who held no title and charged a national armed force.

The result of the American Revolution—the overthrow of a despotic government and implementation of the ideas of Enlightenment—did inspire the French to realize the notions of equality, liberty, the freedom of religion and also equal rights for all and plan an upheaval of its own. However, the interest of the French in the American Revolution cost it more than it had expected. The interest caused a considerably more critical auxiliary impact in France. The trouble of extra war costs, added to an effectively immense obligation to the nation, made it incomprehensible for the French government to dodge liquidation. It was this liquidation, and the failure of the legislature to discover enough cash from its current duty framework to meet administration on the national obligation and its yearly consumptions, that constrained it to call the states-general. It was the calling of the states-general that specifically and unavoidably led to the French Revolution, despite the fact that the Revolution itself could have emulated an alternate course. It is consequently important to think about it as some detail the financial and monetary foundation for the Revolution, even at the expense of recapitulating a portion of the material effectively secured in earlier wars.

2.5.1 Monetary Condition of France in 1789

In 1789, France had the biggest populace compared to any western European country. It was also perhaps the richest across Europe. The eighteenth century had for most classes been a prosperous one. Businesses were flourishing; and despite the fact that industrial production was coming down, it was way ahead of the English. It will be interesting to note that no serfdom existed in France even as it was pervasive across the continent. Also, the country did not experience the ill effects of an area holding framework which made little labourer proprietorship troublesome, as was the case in England. It was also able to meet the costs of the wars that preceded the

NOTES

NOTES

years in which the legislature of the country went bankrupt. The country was thus in a strong financial condition.

However, after the wars, the country could not stabilize financially. The monarchs were known to be lavish spenders and after the Seven Years' War and the American Revolution, the coffers of the country could not be filled to their optimum levels. This was also because the ideology behind the rule of the monarch sanctioned it as the divine right to rule, i.e., the monarchs were seen as the rightful users of the money of the state whether it was spent on personal pleasures, on building grand palaces or foreign travels. This slowly led to the ruin of the French economy. Since the monarchs were in a way a form of totalitarian government, they did not keep any advisors who could heed them the warning of spending bashfully. All finances of the country were in the hands of the rulers and after the war, the financial depression became extremely severe. Recession started in France before the French Revolution as population dipped and growth of industry slowed down. The output from agriculture also came down considerably even though the monarchs continued to impose blind and severe taxes on the people of the country. The building of the palace of Versailles, with real gold being used to decorate the interiors, is a case in point. According to some estimates, nearly 7-10 per cent of the national money was spent to build the palace.

The financial condition of the country was also ruined due to the national debt that was sustained after the two wars. Some poor financial decisions by monarchy and administration, like pumping all money into the army, were another factor. Corruption was another issue plaguing the French. The local as well as the national monarchy imposed taxes on the peasants and used it for their personal purposes than depositing it back to the state fund. All economic powers were also in the hands of the few nobles and monarchs. Since France was a large country, small time nobles collected the taxes and enforce laws which were deeply corrupt in nature. This led to two problems – firstly, the accounts of the state was deprecated and secondly, the rich became richer while the poor peasants became poorer. They started to mobilize against the monarchy, in what was to eventually lead to the French Revolution. To combat the crisis, France decided to take loan from Western European banks but by then, the French economy was already in a freefall. The loan was not taken and as a final attempt at recovering, more taxes were imposed on the poor peasants as the nobles and people higher in the administration refused to pay any taxes themselves.

2.5.2 Grievances of the Different Class

Each class in the French society had its grievances against the administration. Indeed, the respectable upper pastorate that made up an uncovered 2 per cent of the populace favoured the administration but at the same time were aware of the uneasiness that it brought. This class disliked the force of the rulers and pastors and therefore, would have favoured an arrangement of legislature under which they could control the lord against their bosses. As has been mentioned earlier, it was they who discovered most of the incidental commitment made by the Church to the illustrious treasury. The area ministers, as had been genuine from the Middle Ages, were in minimal

preferable position over the workers among whom they lived up to expectations, and it was characteristic for them to distinguish themselves with labourer engages.

The upper bourgeoisie were frequent beneficiaries of the current framework; yet they could not sanction it. They could see their class managing on the opposite side of the English Channel, and characteristically pined for a similar part for themselves in their own nation. Despite being aware of their class and the responsibilities, i.e., their riches that paid for the majority of the country's costs—they were also aware of the privileges of their American counterparts who ceased to pay taxes 'without any political benefits.' The French bourgeoisie also realized that they had lesser legislative representation than the American settlers. Thus, members of this class protested determinedly to seek the special position in politics. The argument was that the nobles contributed little or nothing towards the prosperity of the state. They demanded 'keeping up antiquated primitive rights which interfered genuinely with the free development of exchange inside the nation, and added extraordinarily to kick the bucket expense of merchandise bound for fare which had to be sold in an aggressive business.'

By 1789, all French labourers were free in status. The dominant part claimed land or leased it, either for cash or in return for an offer of their harvests. A minority of landless workers who existed had the right to contract themselves out to any manager who required them. The area on which the proletariat worked was burdened by numerous vestiges of the primitive and manorial frameworks. The landowning workers needed to pay certain charges to their previous manorial rulers, who likewise kept on administering equity in minor cases to the financial inconvenience of the labourers. The ruler, however, no more performed any administrations for the workers. What had in the past been the master's plant or the ruler's stove which the labourer was forced to utilize, became a town property. But the ruler still had to be paid for its utilization and the worker was prohibited to make use any option available. Thus, it was the labourer who needed to pay most of the *taille* (This was a direct tax on the French peasantry and non-nobles during the ancient regime). What he had left after the giving to the ruler and master was not enough for himself and his family. Nevertheless, his hatred was administered against the masters as opposed to against the ruler; the workers remained loyal to both the lord and the Church.

Under the old administration, it was the urban worker and white-collar class which were most terribly affected. Expansion of costs was steady through the eighteenth century. However, at the same time, compensation did not climb in proportion. Despite the fact that the larger part of labourers in 1789 were occupied with fabricating on their own account and offering the resultant item for what it would bring in the neighborhood market, there was a solid and vocal minority of compensation earners, a significant number of whom were moved in Paris and in this manner equipped to have impact in the revolution out of extent to their numbers in the nation. These labourers were the first to be influenced by an increase in costs. At the point when costs climbed again in the vulnerability of the first year of the revolution, when inflation diminished the estimation of cash to practically nothing and labourers stopped to offer their produce for sale to the public, the state of the urban specialists became worse than it ever was.

NOTES

NOTES

The intellectuals and philosophers did not anticipate or favour an insurgency. The physiocrats sought a more normal arrangement of government, less governmental impedance with the free development of trade, and an offer in government for their own particular class. Others had censured the absence of illumination from their rulers, yet typically focused their assaults on particular ill-uses. The running feedback of the old administration must have had its impact on the reasoning powers. Specifically, Rousseau's contentions for famous guideline were generally known and utilized by the revolutionaries, particularly by the Jacobins. Before 1789, men had started to meet in small gatherings to talk about changes. However, the greater part of the political clubs which had an extensive influence in the Revolution were not sorted out until after it had started, during a period when it had become clear that much arranging and also heading and administration would be required. They sought decisions on protected improvements, on the type of government, on the establishment and on comparative matters. It was therefore no mischance that a great part of the initiative was given by legal advisors, as it was in America; and legal advisors regularly shaped the greater part of the representation of the third bequest in the initial gathering of states general.

2.5.3 The Calling of the States-General

The very year of his promotion, Louis XVI restored the parliaments and in the meantime selected a heading economist Turgot to be his chief pastor. Turgot created a change programme. It smashed against the restriction of the parliaments and the favoured classes, and Turgot was compelled to leave two years after this episode. Subsequently, Louis was included in the American War of Independence, and his financial consideration got even more severe. Jacques Necker, a Swiss broker, was made the economist but was dropped when his system met with the standard restriction. Necker, nonetheless, was more intrigued by emulating conservative budgetary measures than in expanding charges. He was consequently more disagreeable with the lord than with the citizens. In 1783, Louis picked Charles Calonne as pastor. The new priest established a project of open lives up to expectations, which was more computed to win fame, and maybe to restore certainty, as he trusted, than to enhance the financial position of the legislature. In any case, French brokers questioned the project, forcing Calonne to change his earlier duty framework. In 1787, the lord, at his solicitation, convened a 'get together of notables' for the purpose of winning some backing for his new recommendations, which would have included the diminishment of some of their benefits. Since they additionally incorporated a few concessions toward delegate establishments, Calonne trusted that their support may be won.

The estates general in any case represented the three orders of the realm—the clergy, the nobility and the third estate which was represented by the people. It was called several times before the revolution but it slowly became clear that it could not become the institution of consent. These kinds of assemblies were not able to take decisions due to several factors like assassination of the bourgeoisie members and dissatisfaction among the members of the provinces. Yet the estates general could not become an institution because the king had levied taxes without

their consideration and the monarchs after Francis I never called the estates general to meet except in the times of crisis. The people on the body of the estates general had many conflicting interests and the people on board refused to give consent to some of the orders of the monarchy until it shed some powers in favour of the people. These conflicts emerged immediately before the revolution, and some other issues included the financial crisis, widespread protests and the falling power of the monarchy. The common people who constituted the third estate generally feared that the other two classes would overrule them while making attempts at the reforms. They thus led the formation of the National Assembly which was revolutionary in nature. It was representative of the end of reservation in estates general based on traditional social classes.

NOTES

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-IV

8. What was the main cause of the American War of Independence?
9. Why did France join the American War of Independence?
10. What was the fear of the common people who comprised the third estate?

2.6 THE PERIOD OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

From the start, King Louis endeavoured to take after the guidance of the respectability and have the domains meet and vote independently. The third estate, headed by an aristocrat called the Marquis de Mirabeau, demanded to form a separate estate to represent the nation as the other two classes spoke to just the advantaged class. They withdrew from the gathering and constituted themselves as the National Assembly, swearing a vow (Tennis Court Oath, June 20, 1789) that they would not scatter until they had coincided on a constitution and had it acknowledged by the ruler. King Louis agreed to this as from the beginning, he had longed to release the States-General or to demand his unique arrangement of voting by domains. At the same time the determination showed by the third estate intimidated him, and he didn't have enough troops to make certain of achievement on the off chance that he endeavoured to utilize energy against the Assembly. In this manner, he bowed to the revolution and allowed the States-General to meet as a National Assembly in the interim requesting his troops to amass at Versailles.

At this point, the nationals of Paris, a couple of miles from Versailles, chose to take a hand. Determined to edginess by an arrangement of terrible harvests and the lack of sustenance in the city, and frightened by the activation of the troops, they started to get ready for equipped safety. On July 14, 1789, a swarm walked on the Bastille, the regal jail, and released the few detainees who had been kept there.

The King acknowledged the circumstances, and requested the nobles and pastorate to sit in the National Assembly as individual parts. A National Guard, made up of common people, was built, headed by the Marquis de Lafayette. The ruler's

NOTES

troops were rejected. The Assembly then set to work to draw up another constitution and an arrangement for change. It is accordingly not to be marveled at that Bastille Day is still celebrated by the republicans of present France as the day that brought on the Revolution.

In the meantime the labourers, who had been directed to accept that their bonds would be relaxed, took to arms themselves, and occupied with a general assault on the noticeable property of their masters. The development, referred to at the time as the Great Fear, had marked influence in the consultations of the respectability in the National Assembly. On August 4, various nobles affirmed that they were relinquishing their leftover medieval rights and levy on their properties. It was announced that feudalism had been abrogated. In later years, numerous labourers were obliged to remunerate the properties that they had acquired, in the event that they didn't effectively own them, at extraordinarily lessened costs. The recompense for medieval contribution, abrogated in 1789, was once in a while high enough to present any incredible budgetary load.

Later that year, in August, the National Assembly proclaimed the Declaration of the Rights Man, which characterized the 'common rights' of man as indicated by the standards of the Enlightenment. They talked about law as the statement of general will, 'as per the principles of Rousseau, and pronounced that the main sovereign of a country is the individual itself.' At that point it moved ahead to attempt to work out a constitution, which, after the American illustration, would be a composed one. In the interim, a considerable number of the leading nobles, understanding that the bourgeoisie and lower classes had won the first part of the Revolution, and that the triumph could now be switched just by energy of arms, had effectively left the nation.

Their one emphasis was to pass on different rulers of Europe to the risk in which they themselves stood if the Revolution in France were to succeed in toppling the ruler from his throne, or even in constraining him to acknowledge restrictions on his absolutism. Their contentions saw light when a swarm in October 1789 walked on Versailles, caught the ruler and monarch and brought them to Paris, and introduced them in the Palace of the Tuileries. Later, the National Assembly started to meet in Paris, where it was considerably more open to intimidation from the radical Paris masses than it had been in the Baroque castle of Louis XIV.

2.6.1 The Constitution of 1791

Some of the most contentious measures of the Assembly were those concerned with the structure of the Constitution and the change of the congregation. As specified in prior sections, the Gallican Church had been subordinate of the Papacy. However, the National or Constituent Assembly longed to go further and make it completely reliant on the state. Not just had majority of the authority of the Church in the most recent century fallen into the hands at 'the honorability,' yet the Church was clearly wealthier than it required to be. Besides, it possessed an excessive amount of property on which it paid no taxes. It was in this manner the most visible wellspring of the riches accessible for confiscation by a government which was still as bankrupt as at the start of the Revolution. The National Assembly chose to confiscate the Church

and help issue new cash on the security of Church, which were immediately set available to be purchased. The ministers were to serve as the ‘servants of the state’ and were to be paid compensations. They were chosen to their work places. New cash was issued, called assigners, which for a period calmed the money-related challenges of the administration. The choice brought about perplexity among the ministry. Despite the fact that the monetary professional dreams of what was known as the Civil Constitution of the Clergy were not many, the procurements for the arrangement of ministers and religious administrators brought on numerous second thoughts among both the ministry and the people. In return, the Pope reacted by declining to acknowledge the constitution as well as by denouncing the whole Revolution.

This judgment created differences between both the ministry and the common people. The Assembly acknowledged the crisis and directed all clerics to make a solemn vow of steadfastness to the State. The church, caught in the conflict, sought advice from headquarters in Rome, therefore giving the Papacy a prevailing voice in France that it had not had for quite some time. The ministry however continued to hold its position illegally and despite being driven underground, kept on summoning the labourers and the more traditionalist specialists and their wives, who accommodated their maintenance by intentional commitments. They were generally viewed as the main genuine Catholics, since men repudiated by the papacy could scarcely be true clerics. The headstrong church and the labourers in later years shaped the spine of a counterrevolutionary development called the Vendee.

The heading layman to deny the administrations of the ‘sacred’ pastorate was the lord himself, who had been not able to keep the foundation of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, yet who accepted his spirit would be jeopardized in the event that he provided for it even ostensible backing once the pope had censured it. His sample was trailed by the royalists in the population. The counterrevolutionaries in this way battled for their confidence and their lord in the meantime, giving the progressive battle a religious viewpoint that it had not from the beginning introduced.

The standards of the new constitution that was to supplant unquestionably the government were at last settled on in 1791. For the shots of its prosperity, Louis XVI, supported by his wife and by the counterrevolutionaries, headed by his sibling, made an endeavor to escape France in June of that year, yet was recaptured and brought to Paris. It was hence apparent to the assemblymen and to the populace of France and outside nations that the ruler could be attributed with no aim of attempting to execute the new constitution. Outsiders characteristically inferred that he was a detainee and that the constitution had been sent out as a little prayer to him, that his assent had been propelled. From the time of his capture, remote rulers understood that his life was at risk, and some started to think genuinely of intercession.

2.6.2 The Legislative Assembly: Beginning of the War

As per the Constitution finally drawn up, a Legislative Assembly had to be made comprising men who did not help finalize the Constitution. Its parts were to be chosen under an extremely confined establishment, and through electing universities.

NOTES

NOTES

The ruler was to have a suspensory veto on enactment. The Constitution went into the force in September 1791, one month after a presentation had been made by the Austrian Hapsburg sovereign and the King of Prussia (Declaration of Pillnitz) that if alternate powers in Europe did not support them, they would make moves to restore 'lawfulness' in France. This presentation halted the progressive development in France and the radicals were further powered. Though the radicals were small in number, they had not done enough to build a coalition that could make any dynamic strides in France.

It was characteristic for the rulers in Europe to feel undermined by the French treatments. Large number of them faced minor revolts and strikes in their own particular nations. The methods decided to make their perspectives known prodded the French at last into proclaiming war themselves. Headed by men such as Danton and Robespierre, the Jacobin club in Paris, which had been radical, was more famous by then than at any time in the past. What may be termed the conservative parts of the club were called Girondins, who were from the area around Bordeaux from which a few of their pioneers came. The Jacobins were aware of the global spread of their Revolution. They were restless to spread 'freedom, balance, and clique' among all people groups who continued to complain under total guideline. They had no complaints to a war if the Revolution in France were ever to be imperiled. On foreign lands, it was to be a war of liberation in which they would be joined by the discouraged in outside nations. The men who were in force in the Legislative Assembly were relatively direct average, as was to be expected under the current propertied establishment. Huge numbers of them were likewise much unpracticed, since they had not taken a dynamic part in the work of the National Assembly, and had not accomplished its goals.

The old and accomplished Hapsburg emperor Leopold II, sibling of the French ruler who had issued the generally direct Declaration of Pillnitz, shunned the throne in 1792 and was replaced by his son Francis who had fewer qualms about intercession and demonstrated this in his plans. The Girondins who controlled the Legislative Assembly felt that war was certain, and they had no complaint to it. They accepted that Europe was ready for revolution under the French administration. Despite the fact that they thought little of how such a war was to be pursued, they had a sovereign scorn for the Austrian and Prussian armed forces, and longed to put an end to the fomentation of the émigrés who were behind the interventionist powers. The Assembly finally declared war in April 1792.

The war started in this way under the influence of the radicals. Volunteers prepared to battle in the war put into Paris yet they doubted the Assembly because the conditions in Paris were far from what they had anticipated. The renewal of the French situation was not in sight and in the meantime the costs of nourishment kept on running high and bread became short in supply. In a sudden revolt in August 1792, the Parisians set up a progressive government, slaughtered various persons who had been held in jail as counter revolutionaries, and endeavored to catch the ruler and monarch. The monarch couple fled to the Assembly, which detained them to put them to trial. At that point the Assembly voted itself out of presence and called for new races to a National Convention, to be picked by suffrage. The chief undertaking

of the Convention would be the surrounding of a republican constitution to supplant the fleeting protected government in 1791.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-V

11. Who headed the third estate and what was his demand?
12. What were the Girondins thoughts on war?

NOTES

2.7 THE SECOND PERIOD OF THE REVOLUTION—THE FIRST REPUBLIC

In the meantime, the Central European forces were walking their armed forces to Paris and multitudes of French were not able to adapt to their presence. There was little uncertainty that the Prussian and Austrian armed forces would have had the capacity to take on France in war. At the same time, their significant investment was in the impending second segment of Poland, an occasion that spared France. As it happened, at the clash of Valmy in September 1792, French General Dumouriez could hold the adversary without any striking battling on either side. On that day of the clash of Valmy, the National Convention met and put the monarch on trial and sentenced him to the gallows.

On the other hand, the new King quietly submitted and even backed the new assembly. In this way the revolution followed through to its logical end, and always compelled men to take the lead. After the demise of the ruler, every individual who had voted in favour of the execution of the king felt marked in the same way as Cromwell and his Rump Parliament in the seventeenth century as regicides. They could search for no leniency either from a restored government or from outside interventionists, each one of whom, including the English—whose unrest and execution of a lord were currently about a century and a half in the past—claimed to respect such an end of a monarch.

The progressive initiative was presently in the hands of two gatherings of Jacobins and the Commune or the city administration of Paris. The conservative Girondins were still traditionalist in examination with the left wing, and had voted against the execution of the lord. In their perspective, the Revolution had gone far enough. They felt it should be put to an end and verify the common decide that they craved even at the expense of forsaking their progressive points abroad. The remaining Jacobins craved an upheaval to be spread in Europe through the medium of war and in shifting degrees, to make a genuine social transformation at home. The Commune was firmly anti-bourgeois, viewing the white-collar classes as barely superior to the nobles and censuring them for making benefits out of the war. The quality of the Girondins was focused in the regions as opposed to in Paris. At the same time, the Convention met in Paris (passing around 11,000 laws in its lifetime), and the regular workers could practice consistent weight on its members.

NOTES

The Girondins were caught off guard in Paris and were continually subject to intimidation. It was a matter of time before they would be denounced as counterrevolutionaries. Despite the fact that the Girondins shaped the first republican government, they were not able to make an accomplishment of the war exertion. Lastly, the Girondin General Dumouriez, victor of Valmy, left it to the Austrians. In June 1793, the Jacobins and leaders of the Commune turned on the heat on the Girondins and captured them. This occasion denoted the start of the alleged Reign of Terror, the pioneer being Maximillian Robespierre.

2.7.1 The Reign of Terror

The Convention, now ruled by the receptacles, set up a Committee of Public Safety, a Revolutionary Tribunal. Robespierre was the recognized the leader of the Committee. Other critical part were, one, Lazare Carnot who was given the title of ‘coordinator of triumph,’ earned by the arrangement of supply and recruitment; and Georges Danton, who was a part of the first committee yet was dropped later. Danton was an articulated progressive. Both the Committee and the Convention were a long way from the strategies to be sought after. The parts soon isolated into conservatives and radicals, while there was consistent weight from the different progressive developments, particularly in Paris.

The Committee of Public Safety was viable and performed its capacity with impressive capability. The three basic laws which it put into impact were the Law of Suspects, under which counterrevolutionaries of all classes—numerous were labourers who were in open revolt in the regions against induction and the Civil Constitution of the Clergy—were attempted and put to death regularly without satisfactory evidence on the condemnation of heading revolutionaries; the Law of Maximum, which set up value controls, upheld decently viably by the new organization set up in the territories by the Committee; and the levee as once huge mob, which was of huge relevance later on in the history of Europe.

2.7.2 Levee En Mass and its Significance

Until the French Revolution, all European wars had been battled with hired fighters and expert armed forces paid for by the government. When the war was complete, the terms of peace were concurred upon. ‘I have lost a fight. I will pay with a region,’ an Austrian monarch had once commented, and this was the standard state of mind of rulers. In the eighteenth century, scholars had found it conceivable that sometime or another, war would be battled without casualties. The armed forces of one power would endeavour to outflank those of an alternate; then, at another minute, the general would introduce a final proposal which would be acknowledged by his inverse number since the recent would recognize that on the off chance that he battled he would be crushed. Frederick the Great is accounted for to have said that he would never set out to force conscription, on the grounds that he would be confronted with wholesale abandonments.

The levee forced by the Committee of Public Safety on France amid the Revolution was the first current illustration of enrollment of the labour of any European

country. It was made conceivable by the way that the populace of a country identified itself with the war points of its leaders, as the people groups had never recognized themselves with the wars of the lords. It made little distinction to the inhabitants of a nation whether they were led by one ruler or an alternate. The Austrian Netherlands (Belgium of today) had some time ago fit in with Spain; after 1815 they would be quickly administered by the Dutch. Italian states were governed thus by French, Spanish, and Austrian rulers. Occupants of such states had little feeling of nationality; it would have been impossible for their rulers to have urged them to battle for their sake. Despite the fact that disciplines were recommended for refusal to battle, the law could not have been implemented if France had not gotten to be by now a genuine country, battling a national war.

An essential outcome of the idea of country-in-arms, battling a national war, had been called attention to by Mirabeau before his demise in 1791. The country itself was included in criticism and would not be prepared to acknowledge the misfortune of influence and eminence that went with it as long as more men could be selected and more assets tossed enthusiastically in the trust of turning the tide. Along these lines was conceived the thought of a national war, and, with the levee all at once, the methods were made accessible for pursuing it. The result for France was that it had neither a store of labour in arms that were not matched by any contemporary country nor for sure by all the armed forces together that contradicted it.

2.7.3 The Republic of Virtue: Fall of Robespierre

Under the veil of Committee of Public Safety and with the help of the authoritative virtuoso of Carnot, the French armed forces were gradually brought into shape and started to extend past French outskirts. Belgium and Holland were involved; the Spaniards, who had entered the war after the execution of Louis XVI, were vanquished. Prussia and Spain sued for peace before the end of 1794. Britain, which had entered the war against France when the French had possessed Belgium, met with no accomplishment against French arms on the continent; yet despite the fact that the port of Toulon in southern France was surrendered by royalists to the British naval force in 1793, the city was soon recaptured, and the Toulon royalists slaughtered.

The Committee suffered from inner discord, more from the clash of identities and battle for power than over standards. Conflict emerged between the direct members of the Committee and the people who leader was Robespierre. Robespierre won the conflict and Danton, who was heading the part of his resistance, was ousted. However, tables turned on Robespierre next and he was captured and sent to gallows. What happened afterwards is called the Thermidorian Reaction, after the name of the revolutionary month of Thermidor. The Girondins had been sticking around for their opportunity until the Terror as over, started to make themselves felt once more. All the more progressive components in the nation imagined that the Terror had gone far enough and should be abrogated. The forces of the Committee of Public Safety were curtailed yet Paris erupted into a revolt. People recouped full control of the Convention. As opposed to putting into impact a radical constitution which had been drawn up two years at one time, they chose to compose yet another

NOTES

NOTES

and significantly more traditionalist one. This Constitution of the Year III (1795) provided for an official collection of five chiefs and a bicameral assembly chosen by a more confined establishment than any that had so far been attempted. The two chambers got their names from olden times. The upper house, the Council of Elders, was determined from Sparta, and the lower house, the Council of Five Hundred, from Athens. The Convention, when it at last broke down itself, verified by suitable enactment that the vast majority of its parts would fit in with one or the other of the two chambers.

The Directory hence set up was to liquidate the Revolution. It was not allowed to take office without restriction. A gathering of royalist dissenters who questioned the new constitution set in movement an equipped insurgence, whereupon the friendly Convention called upon Napoleon Bonaparte to smother it. Napoleon, an officer who had separated himself in activity against the British in Toulon, scattered the revolutionaries with a 'whiff of grapeshot.'

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-VI

13. What did the Committee of Public Safety on France point out regarding the population?
14. How was the reign of terror initiated?

2.8 THE NAPOLEONIC ADMINISTRATION

When Napoleon took over as the First Consul in 1799, he was only thirty years old. He was not the only applicant for the part of military deliverer of the chiefs. Two men had been approached before him but had declined the honour. It is not argued that Napoleon was not prepared for this job. Scholars have contended that despite his military capabilities, he had a remarkably lithe personality and a retentive memory, a force of speedy choice, a mighty identity, and a non-appearance of critical qualms, all of which empowered him further. Such was his power that as soon as he took oath to his office, he was ready to remove the very people who had posted him there. His glory, won by triumphs picked up as First Consul, consolidated with the way that he could give the compelling classes what they needed, secured for him an enlargement of his residency as delegate to ten years. He won the title of 'Sovereign of the French', and the Pope came to France to crown him.

The most vital part of his project was to acquire peace and put an end to the war keeping in mind the end goal to provide for him time to set the domestic undertakings of France in place. Next in criticalness, and an essential for acknowledgement in the nation, was to put an end to the internal religious strife. After these, the additions of the Revolution must be solidified in a lasting law code, and the accounts of the nation must be put on a safe premise. All these points he accomplished, giving his exceptional vitality something to do to constrain each one of the individuals who worked with him to do their part as soon as possible.

2.8.1 Household Achievements of Napoleon

The main accomplishment on the home front was the Concordat with Rome (1801). Under the same plans which he arranged with the Pope, Catholicism was announced to be the religion of the three delegates and of most of the French individuals. Napoleon was to have the decision of the clerics, and they were to be blessed by the Pope (see: Concordat of Worms, 1122). The Church was to be disestablished, and the pay rates of the pastorate were to be paid by the state. The Pope consented to acknowledge the reallocation of Church properties, and to restore the refractory church to their obligation. The Concordat was an increase for the Church insofar as it was restored to some power in France, and it eased the buyers of Church grounds from the dread of being made to return them. In different ways, it was a triumph for the State and for Napoleon, who now needed to battle just with the anti-clerical revolutionaries. He could conciliate these to some degree by an arrangement of Organic Laws, which accommodated the installment of Protestant ministers, conceded opportunity of private love and religion to all (counting the right to be without religion), while in the meantime accepting for the State certain rights to police even the Catholic religion. The administrative gatherings sanctioned the Concordat and voted the extra laws in 1802.

Napoleon found that a great part of the monetary work that was required for the adjustment of the cash to have been achieved by the Directory. The piece of national obligation that had not been revoked was combined; costs in the early years of the consulate were highly decreased; and Napoleon put duty gathering on a more proficient premise. The intendants of the old administration were restored, with the new name of administrator. Such changes had constantly framed piece of the arrangement of the more compelling rulers. On the other hand, the establishing of the Bank of France in 1801 significantly supported the recuperation, and was additionally fit to support Napoleon when in later years he needed cash.

Napoleon himself accepted that his strongest accomplishment was the law code that bore his name, the Code Napoleon. He was in charge of the way that the Code, on which legal advisors had been working through the Revolution, was at last issued. Napoleon saw to it that the legal counselors when essential embraced the sound judgment perspective, and regularly kept them from hindering in lawful question on specialized matters. The Code in reality sanctified a considerable lot of the revolutionary changes. All subjects hence were to be equivalent according to the law. Primogeniture and the involving of domains were abolished; common marriage and separation were avowed as individual rights; the State was the incomparable power in religious and instructive matters; however every individual had the right to opportunity of inner voice. Therefore the common freedoms of the national were affirmed.

The Code also affirmed the rights and security of property yet the average workers picked up little. Aggregate dealing was a taboo, and the manager's oath was given more weight than the worker's in any disagreement about wages. The managers needed to issue a work card which recorded his employments and made blacklisting straightforward. Moreover, far reaching rights were given to parents

NOTES

NOTES

over their children and to spouses over their partners. The Code made a stride retrogressive by re-securing bondage, which had been nullified during the Revolution in the settlements. A significant part of the Code accordingly reflects the enthusiasm of Napoleon in securing the support of the working classes.

It ought to be mentioned here that in his later years, Napoleon kept an effective mystery police. In his reformatory code, issued in 1810, disciplines for unlawful acts against property were made more extreme, and a few manifestations of legal torment, constantly show in codes determined from Roman law, were reintroduced in the wake of having been annulled during the Revolution.

2.8.2 Wars of Napoleon

When Napoleon got to be delegate, France was still at war with a far reaching coalition, and had lost distinction over the Egyptian disaster. Egypt fell to Britain in 1801, while Napoleon had crushed Austria in northern Italy. Austria had to sign for peace, and Napoleon wheedled from the coalition all the associates of Britain. Britain, again alone, sought peace which was marked at Amiens in 1802. Egypt was allowed to the French, together with some minor concessions. Along these lines, by March 1802 Napoleon had united his position abroad and at home. Yet his position was a long way from secure, since it was sure that the British would not for long acknowledge such an unfavourable parity of force on the Continent, and Austria was just waiting for the right time to strike. The Treaty of Amiens was never satisfied totally by either France or Britain. On this basis, Napoleon plunged France into a commercial wander. He had the best armed force in Europe and he presumed that he could be brought to annihilation. In the meantime, the assault on Austria was being readied at the zone time. In October 1805, an Austrian armed force was compelled to surrender at Ulm. From there on England was protected from intrusion, and Napoleon concentrated on crushing his mainland foes.

The Austrians were crushed at Austerlitz in 1805, and made to sign an embarrassing peace under which Venetia was ceded. Prussia was crushed at Jena in 1806, and Napoleon possessed Berlin. The accompanying year, he imposed terms on Prussia which left her minimal more than a French manikin. Western Prussia was shorn from whatever remained of Prussia and given to Napoleon's sibling Jerome to manage as the kingdom of Westphalia. All Prussia's additions from the parts of Poland were taken from it, and another state of Warsaw was made. In the meantime, Napoleon crushed the Russians at Friedland in 1807, and Tsar Alexander I was forced in like manner to make terms with the champion. At this stage, Napoleon preferred Russia as a partner, as long as Alexander faithfully took his part in the last incredible hostile, the Continental Blockade, which was expected to bring Britain to her knees by cutting off her exchange with Europe.

The bar was declared in November 1806 and extended by two announcements of the accompanying year. The whole Continent was to be shut to British merchandise, and all exchange in the middle of Britain and the mainland nations was banned. British property on the Continent was confiscated. The declarations were made material to France and her partners, as well as to neutrals, which were urged to

watch the pronouncements on torment of being viewed and treated as adversaries. Britain commonly struck back with her own particular Orders-in-Council of 1807, which disallowed neutrals to exchange with France and her associates.

With her charge of the ocean, it was much simpler for Britain to keep up the bar than for France, which needed to police the whole coastline of Europe. Moreover, British products were much less expensive than any delivered on the Continent, owing to the better advancement of British industry (than be managed in the part on the Industrial Revolution), and it was impractical for French industry to take up the administration of all Europe. France herself could not do completely without some British items, and Napoleon was constrained to make certain exceptions to his regulations. Britain, in the meantime, got the support of the United States. Its strategy brought about the entrance of Denmark into the French framework after Britain had besieged Copenhagen in 1807 and seized the Danish armada, and in the War of 1812 with the United States.

Napoleon's impendance in Spain was the start of his defeat. He had acquired the Spanish crown for his sibling Joseph. The endeavour to spread the standards of the Revolution to a nation so appended to the Church along these lines riddled with benefit offered ascent to sporadic rebellions and an unending channel upon Napoleon's military resources. Portugal's rulers likewise were crashed into outcast, as Napoleon spread his Continental System through to the Atlantic and endeavoured to close Portuguese ports. The British sent what support they could to the promontory, and for five years kept on sending troops and supplies, constraining Napoleon himself to take the field in 1808. Despite the fact that the fortunes of war swung now to one side, when of Napoleon's thrashing in Russia in 1812-1813, Portugal and Spain were in British hands, and the British general, the Duke of Wellington, headed his troops into France in 1813.

2.8.3 The Russian Campaign and the Downfall of Napoleon

Napoleon was incomparable in Europe from 1809 to 1812, and had also won the war. At the point when Napoleon abandoned in 1814, his child in principle got to be the ruler and was known to Bonapartists as Napoleon. However, just like Louis XVII, he never dominated. Britain and in the Iberian landmass to contend with, the Continental System was not making much advancement. Despite the fact that it did harm British exchange, it did not hint at bringing the nation to annihilation. Russia withdrew from it in 1810. Alexander I of Russia was likewise genuinely stressed by Napoleon's action in the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, which he was continually growing.

It was Napoleon choice to attack Russia in 1812 with an armed force made up of troops gathered from all over Europe, invigorated by the French veterans who could have crushed any armed force they needed to meet. Alexander's officers did not propose to battle head on. One dangerous encounter at Borodino was the main fight they allowed. Napoleon took Moscow, yet it was set aflame by the withdrawing Russians, and the sovereign was constrained to withdraw himself. His armed force was demolished by winter and by rebuffing assaults from the Russian rangers. The head at long last left the armed force and came back to France, barely in time to assemble enough constrains to make the armed forces of all the European powers.

NOTES

NOTES

In 1813, the ruler was totally defeated at the clash of Leipzig. Wellington immediately moved up Spain, and attacked France over the Pyrenees. The joint armed forces caught Paris in March 1814 and Napoleon surrendered a couple of days. He was banished to Elba with a benefit, while the forces accumulated in Vienna to civil argument what was to be finished with France.

Louis XVII was restored to his throne in the wake of undertaking to give a constitution and acknowledge the heft of the changes of the Revolution and the Napoleonic administration. Napoleon got away from Elba, and France officially exhausted of the restoration, longed for the glories of the Napoleonic period. The opposition to Napoleonic coalition was without a moment's delay restored. While Napoleon had won some minor triumphs, his armed force was defeated by the coalition, headed by Wellington for the British and Gebhard Leberecht von Blucher for the Prussians, at Waterloo (1815). This time Napoleon was banished to St. Helena, a remote island in the southern Atlantic.

2.8.4 Character and Achievements of Napoleon

Napoleon satisfied the trusts brought by the Revolution in France. He conceded certain individual freedoms, subject to the higher needs of the State — which in Napoleon's opportunity implied a restriction and a mystery police. In France, the legacy of Napoleon, as unique from the legacy of the French Revolution, was patriotism and patriotism that have been excessively closely connected with military accomplishments to be wholly sound. The association in the middle of triumph and national magnificence is still not opportunity and status. Such intimate components as were sporadically encouraged by the Revolution were never arresting under the tenet of Napoleon. Napoleon had founded new requests of honourability and presented titles on the individuals who notably helped him, particularly officers; he likewise initiated the Legion of Honor, a grant of legitimacy which persisted and got to be profoundly looked for after even in later republican administrations. Napoleon's instructive re-structures incorporated a state college and an efficient secondary school (lycee) framework, which in his day was planned to turn out common servants, required in ever more noteworthy numbers under his tenet. His framework, obviously, survived, and could be utilized by different administrations than his.

Napoleon was one of the best propagators of individuals' thoughts, and every one of them he turned adequately to his own particular utilization. His speedy discernment empowered him to see exactly how any thought or organization could be changed over to his benefit, and his unequaled vitality and self-discipline empowered him to reduce quality to increase throughput when he accepted it to be in his own particular diversions and in light of a legitimate concern for his administration. Despite his own particular exertions to run across it in the isolation of St. Helena, few others have ever had the capacity to perceive any flash of optimism in his make-up; nor any indication of good doubt.

As a military man he had the utilization of the best and by a long shot the biggest, armed force in Europe, and he made compelling utilization of it, particularly by developing velocity of move and 'getting there first with the most men.' He

exited as meager as could be expected under the circumstances to risk. He was loved by his troops, for he had the attraction of the conceived pioneer; yet despite the fact that his absence of liberality indicated in his reluctance to give credit to his officers and marshals for their triumphs, and he accordingly incurred the hostility of some, the political needs of a military explorer may be sufficient explanation for this unvarying request on taking particular credit for everything that he considered respectable accomplished under his rule.

Serfdom was nullified and various other common changes were put into operation. Before the Napoleonic administration was brought to a halt, Prussia had received induction. Prussians were burnt out on thrashing and tired of being viewed as eminent just in logic. The political framework initiated by Napoleon to supplant the defunct Holy Roman Empire was in the end to bring about the unification of a German country, as portrayed in the following part an occasion that appeared miserable as long as the old imperial framework made due, in however weak a structure. The impact of the Napoleonic long for realm on Germans is hard to assess; Germany was more intensely populated than France, and had unrivaled assets for a modern age. When Germany was bound together into a cutting edge mechanical country, the background for conceivable extension was available, whether Napoleon had ever managed much of Europe in an earlier age.

The nations administered by Napoleon were all to a more noteworthy or lesser degree exasperated by French progressive plans, despite the fact that they had been forced upon them by a tyrant. As the nineteenth century was to reveal to, it was unthinkable for them ever to submit to a wholly unenlightened or wasteful imperialism again, nor would they be able to allow their rulers to lead without some investment in government by the working classes, not even in minister and respectable ridden Spain.

Latin Americans utilized the time of Napoleon to start their liberation from the Spanish yoke. Russia's ruler allowed liberal constitutions to Poland and Finland, which he had won through the wars, and thought about re-structures in Russia herself until he fell under different impacts than French and dismissed from his progressivism. Britain, despite the fact that the wars were an extreme strain on her assets, rose with a much stronger modern establishment than before the war. There was no unmistakable sign that she had been highly influenced by the progressive thoughts of France or Napoleon. Patriotism had characteristically expanded through the wars. So the world proceeded onward into the nineteenth century; and the forces were urged to repair the harm delivered by Napoleon and the French Revolution as best they could.

NOTES

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-VII

15. What was Napoleon's main agenda?
16. What is Napoleon's greatest achievement?

NOTES

2.9 UNTREST OF 1838

This part will present the accomplishments of **liberalism** and the development of vote-based system in the 19th century Europe. Such progressivism as there was in the disunited and subject states fundamentally needed to take second place to nationalism while autonomy or solidarity was being accomplished. It is in the more established countries that radicalism can best be seen at work—changing the organizations, making the lawmaking body more illustrative, taking power away when important from the ruler or gentry, attempting to enhance the part of the individuals by proper enactment. The three nations where radicalism thrived most were, France, Great Britain, and the United States, and thus the three nations find greater mention in this section. At the end of the nineteenth century there were still just two republics in Christian Europe: the confederation of Switzerland and the Third Republic of France. Yet there was only one supreme ruler, the Soviet Union, and even Russia needed to concede a constitution in 1905.

2.9.1 Demeanor of Different Social Classes toward Constitutional Government

There was wide contradiction among different social classes in France with respect to what sort of government was attractive. This distinction reflected the social structure of France. In France, for a considerable length of time there had been a steady, traditionalist, and usually religious class of labourers and little agriculturists whose work was limited by the neighbourhood residential community and which had doubts about the revolutionary Paris. The bourgeoisie had its establishment in the field or the residential area, and not in the substantial towns or in the capital. This was obviously more stamped in the nineteenth than it was in the twentieth century.

The proletariat, on the other hand, was a long way from being non-literate; its most vivid memories of the French Revolution incorporated the consummation of feudalism, the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, the breakdown of the flow of cash, the Terror and the labourers' own particular counterrevolution of the Vendee, and the extraordinary wars, battled outside the dirt of France, exceptionally the triumphs of Napoleon. Except for the closure of feudalism and the conceivable exemption of the wars, all these occasions were viewed as wrong by the proletariat. However, the workers shared the French patriotism and yearned for greatness of the Napoleon era. The labourers likewise recollected that Napoleon had gone to an agreement with the Church, under which their ministers and their religion had been restored.

At whatever point the labourers were given the opportunity to vote, they went either for the local person whose work they were aware of and who was mostly a traditionalist or the one who most likely belonged to the moderate ideology. Although in specific districts of France a few labourers were unequivocally anti-clerical, the majority of them supported the government. In 1848, people voted in favour of a moderate government and in 1849, for a royalist government, notwithstanding the fact that a couple of months back they had picked Louis Napoleon as president. All the workers were aware of was the name of Napoleon, while

having no clue what he remained for. In 1871, when Napoleon was in a state of banishment, they realized that he had recently been vanquished, and they had no longing so far for a republic. So they voted in favour of the monarchy who they felt could restore a Bourbon or an Orleanist to the throne.

At the same time, the radical representatives of the proletariat had no possibility of transforming the constitution to the point that they could win power. Widespread suffrage implied a royalist or Bonapartist to power; a constrained property establishment implied administration by a middle class government. A plebiscite, the instrument utilized by Napoleon III and General de Gaulle, varied just in its straightforwardness from the race of agents. It gave the specialists no possibility of making their perspectives dominating. They were thus in a state of perpetual political dissatisfaction.

By clever strategies, they were able to take control of Paris following under a centralized authoritative framework the focal represent meant controls of neighbourhood arrangements. Paris could not be managed by the common labourers. It was not until the 1880s that France had chosen a comparative metropolitan legislative framework and the forces of the government were strictly constrained. All that the Parisian specialists could consequently do was to topple a government by immediate activity. This was achieved in 1830 and in 1848. In 1871, the specialists set up a Commune, which was stifled by the armed force. Today, the majority of French professionals stand by the Communist party. The class cleavages in France still have not buried and no constitution could address the issue.

The nineteenth-century political and constitutional history of France might be seen just if the essential class cleavages and the transcendence of Paris in the life of the country are caught on. The bourgeoisie put something aside for the time of the Second Empire and for the concise rule of Charles X (1824-1830), were in undisputed control of the nation. Amid the Second Empire, they wielded more impact than whatever available gathering. There were numerous liberals among them, and under the Third Republic the administration was in numerous regards the most liberal. It was a preservationist and not a radical progressivism and majority rule government; the privileges of property, as in contemporary England, were sacrosanct, and the legislature principally served the premiums of the rich classes.

2.9.2 The End of the Bourbon Monarchy (1814-1830)

Louis XVIII (1814-1824), ongoing to the throne, ‘allowed’ a constitution to his subjects under which the Chamber of Deputies (the lower place of the assembly) was chosen by more or less 100,000 voters, respectable men of property. The lord and his parliament generally saw eye to eye on most matters, and the ruler had no craving to squabble with it. His sibling Charles X (1824-1830) had no such compunctions. He had no expectation of permitting his energy to be constrained by the lawmaking body; and when, as the aftereffect of his disagreeable strategies, even the propertied electorate picked delegates who contradicted him, government quickly got to be incomprehensible. The ruler was scrutinized in the press and proposed to organization control. He appointed clergymen in whom the Chamber of Deputies

NOTES

NOTES

had no certainty and who couldn't charge a lion's share in it. He utilized his just control over the Chamber to attempt to get a dominant part great to him; that is, he disintegrated it. The new Chamber was even, more liberal than the old. Charles hence proposed to change the discretionary premise to guarantee the decision just of his own partisans, the ultra-royalists, known as Ultras.

Charles did not have available to him the forces delighted in by the English Charles II amid the Restoration; even the French armed force, which may have been devoted to the ruler, was award battling in Algeria. The National Guard, made up of propertied persons who kept their arms at home in preparation for a call to administration, was not thoughtful, and Charles had disintegrated the Guard, from a certain perspective, a couple of years at one time. In July, 1830 the Paris labourers, headed this time by the resistance common delegates, climbed in rebellion and Charles went into outcast.

2.9.3 The 'July Monarchy' (1830-1848)

The July Revolution set off a train of minor upheavals in Europe; in France itself little was changed. The establishment was multiplied by lowering the property confinements; and the Ultras had lost their impact in parliament with the misfortune of their impact on the Crown. Louis was exceptionally cautious to offer as non-revolutionary an appearance as he could. He evaded remote wars called himself the 'Napoleon of Peace.' At the end of his rule, when a progression of terrible harvests and the main extreme modern dejection that France needed to experience amid the century were stimulating a progressive mature, particularly in Paris, he attempted to accomplish more.

During the rule of Louis Philippe, the legislature was in the hands of the upper Bourgeoisie, under a progression of chief ministers. The French were exhausted with Louis and his tenet. There was no glory; flourishing was generally for the few; and at the end there was close dejection for a large number of the labourers. At the point when Louis Philippe was asked for to enlarge the establishment to provide for some political influence to others than the rich, he could not answer, 'Get rich yourselves and afterward you can have your vote,' he retorted. The liberals requested a more extensive establishment and a more prevalent government, yet Louis opposed their requests for his entire rule, despite the fact that at the end he was on the purpose of allowing it. The Paris specialists, a large portion of whom were influenced by the new communist assumptions joined with the liberals in the longing to dispose the government. A revolt finished with the executing of twenty persons in February 1848. Louis surrendered and took after his forerunner to England.

2.9.4 The Revolutions of 1848

At the point when in 1847 Marx cautioned of the approach of a revolution in The Communist Manifesto, he may have been the only individual in Europe to expect it. Yet, within the four months of 1848, the Continent was shaken by just about 50 different upheavals in Prussia, Austria, and practically all the lesser German and Italian states. Studying the wreckage of governments, Tsar Nicholas I kept in touch

with Queen Victoria that Russia and Britain appeared to be the last two states remaining in Europe.

The Causes of the Revolutions

Some general reason for the upheavals could be perceived even though they contrasted with the circumstances of each state or district. The Industrial Revolution, which had started decisively on the Continent after 1830, had shaken social and demographic examples and significantly adjusted political ones. Unfulfilled patriot yearnings were an essential impetus in Germany, Italy, and Eastern Europe. These tensions and grievances were additionally exacerbated, as before 1789 and 1830, by difficult times. Harvests were poor in the three years before 1848; the Prussian lower class lacked bread, while in Ireland the failure in 1845 of the potato crop was led to the mass starvation and resettlement, which between them lessened the number of inhabitants in the nation from 8.5 million to 6.5 million in five years. Urban labourers were pressed by the climbing cost of sustenance, and agricultural emergency soon created modern despondency. The coordination of rural and modern markets through industrialist improvement implied that any aggravation in one area of the framework had prompt repercussions in whatever remained of it, while the new centralization of populace in towns and urban areas gave characteristic foci of discontent.

The most pervasive component in the unrests of 1848 was the general addressing of the existing political request. The rulers of the Old Regime had built their power in light of talks of a perfect right and a traditional social request. But such a rule could not bring in the desired social changes of a new world. The new average or semi middle-class administrations established by the occasions of 1830-1832, however, were unwilling to grasp the larger part of the individuals in the political procedure. In no European country could the electorate surpass five per cent of the populace. The Chartists sought after their interest for widespread masculinity suffrage in Britain with requesting of fights of three million marks in 1842 and five million in 1848, just to meet with continuing dismissal in Parliament, while in France, with just legislature of Francois Guizot set itself undauntedly against even a token augmentation of the establishment. Following two unrests and 60 years, the French Assembly was a less representative body than the Estates General of Louis XVI had been.

The Collapse of the Old Order

The unrests started with a mixing in Italy where on January 12 the populace of Sicily rose against Ferdinand II. Not long before, Milan and Venice had broadcasted their old freedom as republics and approached King Charles Albert of Piedmont and Pope Pius IX to help bring together the whole promontory. The French were not a long way behind. Liberal reformers, hindered from open showings, had embraced the British strategy of holding meals that were in actuality mass political revives for the benefit of an unobtrusive development of the establishment. At the point when the powers looked to boycott one such dinner in Paris in late February, the occasions of 1830 quickly rehashed themselves. Riots broke out, barricades went up, and the National Guard, shouted to control the unsettling influences, joined in. Louis-Philippe dismissed the disagreeable Guizot in an offer to recapture working class help. Yet the Parisian specialists were not to be hoodwinked a second time. Breaking into the

NOTES

NOTES

Chamber of Deputies, they constrained the declaration of a republic, and Louis-Philippe fled into outcast in London.

The news from Paris aroused protesters in Germany and Austria. In Berlin, the faltering Frederick William I (1840-1861) ended up a virtual detainee of patriots who requested that Prussia lead the pack in binding together. Understudy dissidents and specialists joined in Vienna to concentrate a guarantee of reform from the sovereign Ferdinand I, and the matured Metternich fled the city in cover to join Louis-Philippe in a state of banishment.

More genuine were patriot uprisings by the Bohemians Prague and the Hungarians in Budapest. Moreover, the Hungarian Diet, made only out of aristocrats and long a standout among the most response gatherings in Europe, voted in favour of protected government, the annulment of serfdom, and the inconvenience of duty on the honourability. Before the end of March, the Austrian domain was prostrate, while in Germany a gathering of liberals, gathering spontaneously in Heidelberg, called for the race an all-German parliament on the premise of widespread suffrage and under the supervision of a chosen body, the parliament, summoned specifically by them. The absolute most obvious actuality about this tornado of insurgencies was the shortcoming and surrender of the built governments. As Charles X had fallen in 1830 the strong thrones in Europe, Prussia and Austria were also shaken.

Counterrevolution in Central Europe

In Italy, Charles Albert had sooner expected initiative of the opposition to Habsburg coalition when it started to crumple; a counterrevolution restored Ferdinand II in Sicily, while the Venetians made it clear that they had no proposition of deserting their republic to union with the House of Savoy. In July, Austria gravely crushed Charles Albert's powers at the clash of Custoza, and a last endeavor to revive the reason finished in misfortune at Novara in March 1849. The Italian conflagration was not exactly over; in November 1848 Pius IX fled Rome after the death of his chief pastor, and a republic was broadcasted in February headed by Giuseppe Mazzini (1805-1872), whose energetic vision of a united, majority rule Italy had made him a legend to a generation of junior patriots. Mazzini's legislature immediately proclaimed the reallocation of chapel terrains and their redistribution to the proletariat, and in addition a project of open lodging for the urban poor. Despite the fact that it controlled just the city of Rome and its prompt environs, the republic announced itself the core of a united Italy. It fell to a French armed force in July notwithstanding tenacious safety, and with the fall of Venice a month later, the breakdown of the progressive reason was finished.

In Hungary, the Magyar greater part under Kossuth quickly distanced the different minorities under its control by annulling neighborhood gatherings in non-Magyar regions and recommended that Hungarian be the selective dialect of all higher education and also of the Diet. This fortified Slavic nationalism, which finished in a skillet Slav congress that gathered in Prague in June, just to be stifled by troops under General Alfred Windischgratz still devoted to the Habsburgs. This triumph encouraged the court gathering to endeavor the liberation of Vienna. In October, Windischgratz possessed the city after a siege and executed or ousted its radical

pioneers on the spot. Two months after the fact Ferdinand I was affected to venture down for his 18-year-old nephew, Franz Joseph I (1848- 1916), who, unencumbered by his antecedent's guarantees to the liberals, finished the procedure of reclamation the accompanying summer by pulverizing the Hungarian revolt with the help of 140,000 Russian troops.

In Germany, in the meantime, the Frankfurt Assembly set to its errand of giving the nation a national government and a constitution. The principal abnormality of its position was soon evident. All the agents were college instructed parts of the upper bourgeoisie: legal advisors, specialists, researchers, pastors, bankers, dealers, and producers. Their vision was of a world made alright for common open door: unhindered commerce, unrestricted development, an end to the political restraining infrastructure of the privileged, and a liberal administration directing kindly over a swelling terrible national item. However, the masses did not need these. They were workers clamoring for area, artisans requesting assurance for their exchanges, and labourers who needed higher wages and mechanical revival.

While the Frankfurt representatives endeavoured to whip their complex contrasts whether the new numerous ought to be an alliance or an unitary state, insurgency, a domain, or a republic, or more all what ought to look to consolidate German-speaking regions of Denmark, and Poland inside its outskirts the ex-administrations of the German Confederation, help sitting tight for last annihilation yet at the same time in control of their enemies, gradually recuperated their power. When the get together had drafted its constitution, which included penitentiaries for flexibility of discourse, gathering, and the religious toleration, and state funded instruction, both Prussia and Austria had ended up solid enough to reject it out of Frederick William IV.

France: From Revolution to Empire

The course of occasions was truly distinctive. Here from Mazzini's fleeting Roman republic, rich of an autonomous state had really been in and another temporary government secured. Blanc was the apparition of Blanqui, white-haired and cackled, 'the most finish progressive of his time', demonstrated his energy by showing off 1,000 white-collar workers in Paris in March 1848. At the point when Blanc assured to win them the concessions they requested, one of marchers called him a swindler. By then, a large portion of the wealthier bourgeoisie and honorability had officially fled Paris, and the United States was the main influence to perceive the French republic.

A Constituent Assembly, chosen by adult suffrage in April, met on May 4 and quickly supplanted the provisional government with a five officials of its own. On June 22, after an abortive upset headed by Blanqui, the administration proclaimed the disintegration of the employment program, leaving 200,000 unemployed persons in Paris in the lurch. The people went up in revolt, the government declared military law, and the class war proclaimed just six prior before Marx wrote *The Communist Manifesto*. Ten thousand individuals were killed or injured in a three-day battle without quarter (June 24-26) until troops under General Louis Cavagnac recaptured control of the city. The Assembly declared that the 15,000 detainees will be extradited.

NOTES

NOTES

The 'June Days' sent a shiver down the spine of the middle-classes in Europe. Such was the violence that it was compared to the attack on Rome by tribes. 'Each ordinary,' composed the editorial manager of Red Revolution in London, 'who does not see and feel that he has a place with an oppressed and debased class is a trick.' The ideological break between the classes was finished, and that division remains the formal carriage of western European governmental issues till today.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-VIII

17. In which three countries did radicalism thrive?
18. What did Mazzini's legislature proclaim?

2.10 ASCENT OF PATRIOTISM IN RUSSIA

The rise of nationalism in Russia was an important event for the development of nationalistic fervor in the European continent. The noteworthy extension of the Russian Empire frightened and perplexed other European powers. The immoderate victories accomplished by France and Britain in the Crimean War (1854-56) weighed the Muscovite aspirations in the West, and saved Turkey from dismantling. However, Russian colonialism proceeded with its drive to the east and south. In the twenty years that emulated the Peace of Paris (1856), Russia picked up the coastland inverse Japan and enslaved Turkestan. This Asiatic domain, procured in two decades, surpassed in territory all the additions that the Russians had won in Europe in two centuries. Obviously, the settled and cultivated European states could withstand the Russian infringements substantially more effectively than the retrograde and disarranged people groups of Asia.

2.10.1 The Aftermath of the Crimean War

Russia is an extension in the middle of Europe and Asia in a geological sense, as well as in a social, recorded, and military sense. The Crimean War had showed that the military strengths of France and Britain surpassed the Russian armed forces in preparing, organization, and supplies as incredibly as the Russians in their turn surpassed the Chinese. All through the dictator's realm the bumbles and thrashings of the war created a mood of dissatisfaction and discontent. The Russian armed force had been an object of extraordinary pride to Nicholas I (1825-55) and his last days were obscured by the switches which it endured on the Crimean Peninsula. These switches could not be credited to absence of labour or of assets, for Russia had both in plenitude. The basic troopers had battled unyieldingly but the breakdown of the commissariat benefit, of transport offices, and the joining and debasement among high authorities invalidated the offerings of the majority. The war uncovered surrenders in the Nicholas System which could not be concealed, and the armed force lost a great part of the eminence which it had delighted in since the battle with Napoleon a large portion of a century before.

The spreading discontent supported the new emperor, Alexander II (1855-81), to inaugurate a period of changes. Totalitarianism, conventionality, and patriotism remained the watchwords, yet Alexander proposed to bring Russian foundations into closer agreement with the dynamic and humanitarian soul of the nineteenth century. He failed to offer his father's military solidness and had little encounter in managerial undertakings, yet he was patient, wary, and kind-hearted.

NOTES

2.10.2 The Emancipation of the Serfs

Alexander's single accomplishment was his liberation of about forty million Russian serfs, a deed which won him the distinguishment of deliverer. To visit a rustic Russian group in the prior nineteenth century was similar to going to the Middle Ages. Ninth-tenth of the area was held by about one hundred thousand honourable families. The serfs could be sold with the homes to view proprietors, recruited into the noble man's family to act as household servants, or even sent to the plants in the towns for their expert's benefit. Serfs were badly treated; they could not marry without the assent of their masters, could not leave the bequest without authorization, and be rebuffed in the event they tried to escape.

This arrangement of human servitude was disliked by Russians as a disgrace upon their development. As landowners declined to change the framework willfully, Alexander II issued a law annulling serfdom in 1861. Supplemented by further declarations in 1863 and 1866, this decree transformed serfs into free natives, and allowed them to hold their houses, instruments, and sufficient area for them to keep up themselves by their normal exertions. This miffed the upper classes as well as the labourers because this abolition meant that serfs will be equal to the working class of the country.

2.10.3 Other Reforms of Alexander II

The ruler reorganized the law courts. He declared a court framework displayed on that of the western countries, with nearby justices of the peace, region tribunals, and a high court of last claim. Criminals won the benefit of trial by jury and the proceedings in common and criminal cases were opened to people in general. Alexander himself neglected to make the new request either reliable or all inclusive, for he safeguarded the notorious 'Third Section' and the mystery police tribunals sorted out by his father to rebuff political guilty parties.

Alexander additionally portrayed the arrangement for an open instruction, with grade schools, auxiliary schools and universities, backed and supervised by the state. He loosened the strict restriction on the press, allowed Russians to travel abroad and treated the Jews and other minority races in the realm with more noteworthy thought and mercy than his father had demonstrated. At the same time, the tune of criticism which welcomed his attempts overwhelmed and debilitated him. The moderates reprimanded his arrangements as perilously radical. The liberal learned people called them nerveless moderate, while the workers resisted all developments with devout lack of concern. The aloofness and dynamic resistance which he experienced checked Alexander's reforming exertions after 1865, despite the fact that he maintained an affectation of excitement.

NOTES

The Reaction in the Later Years of Alexander II

One component which turned Alexander II to respond was the Polish uprising of 1863. Blended by the spread of liberal thoughts and by their invulnerable long for national freedom, Polish loyalists organized a rebellion, which was crushed by the Russian army. Set to destroy the Polish nationalism, the Russian government executed the pioneers of the rebellion and sequestered their territories. Russian became the authority dialect and the Catholic Church in Poland was debilitated by the misfortune of much of its territory and the concealment of cloisters. The reallocated terrains were dispersed among the proletariat.

An endeavour to kill him, made by an aficionado in 1866, scattered Alexander's last liberal sensitivities. Persuaded at long last that in messing with the Nicholas System he had opened the route to disorder, the ruler betrayed change. Thus the zemstvos, the law courts, the diaries, and the schools discovered their benefits relentlessly diminished; vigilant police spies kept a check on the society; and the intellectuals were royally disapproved. Author Count Leo Tolstoy (1828-1910) 'admitted that he felt amaze each one morning on arousing to observe that he was not making a course for outcast in Siberia'.

An extensive gathering of Russians, known as Slavophil's, or Nationalists, hailed the dictator's resumption of the Slavophil's customary approach of dictatorship, universality, and patriotism. The Slavophil's held that Russia was a special nation, with traditions, convictions, and organizations exceptional to itself. To embrace the dress, the behaviour, the legitimate and political standards of the western European states appeared unfaithful to these nationalists whose aversion of the 'westernizers' and their servile impersonation of European society dated from the days when Peter the Great had opened his 'windows to the west.' The Slavophiles themselves had little to offer in the method for a constructive system. Their beliefs were generally ambiguous and negative yet they appealed to the nationalists, the conventional church, and the inactively conservative masses.

The 'Father of Russian Liberalism' and a heading hero of protected reform had been Alexander Herzen (1812-70). Herzen had done much to energize the liberal analyses that denoted the period 1855-65, for his leaflets and diaries, pirated into Russia notwithstanding the control, were perused by a lot of people and the high authorities, including the 'Emperor Liberator' himself. With Alexander's change to a more mindful arrangement after 1865 and Herzen's passing in 1870, the more direct programme of constitutional change lost its bid.

2.10.4 The Spread of Anarchism, Nihilism, and Terrorism

The change of temper after 1870 is reflected in the exercises of the agitators, skeptics, and terrorists. The anarchism word 'political agitation' was first popularized by French essayist Pierre Joseph Proudhon (1809-65), who, accepting that all legislature based upon physical power was unfair, urged a request of society in which men would live together in peace and freedom without governments, without a police energy, and without compulsion of any sort. Proudhon's speculations, which may have sufficed to administer a community of holy persons, showed up absolutely impractical link for

the direction of a general public in which most people are trying to enhance themselves by misusing others. His contention that the institution of private property, ensured by the law, the police, and the legislature, was piece of an unfair framework struck a responsive harmony in the heart of Russian leader Michael Bakunin (1814-76). On the off chance that Herzen was the father of Russian progressivism, Bakunin may be viewed as the father of Russian radicalism.

In 1814, Bakunin went to Germany and France and joined in the progressive development of Bakunin 1848. Captured in Dresden and transported to Russia, he was banished to Siberia from where he escaped in 1861. His hand was lifted against everything which forced upon or limited the freedom of individuals, against God of the theologians, against marriage, and against the state. Sympathetic and basic in way, Bakunin felt himself committed to a vocation of all inclusive devastation and rebellion, urged on by his compassion for misery mankind which he saw as smashed underneath the oppression of existing institutions. That legislature, while it benefited a few parts of society a larger number of maybe than others, may none the less be indispensable for the insurance of whatever, he could not see, and in nations, for example, Russia, where the disasters of dictatorship were more obvious than the points of interest given by the administration, his principles won numerous proselytes among radical thinkers.

The terrorists were witnesses of activity who accepted that no methodical or legitimate cure could be found for the shades of malice of the czarist administration. The government was believed to be untrustworthy and despotic by them and they claimed that it had neglected to check its misapplies, and adamantly declined to let the Russian foundation changes through an agent parliament receptive to their wishes. The main system which remained, the terrorist held, was to terrify the ruler and his pastors into making changes by a conscious approach of savagery and death. Mystery progressive gatherings, working with uncommon understanding and sly, plotted one death after an alternate, regardless of the relentless movement of the police. In 1879, an endeavour was made to explode the ruler's train; and another blast smashed the Winter Palace. Alexander II declared war on these radicals but was killed by them in 1881.

2.10.5 Alexander III and the Policy of Russification

This intense exertion to temper imperialism by death demonstrated a disappointment. The revolutionaries picked up no playing point from the rough demise of the saved Czar Liberator, for his child and successor, Alexander III, showed himself a solid willed autocrat who immediately announced his plan to retaliate for his father's homicide and to safeguard the totalitarian regime. In Constantine Pobiedonostsev (1827-1907) and Yenceslas de Plehve (1846- 1904) he discovered subordinates prepared and willing to do this approach. Pobiedonostsev, as 'Procurator of the Holy Synod,' steered the undertakings of the Russian Orthodox Church. He had excused his doubt of parliaments, prevalent training, and the press into a veritable theory of response, and he pushed an urging impact over the brain of the new emperor. For the more practical undertaking of running backstabbers to earth, Alexander III depended upon Plehve, who directed the state police with such savage proficiency that for a few years' revolutionary action everything except stopped.

NOTES

NOTES

2.10.6 Nicholas II and the Revolution of 1905

Alexander III was succeeded by his child Nicholas II in 1894. Nicholas was an amiable man but without perseverance, authoritarian on a basic level yet frail in will. Like Louis XVI of France, he inherited unrest and was bound to pay with his life for the oversights of his predecessors and additionally for his own. In spite of the fact that his father's arrangement of response and Russification had created mounting restriction, Nicholas made no concessions. He held Pobiedonostsev in office and duplicated the powders of the scorned container Slavist, Plehve, until the last's death in 1904.

The Russo-Japanese War (1904-05), a result of the skillet Slavists aspiration to grow the Russian solid footing on Ocean, brought rude disasters which the spoiled imperial framework was ill-suited to persist. As this annihilation emulated an alternate, and proof of defilement and wastefulness in high official rings became visible, an age of grumbling, feedback, and issue cleared the domain. Deaths reproduced, equipped rebellion softened out up Poland, and in Saint Petersburg a parade of solicitors headed by a minister, Gapon, was terminated upon by the warriors. Revolution undermined to inundate the supreme administration and Nicholas II concurred reluctantly to offer concessions. He announced religious toleration for minority factions, crossed out the overdue debts which numerous workers still owed for their collective grounds, evacuated disagreeable authorities, and guaranteed (June, 1905) to establish a Russian parliament. This make a guarantee to be reaffirmed four months after the fact in his 'October Manifesto,' which ensured mainstream liberties restricted suffrage, and capable government under a bicameral lawmaking body.

By 1906, the progressive wave had begun to ebb. The Social Democrats in the urban communities and the Socialist Revolutionaries in the nation couldn't join together their deliberations; numerous working class liberals were fulfilled by the October Manifesto (and were thus known as 'Octobrists'), while others (termed the Constitutional Democrats, or Cadets), longed to press on to a genuinely fair government. The reactionary classes, perplexed in 1905, started to rally their strengths, and, feeling sure that the risk of transformation was melting away, they urged Nicholas to withdraw his promises. Under these circumstances it is not surprising that the first Russian Parliament, or Duma, which collected in May 1906, found itself weak to resuscitated control over emperor's pastors.

At the point when the delegates of the realm demanded a capable service, the Duma was broken down by majestic declaration. The Cadets, the most resistant gathering among the appointees, endeavored to reassemble at Viborg in Finland, and bid futile to the Russian individuals to help their stand. A second Duma was summoned to meet in March, 1907, but when it demonstrated the same independent soul, it moreover was quickly broken up. Nicholas now resolved to overhaul the electoral framework in such a way more radical components were checked or disenfranchised. The third Duma, in which the moderates and preservationists prevailed, demonstrated more mollifying and was allowed to sit until 1912. Its part had been reduced from that of an assembly to the weak nobility of a bulletin or consultative body, and the

Russian government kept on advocating Herzen's arraignment that it was 'material drive set up of a perfect, material power set up of power.'

In 1906, Nicholas picked as his prime minister a capable compromiser, Peter Stolypin (1863-1911). Stolypin was a man of firm character who managed enthusiastically with political wrongdoers. After 1906, revolutionary disturbance gradually subsided, demonstrations of roughness developed less regular, police retaliations less serious. Stolypin was killed in 1911. In 1912, a fourth Duma was chosen and displayed the same moderate aura as its forerunner in trading off Duma (1912) with power. Russia had accomplished a flitting harmony between the powers of radicalism and oppression. It stayed to be seen whether, under savvy statesmanship, the realm would progress gently along the protected way, or whether another emergency would hasten a second insurgency more radical, more ferocious, and more destructive than the uncertain exertion of 1905. The desire for tranquil advancement blurred when World War I opened in 1914, for war conditions halted all reforms.

NOTES

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-IX

19. What did the Slavophiles believe?
20. Who was known as the Father of Russian Liberalism?

2.11 UNIFICATION OF GERMANY

The frenzy which seized the administering classes all through Europe amid the progressive episodes of 1848 and 1849 made it felt with specific drive in Germany. After 1849, the Austrian government, strengthened by its military triumphs over the Italians and the Hungarians, turned its drives to the well-known assignment of stamping out the last ashes of rebellion. The recommendations for German unification supported by the Frankfurt Assembly had tumbled because of Austrian danger to the venture; and a Prussian plan to sort out a federation of states barring Austria met with the same haughty resistance with the result that Prussia surrendered the arrangement (Humiliation of Olmiitz, 1850). In 1851 Diet of the Germanic Confederation of 1815 continued its sessions, and the Austrian chancellor, Schwarzenberg (Metternich's successor), prompted the German sovereigns to wipe out the freedoms which they had conceded to their subjects amid the famous turmoil of 1848. In the test of quality between Prussia and Austria for initiative in focal Europe, the reluctant Frederick William IV (1840-61) had been consistently outmatched by the deliberate Schwarzenberg and the Prussians, caught off guard for war, had been compelled to yield the predominance of Austria and to stomach a discretionary thrashing. These realities made it undeniable that the unification of the Germans would need to be attempted in rebellion of Austria.

NOTES

2.11.1 The Decade of Repression After 1848

For German liberals, the decade from 1850 to 1860 was a terrible period. Their books censored, their letters opened, their homes spied upon, they persisted through authority abuse until a large number of them were actually sent out of the nation as a result of their political feelings. They had come so close to building a protected government in united Germany that the response covered them with dishonour. Convinced in their thwarted expectation that democracy could never flourish in the harmed soil of Europe, with its established biases and old abhorrence, thousands emigrated to shape their lives over again in the more liberated demeanor of the New World. Many discovered homes in the United States.

The individuals who stayed behind found that a change came over the soul of their fantasy. After 1850, a more reasonable tone attested itself in Germany. Experimental trials pulled in an era which had lost confidence in philosophical vagaries; business success and the advancement of industry opened another street of development to an individual discouraged by the disappointment of their national trusts. Liberals were losing ground while the national reason, drawing its quality from other and more traditionalist sources, manufactured relentlessly ahead.

After 1858, the soul of repression subsided to some degree; however liberals picked up little by the change. William I, who succeeded his sibling on the Prussian throne in 1861 (he had been official since 1858), had a more open personality than Frederick William IV and a firmer character, yet he had no less confidence in power. Austria, defeated in the Italian War of 1859, still championed the reason for response. The tide was gradually turning for the German nationalists and they replenished their endeavors with energy. The business classes in particular, mindful of the focal points they would derive from closer political ties, worked for the day when Germany, as an incredible force, would procure the position and the renown to safeguard and enlarge their business engages at home and abroad. Before unification could be attained, the Germans needed to figure with Austria and France, and the retribution was to be settled on the battlefield.

2.11.2 The Prussian System

What was this Prussian framework to which its supporters pointed with such deference? Since the times of the Great Elector (1640- 88), the administration of Brandenburg-Prussia had been a military and bureaucratic despotic. Underpinned by corrupt authorities and a resolute armed force, the Hohenzollerns had transformed their scattered legacy into a powerful administered state. Vanquished and humbled by Napoleon, the Prussian authoritarian class benefitted by the lessons of difficulty, found ill-uses and rebuilt the armed force, with the come about that Prussia rose after 1815 with region expanded and eminence restored.

Austria ruled Germany and Prussia took after the Austrian lead. A crack between the two states in 1849, when Frederick William IV conceded his subjects a constitution, kept it up in energy regardless of Austrian objection. As a sacred state and pioneer of the Zollverein (which avoided Austria) Prussia made a stronger speak to German liberal and national conclusion than the Vienna administration,

which was devoted to response and tied down previously. It will be a misgiving, however, to envision that Prussia had ended up liberal in any genuine sense: the administration remained characteristically an edified military tyranny. Under the new constitution the parliament comprised of a Chamber of Deputies and a perpetual upper chamber, yet its powers remained exceedingly dubious. The lord kept on mourning 'by the finesse of God' and held the right to pick his priests. Such trade-offs between the ruler and parliament led to conflict. The test came when William I took the Prussian throne in 1861, a test the outcome of which significantly affected the eventual fate of Prussia, Germany and Europe.

In 1860, William I endorsed a plan to diminish exclusions under the military administration law and two-fold the store period for recruits, subsequently expanding the Prussian armed force to 190,000 men in peacetime and 450,000 in war. The Chamber of Deputies battled this undertaking adamantly. As opposed to yield on a measure which he considered imperative if Prussia was to satisfy the fate checked out for her, William I was ready to leave his throne. His resignation had been composed out when he altered his opinion and resolved to hold unfalteringly to his course. He had discovered a pastor Otto von Bismarck, who imparted his perspectives and was ready to oppose mainstream assumption and overrule the parliament with a specific end goal to bring through the military changes.

2.11.3 Otto von Bismarck (1815-98)

The Bismarck family, tenants in the Elbe Valley since the fourteenth century, had outfitted numerous officers and servants of the state. The future chancellor of the German Empire inherited his confidence in absolutism and militarism from progenitors who had figured on ways to adore those standards under the Great Elector and Frederick the Great. Between the liberal days of 1848 and 1849, the adolescent Bismarck remained a blunt reactionary, unashamedly voicing his contempt for parliamentary government and his esteem for the firm conservatism of the Austrian administration.

Yet this adoration blurred when, as Prussian minister to the Diet of the Germanic Confederation, Bismarck considered Austria at a closer go. Between 1851 and 1858, he came to view a war in the middle of Austria and Prussia for control of the Germany as inescapable, and he pressed to it so intensely that William I (then official) 'put him on ice,' as he communicated it by exchanging him to Saint Petersburg. As Representative to Russia, Bismarck set himself to reinforce the benevolent sentiments in the middle of Prussia and Russia, for he knew how in value capable the emperor's fellowship would be to the Prussians when the minute aimed to get them to battle Austria.

William I designated him as his chief priest in the emergency of 1862. For the next four years, Bismarck overrode the restriction of the Prussian parliament, gagged the press, and took from the treasury what they needed for armed force change. Few men have been so savagely criticized, so astringently loathed and denounced; endeavours at prosecution and even at death left him unmoved. He had set his abilities to the assignment of making Prussia preeminent in Germany and Germany incomparable in Europe, and he held no dream that such a triumph could be attained

NOTES

NOTES

by bargain or influence. The extraordinary questions of the day, he avowed in an announcement which got to be popular, were settled 'by blood and iron.'

2.11.4 The Austro-Prussian War

With such a man controlling Prussian strategy it was not surprising that the German Empire was fashioned in the fire of war, of three wars fought within a span of six years. In the first clash, Austria and Prussia united to wrest the territories of Schleswig and Holstein from Denmark, cutting with the sword of war a Gordian bunch of tangled discretionary cases. The two duchies, however, inhabited generally by Germans, had long been liable to the Danish rulers. In 1864 they were invaded by the Austro-Prussian powers in spite of a gutsy safety, and Christian IX of Denmark needed to surrender his cases to the vanquishers (Treaty of Vienna, 1864).

In spite of the fact that they had united briefly with the end goal of pillaging Denmark, Austria and Prussia tumbled to quarreling again after the finish of war peace. A sharp disagreement about the transfer to be made of the prevailed over duchies brought them to an open break in 1866. Austria controlled the Diet of the Germanic Confederation and could check upon backing from the South German States. Prussia had a mystery partnership with Italy, however even so the chances had all the earmarks of being against her, and few individuals questioned that Austria, such a great amount of predominant in riches, region, and populace, would have the triumph. At the same time the Prussian troops conveyed a recently invented 'needle firearm,' which was three times as fatal as the old gag stacking sort, and their strategies were contrived by the best strategist of the age, Helmuth von Moltke. What emulated was a staggering demonstration of Prussian effectiveness. Austria's German associates demonstrated of little support, for the capitals of Hanover, Savoy, and Cassel fell inside two weeks; the resistance of Bavaria, Wurttemberg, Baden, and Hesse-Darmstadt broken down very nearly as quickly. Three Prussian sections merged upon the Austrian armed force in Bohemia and smashed it on July 3, 1866, in the unequivocal skirmish of Koniggratz.

As opposed to walking on to Vienna, Bismarck influenced William I to offer Austria a liberal peace. By the Treaty of Prague (August 23, 1866) the Italians, who had worked together by assaulting the Austrians in Venetia, got that region for their assistance; Prussia affixed Schleswig and Holstein; and the Germanic Confederation was formally broken up, leaving Prussia to control Germany. Bismarck saved the Hapsburgs all undue mortification, anticipating a period when the fellowship of Austria may demonstrate supportive to his ventures. He abstained exploit a triumph which had effectively frightened alternate forces. Napoleon III acknowledged that he had missed an uncommon opportunity to hold the scales between the warriors. To recover distinction he started to press for his 'concessions,' and Bismarck, who had no true intention of satisfying him, was cheerful to extricate the Prussian armed forces from Bohemia before a French hostile could appear.

2.11.5 The Franco-Prussian War

An unrest having driven Isabella II from Spain in 1868, the Spanish decided to offer the throne to a German ruler Leopold of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen. Dreading the

possibility of collusion in the middle of Prussia and Spain if a relative of the Prussian ruler ought to wear the crown at Madrid, the French government entered a dissent. The ultra-radicals who encompassed Napoleon III needed to scare Prussia in some more indicator design. They persuaded him to ask a certification from feign old William I that he would make a guarantee to never to approve the candidature of his brother at any future time ought to the Spanish offer ever be reestablished. This incautious activity played straightforwardly into Bismarck's hands.

Far away from public view, Bismarck had been deliberately meeting expectations for war. He realized that a battle with France would dispatch the German country and meet the obligations of a political union as nothing else could do. It was key for his arrange that France showed up as the attacker. He had secretly empowered the Spanish offer of a throne so as to alert the French, and the news that Leopold of Hohenzollern had declined it (July 12) filled him with misery on the grounds that it wrecked his arrangements. At that point the French agent, Benedetti, looked for William I at the point where the Prussian lord was resting, and pressed the French requests for further certifications so tenaciously that William rejected him with a few abruptness. To Bismarck at Berlin, the lord dispatched a telegram describing the occurrence (July 13), and Bismarck saw this as a chance to recover his trusts.

Napoleon III did not need war; however, he permitted himself to be pushed into it by the ultra-radicals. Apparently the preference in the approaching clash lay with France, an inferior armed force and poor pioneers. On July 15, 1870, the French executive, Emile Olivier, announced the approach of war to the Chamber of Deputies and announced that the ministry acknowledged the prospect 'with a light heart.' Misled by wrong data on the reason for the clash, the Chamber voted to announce war on Prussia (July 19) while the Parisian swarmed Berlin.

Later, Napoleon III was compelled to surrender with 86,000 men. On October 27, General Bazaine gave over a second French armed force of 175,000 men which the Prussians had subdued in Metz. In Paris, where the administration of Napoleon III had been toppled two days after Sedan, the recently broadcasted 'Legislature of National Defense' arranged the city to oppose an inevitable attack but starvation constrained the Parisians to surrender. A French National Assembly, convened at Bordeaux, chose Adolphe Thiers as Leader of the Executive Power and Frankfort estimated him to arrange for a peace settlement. By the Treaty of Frankfort, France surrendered the regions of Alsace and Lorraine to Germany and consented to pay a reimbursement of five billion francs.

It was not with Prussia but the German Empire that France closed peace. In the Hall of Mirrors at Louis XIV's stately Versailles castle, the German rulers hailed William I as the German Emperor while the firearms of Paris were terminating their last hopeless volleys. Along these lines, the Franco-Prussian War made Germany a realm and France a republic. Nor did this finish the progressions of the noteworthy year 1870-71. The withdrawal of French troops from Rome for administration against Prussia made it feasible for the Italians to possess the Eternal City and complete the Kingdom of Italy by the securing of its foreordained capital. The passageway of Italy and Germany into the ring of incredible powers profoundly modified the example of European governmental issues.

NOTES

NOTES

The biggest advancement of these years between 1848 and 1870 was the triumph of nationalism. All the significant clashes of the period — the Italian and Hungarian rebellions of 1848-49, the Polish revolt of 1863, the Crimean War which developed to some degree from the Balkan mature; the War of 1859 for Italian liberation; the Danish War of 1864; the Austro-Prussian War of 1866; and the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71, are traceable to the weight of this development for national union.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-X

21. What did the Treaty of Frankfort decide?
22. When was the Treaty of Prague signed?

2.12. UNIFICATION OF ITALY

This movement refers to the coming together of different states of the Italian peninsula into a single nation-state, the Kingdom of Italy, in the 19th century.

Dismissing the national yearnings which had blended in Italy during the time of Napoleon I, the Congress of Vienna in 1815 sought to restore the Italian individuals to that state of disunity and enslavement under which they were before the French Revolution. The Congress had succeeded as was evident with the return of old states and old governments in a state of banishment to claim their benefits for the sake of authenticity. In the South, Ferdinand I got the crown of the Kingdom of the two Sicilies. Focal Italy, from Rome to Ravenna, was reconstituted as the States of the Church under the transient tenet of Pius VII. In the Grand Duchy of Tuscany and the neighbouring duchies of Parma, Lucca, and Modena, the vast majority of them Hapsburg wards came back to their thrones. Austria now held both Lombardy and Venetia, while to the west the congress strengthened the Kingdom of Sardinia by incorporating with it the late republic of Genoa.

2.12.1 The National Spirit Stirs (1815-48)

All over Europe, the progressive age had quickened national sentiments. The Poles, the Germans, and the Italians, who had a free country of their own, had developed awareness of their entitlement to freedom and solidarity. In Russia and Spain, the presence of Napoleon's armed forces had stirred the individuals towards resentment. The strengthening of the inclination of nationalism during the years of war and insurgency made it the most dynamic political constrain in the new world.

The Italians were not oblivious to these developments. They remembered that in antiquated times their country was the paramour of the world, and that a thousand years after the fact the researchers and craftsmen of the Renaissance made Italy the 'mother of expressions.' In the New World, the Mediterranean exchange had declined and the Italian urban communities lost the supremacy to the French, Spanish, or Austrian experts. The Napoleon's call of Italian opportunity had

awakened the Italian soul in a slumber. Despite the fact that the people were again subjected to monarchy, the nationalists declined to relinquish their fantasy of freedom. Mystery social orders, for example, the renowned Carbonari, plotted against the Austrians, artists and producers like Alessandro Manzoni (1785-1873) and Giacomo Leopardi (1798-1837) commended the past glories and the undying virtuoso of the Italian individuals, while all classes felt the mix of a certified revival of the Italian soul, a resurrection, or Risorgimento.

NOTES

2.12.2 Abortive Revolts

In 1820, revolutions erupted in Naples and in 1821 in Sardinia. However, they were poorly managed and effectively extinguished by Austrian intercession. Uprisings in Parma, Modena, and the Papal States in 1831 faced the same results. The revolutionaries were sentenced to death or detained. This fanned the enthusiasm of other Italians who saw all the more obviously each one year that there could be no freedom in Italy until the Austrian yoke was broken. Their scorn for the Austrians was generally depicted by Robert Browning whose Italian in England shouts:

‘I would grasp Metternich until
I felt his red wet throat distil
In blood thro’ these two hands.’

Three Conflicting Projects for Unification

The liberals could not decide as to what type of government to create in Italy when the country achieved freedom. Joseph Mazzini, one of the most leading pioneers of the Risorgimento in the years after 1830, planned to breadth away the vestiges of the different monarchical states and to establish a democratic republic in Italy. A romantic, Mazzini spread the word of freedom and majority rule government with the fervency of a messenger, declaring that mankind remained on the edge of a brilliant age, when all people groups having established free governments may stay together in peace and equity.

Banished in 1831 by the Sardinian government for his progressive exercises, Mazzini composed Young Italy, an affiliation devoted to the foundation of a free law based society in rebellion of prelates and sovereigns. Scores of liberal hearted Italians took a chance with their lives in rebellions seeking liberty. In spite of his truthfulness and his individual attraction, Mazzini failed to offer the characteristics of a leader. His unitary majority rule state advanced predominantly to the lower classes, for his ideas of republicanism frightened conservative Italians and his criticisms of the Catholic confidence annoyed a number of his countrymen. As an option to Mazzini’s republicanism, numerous Italians, particularly parts of the propertied classes and the privileged, favoured the thought of uniting the states of Italy in a confederation with the pope as president.

2.12.3 The Political Unification of Italy

This task found a supporter in Vincenzo Gilbert who composed the Moral and Civil Supremacy of the Italians (1843). The prudence of Gioberti’s arrangement lay in its

NOTES

answer of what was called 'The Roman Question,' that is, the issue of establishing a united Italy without seizing the papacy, for the ecclesiastical government delayed to surrender the states of the Church to the tenet of a common organization. The race to the ecclesiastical seat of the winning and beneficent Pius IX (1846) gave a jolt to the arrangement opened his pontificate by a reprieve for some political wrongdoers, rejected his Swiss Guard, and designated prominent clergymen to his committee. These changes won him an eager following, especially among liberal Catholics who were great churchmen and seekers of Italian freedom.

With its persevering working class, powerful white-collar class and well-prepared armed force, Italian force was positioned as a second rate class force. Progressives like Mazzini doubted the Sardinian lord, the enigmatic Charles Albert (1831-49), accepting him a trickster to liberal goals on the grounds that he had rejected his subjects a constitution and hesitated to test Austria in a war for Italian liberation. To a huge group of moderate liberals, the possibility of binding together their nation under the Sardinian lord appeared an excellent result for what they most wanted for Italy was a common government that would be independent of Austrian impact.

The Defeated Hopes of 1848-49

At the opening of 1848, that year of revolutions which saw the throne of Louis Philippe upset in Paris and Metternich determined from office, Italy was shaken by spontaneous rebellions from Venice to Sicily. Charles Albert at Turin, Ferdinand II at Naples, Pius IX at Rome, and the Grand Duke of Tuscany at Florence, all attempted to mollify their rebellious subjects by conceding constitutions. Nationalism and progressivism appeared to be on the purpose of getting a shared triumph as the Venetian masses dislodged the Austrian army and built a republic under the deliverer Daniel Manin, while at Milan pioneers of the national development announced to the independence of Lombardy. The Austrian government suffered by rebellions in Vienna, Bohemia, and Hungary, and this information urged the Italians to endeavour a general war of freedom.

Charles Albert of Sardinia revitalized to the leader of the national development. 'Italy will do it without anyone's help,' he said and propelled his armed force against the withdrawing Austrians. However, the shortcoming of the Italians deceived them. The Austrians, encouraging firmly under their field marshal, Radetsky, vanquished Charles Albert's blended strengths at Custoza in 1848. With the disappointment of moderate authority, the more radical of the Italian guerillas swung to the left and set up republics (1849) in Florence and Rome. Pius IX fled from the Vatican as Rome passed under the control of a mainstream government headed by Mazzini. The Italians were, however, not ready for move to a vote-based system and the Roman republic.

Elected as the second president of the French republic, Louis Napoleon dispatched an expeditionary energy to Rome which overcame the gallant safety of Garibaldi's republican gatekeeper and re-built the ecclesiastical government by method for French knives. In the meantime Austria helped the Italian autocrats to get their thrones. By the end of the year 1849, the most decided and across the

board exertion yet made to free Italy from remote mistreatment and household oppression had finished in the blackest disappointment.

Two lessons may be drawn from the disappointments of 1848-49. The breakdown of the Roman Republic left Mazzini and his partners without support. The Catholic liberals were without a leader for Pius IX had come back to Rome disillusioned. With the gathering of the Right and the gathering of the Left losing ground, it got to be clear that the gathering of the Centre may win the day and make the Kingdom of Sardinia the core of a resurrected Italy. Also, Italy did need the help of others, especially Count of Cavour.

Cavour Contrives

Cavour graduated from military school at the age of sixteen. He was administered to the Sardinian armed force, but his dabbling in progressivism and his rash remarks about the retrogressive political condition worsened the condition. After a concise imprisonment, he surrendered his bonus. His progressivism made him a checked man and the Austrian police in close by states were cautioned that he was 'profoundly undermined in his political standards.' From 1831 to 1848, he sought after private investment, tried different things with new strategies for farming, travelled and amassed a fortune. By 1848, the political conditions had changed unexpectedly. Albert allowed his subjects a constitution, and Cavour was chosen to the recently made Sardinian Parliament. In 1849, the new lord Victor Emmanuel II selected him priest of business and horticulture, an office which allowed him to show without a moment's delay his exceptional handle of political and financial inquiries.

Few individuals would have speculated from Cavour's appearance that he was one of the prevailing identities of the nineteenth century. With his stocky figure, plain attire, and metal-rimmed glasses, he looked more of a businessman. His ambition was to free Italy and give the Italian a parliamentary government on the liberal English design. The initial phase in Cavour's system was to make the Sardinian Kingdom known as a liberal and prosperous state to which all different Italians would look with pride and jealousy. His wide study and recognition had made him a power on business and farming, on railroads, back, the systems for parliamentary government, and the behavior of remote issues. While diligently developing the fellowship of France and Britain, Cavour kept up a firm state of mind towards Austria, so that Sardinia came to be perceived as a state guided by liberal direction where men set out to arrange the liberation of Italy.

He looked to beat Austria with the help of France. Sardinia had no genuine squabble with Russia but the mediation won Cavour a seat at the peace gathering in Paris where he had a chance to awe Napoleon III and to bring the Italian address before the European ambassadors. Three years after the fact, Cavour and Napoleon held a mystery interview, and the stage was set for the War of Italian Liberation. Napoleon demanded two stipulations: Austria must have all the earmarks of being the assailant, and France must get the province of Savoy and the city of Nice as recompense for the help rendered. Cavour abhorred tribute a part of the Piedmont's domain but he realized that the populace in the debated areas was more French than Italian, and that France could not be relied upon to battle a war for unadulterated

NOTES

NOTES

selflessness. Austria announced war against the Kingdom of Sardinia in April 1859 and Napoleon III met his word by heading a multitude of two hundred thousand men into Italy. The Austrians had been ousted from Lombardy. A second and weightier reason was the developing hostility of the Prussian government which had prepared its armed force and could debilitate France with an assault on the Rhine. Napoleon, on the other hand, suspected that he had underrated the quality of the Italian development for freedom.

Napoleon made peace with the Austrian ruler Francis Joseph (Treaty of Villafranca). As the Austrian powers remained unequivocally entrenched in the round of strongholds known as the Quadrilatero (Mantova, Peschiera, Verona, and Legnago), Francis Joseph presented the deal and despite the fact that he consented to surrender Lombardy, he demanded that the leaders of Modena and Tuscany held on to their thrones. The two sovereigns additionally chose to push the shaping of an Italian federation under the administration of the Pope, a step which Napoleon numbered upon to assuage the French Catholics.

The Winning of Venice and Rome

Italy was later made and yet it was not complete as the church still controlled at Rome and the Austrians held Venetia. Soon, the Prussian statesman Bismarck entered into a partnership with the new Italian Kingdom, which joined in the assault and endeavoured to seize Venetia. Despite the fact that they were vanquished by the Austrians on both area and ocean, the Italians got Venetia for their aid when the triumphant Prussians arranged the Treaty of Prague after their triumph over the Austrians at Koniggratz.

Occupation of Rome

To crown the new kingdom by the acquisition of Rome as its capital had now turned into 'a relentless need.' Twice Garibaldi headed an energy of volunteers to seize the Eternal City, yet he was checked by Victor Emmanuel's troops (injured 'by an Italian slug' he grumbled) on the first endeavour (1862), and vanquished by the French army at Rome on the second (1867). Tact appeared feeble to attain a settlement of the 'Roman Question,' yet the Italian government expected that if the Pope was dispossessed by power, the Catholic countries may arrive to offer some timely help. In 1870, however, the flare-up of the Franco-Prussian War controlled global consideration elsewhere, and propelled Napoleon III to review the French watch at Rome for home barrier. On September 20, 1870, Italian troops walked into Rome, and the natives voted by a larger part of 134,000 to 1500, for incorporation into the Italian Kingdom.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-XI

23. What was the outcome of the 1820-21 revolts of Naples and Sardinia?
24. What was the outcome of the Treaty of Villafranca?

2.13 THE BALKANS

‘We know of no reason in the way of things why a state ought to be any the better for being extensive.’

Sir John R. Seeley

NOTES

1. The Expansion of England

In the advanced European history, the powerful forces have tended more to usurp the middle countries. The people groups of the more diminutive nations legitimately loathed this subordination, yet a course reading which endeavoured to dole out equivalent space to the historical backdrop of France and Finland, or Britain and Belgium, in the nineteenth century, would create anomalous and confounding extents. Of the ten or more states examined in the present section, a few played prevailing jumps in prior centuries, however, none has pushed a conclusive influence in the most recent hundred years. Consequently, their later records have been seriously compressed.

2. Scandinavian Countries

The unmistakable part which Sweden played in the European issues in the seventeenth century arrived at an end with the Great Northern War of 1700-21. Deprived of its authority in the Baltic, the kingdom declined into more serene days and monetary wantonness. The turmoil of the Napoleonic battles, which left no piece of Europe unstirred, drew Sweden into the later coalitions against France, and regardless of the way that the Swedish crusades were to a great extent opposing the Congress of Vienna united Norway to Sweden as a remunerate (1814). On the demise of Charles XIII (1809-18) without beneficiaries, the Swedish throne went to his embraced successor, the French general Bernadotte, as Charles XIV (1818-44). The Bernadotte line still rules in the northern kingdom.

Known as individuals of refined customs, the Swedes proceeded in the nineteenth century to acknowledge the predominance of the extraordinary landowners and (with the improvement of mining and assembling exercises) of industrialists. A constitution promulgated in 1863 did little to break this oligarchic principle, and the subsequent discontent of the lower classes advertised the development of communism and serves to record for the phenomenal resettlement. Over a million Swedes left their country between 1850 and 1900, with the majority of them settling in the United States.

3. Norway

The neighbouring kingdom of Norway, united to the Danish crown from 1397 to 1814, was ceded in the last year to Sweden. By supporting this choice the ambassadors at the Congress of Vienna wanted to comfort the Swedes for the misfortune of Finland (seized by Russia in 1808) and in the meantime to rebuff those who helped Napoleon. This constrained political union of Norway and Sweden left

NOTES

the Norwegians full control of their local undertakings. In 1905 the Norwegian Parliament, or Storting, voted in favour of complete freedom and the individuals affirmed this choice by a plebiscite. The Swedish ruler, Oscar II, gave hesitant agree to the partition, and a Danish sovereign mounted the Norwegian throne as Haakon VII. Further vote-based alterations to the constitution nullified the regal veto and allowed women to vote on the same terms as men (1913). Norway consequently turned into the first state in Europe to accord women this right. Like Sweden, Norway has endured overwhelming misfortunes through migration. The populace at the opening of the twentieth century was short of what two and one a large portion of million.

The Danes, in their small kingdom of promontories and islands, persisted through two attacks by the British armada (1801 and 1807) amid the Napoleonic Wars, on the grounds that they had been subordinated to the French approach. The peace that emulated got a further unfairness the misfortune of Norway. In 1864, Austria and Prussia united to wrest the areas of Schleswig and Holstein from the Danish monarch and the kingdom turned into the most diminutive of the Scandinavian states. Denmark held, nonetheless, as tokens of those gallant hundreds of years when Norse globe-trotters pushed their mythical serpent controlled vessels into unknown oceans, the islands of Iceland and Greenland, shaping a pioneer realm fifty times the zone of the Danish State, however scantily populated with one hundred and twenty thousand pilgrims. In 1918, Iceland picked up the status of a sovereign realm under the Danish ruler.

Cultivating, mostly dairy products, Danes exported vast amounts of eggs, fodder and other such items to England and Germany. The absence of mineral assets and of waterways suitable for giving hydroelectric force hindered mechanical advancement yet wood and material producers were stretching. The crusade for political popular government, which made little progress in Denmark in the later nineteenth century generally on account of the resolved opposition of Christian IX (1863-1906), won a triumph in the twentieth century with the development of the establishment to all men and women of twenty-five or over who had a settled spot of habitation.

Being small countries, the three Scandinavian states could not play an exceptionally eager part in the military, political, or monetary undertakings of the nineteenth-century Europe. If the material commitments of the Scandinavian people groups were unobtrusive, their erudite impact was incredible. The foremost stone worker of the early nineteenth century, Albert Bertel Thorvaldsen (1770— 1844), was a Dane, and Denmark could likewise gloat of delivering the best abstract commentator of his time in Georg Brandies (1842- 1927). Still an alternate Dane, Hans Christian Andersen (1805-75), made his name a house-hold word in Europe and America by his exquisite fairy tales. The plays of the Norwegian Henrik Ibsen (1828-1906) mixed far reaching debates by their unflinching judgment of social issues, and Norway likewise created a widely acclaimed author in Eduard Grieg (1843-1907). Swedish screenwriter August Strindberg (1849-1912) too had no equivalent among his peers in his ability for severe, skeptical, and unexpected characterization.

The commitment which these men made to European society is a fitting impression of the exclusive expectations of brainpower and training common among the Scandinavian countries.

4. Holland, Belgium, and Switzerland

Imperiled by the military caliber of France and the maritime power of Britain, Holland constantly endured when these two forces were at war. In the first years of the nineteenth century, Napoleon constrained the Dutch into his Continental System, a step which managed the British a reason to deny Holland of the Cape of Good Hope and Ceylon. The Dutch endeavour in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had developed a domain which still stays forcing in spite of such misfortunes, and incorporates a local populace (1931) of in excess of seventy millions. It embraces Java, Sumatra, the Celebes, Dutch Borneo, and Dutch New Guinea in the East Indies, Curacao and some lesser islands in the West Indies, and Dutch Guiana in South America. The tremendous volume of exchange, both pilgrim and global, which streams in northern Europe through the ports of Amsterdam and Rotterdam, gives the Kingdom of the Netherlands an economic essentialness out of extent to its size (13,203 square miles) and populace (9,048,529 in 1942).

The Congress of Vienna proclaimed in 1815 the intersection of the Belgian territories (previously the Austrian Netherlands) with Holland, subsequently framing the United Kingdom of the Netherlands under William I of Orange. In 1830, the Belgians withdrew from this union. In 1848, the Dutch received another constitution accommodating a mindful service and a confined suffrage, yet the development of popularity-based sentiment all through Europe later prompted cautious developments of the establishment—until today the electorate incorporates all men and ladies in excess of twenty-five years old. Alarm of foreign hostility affected the Dutch to increase their maritime and military compels considerably after 1890.

After declaring their freedom of Holland (1830), the Belgians secured a protected government with a German ruler, Leopold of Saxe-Coburg, as their first lord. To secure the new state from the plans of more powerful neighbours, Europe, Great Britain, France, Austria, Prussia, and Russia, ensured the freedom and lack of bias of Belgium by serious accord in 1839. The new kingdom was soon mixed by the stimulating impact of the Industrial Revolution, with a resulting abuse of its mineral assets and an ascent in populace which has made it the most thickly occupied state in Europe (assessed population in 1944, 8,334,276). A liberal government, controlled after 1884 by the Catholic government, pushed democracy, expanded the establishment and enhanced the state of the common labourers through edified social enactment. In 1908, the monstrous Congo domain in Africa, which had been misused generally through the business activity of Belgian ruler, Leopold II (1865-1909), and secured as a free state under his sway, was appended to Belgium as a province. Like the Dutch, the Belgians were uneasy concerning their security in the strained years which occurred prior to the First World War in 1914 and emulated the general pattern in enlarging their deadly implements.

NOTES

NOTES

5. Switzerland

Until the middle of the nineteenth century, the Swiss Confederation was minimal, all the more, politically, than a detached agglomeration of cantons, every for all intents and purpose of self-ruling. Their tenants were bound together by a typical adoration of freedom and of republican establishments, however separated by contrasts in traditions, dialect, and religion. In 1941, the number of inhabitants in Switzerland was assessed at 4,265,703 people, a larger part of who spoke German. However, French predominates in five of the twenty-two Cantons and Italian in one, while a few thousands of the nation society spoke a Latin dialect known as Romansch. Notwithstanding these phonetic obstructions there are religious contrasts, for the Protestants prevail in twelve cantons and Roman Catholics in ten.

Regardless of these racial and religious divergences, the Swiss have thought that it was conceivable lately to change their detached association into a well-weaved government state. A constitution received in 1848 made an executive government board and a bicameral legislature. Uniform coinage, taxes, postal regulations and law codes emulated and a government state army was made for national safeguard. Swiss residents appreciated widespread suffrage, showed an energetic enthusiasm toward matters of cantonal and government organization and were given two novel constitutional rights. Cultivating, industry, and the traveller exchange have joined together to make Switzerland, with its four million people, a standout amongst the most prosperous states in Europe. Cultivating, especially dairy farming, gives a living to nearly one-third of the Swiss individuals, while one-half found employment in the production of clocks, watches, silk articles and other high-review items. The copious water force supplied by the mountain torrents, an open utility controlled by the national government gives power all through the nation and permits the charge of most of the Swiss route framework, a large portion of which is in like manner state controlled.

6. Spain and Portugal

The historical backdrop of Spain in the nineteenth century is generally a story of hindered economic advancement, maladministration, interest, and civil war. The withdrawal of the South and Central American settlements had denied the Spanish government by 1820 of its real wellspring of income, plunging it into indebtedness. Spain failed to offer the agricultural abundance of France and has neglected to create an autonomous class of strong industrious labourer proprietors. Industry, in like manner, has made moderate advancement, for the Spaniards had minimal capital and less activity. The dedicated and moderate temper of the masses, the widespread superstition and ignorance, and the absence of present day offices for inner communication have served to protect Spanish society from the changing impacts of commerce and innovation.

The quality of Spanish conservatism lay in the way that it was a particular mix of nationalism and religious enthusiasm. The unpleasant endeavours made by Napoleon to modernize Spanish foundations, in the wake of setting his sibling Joseph on the throne (1808), heightened the national bias against radicalism as an outsider and profane importation. Enlightened and ambitious Spaniards conceded the

preferences of change, yet without a compelling and dynamic working class, the change development drew its boss quality from the loop of the savvy people and the disappointed armed force officers. These minority gatherings, while dynamic enough to mix up infrequent revolts and issue pronounce Mentos (decrees), could not stir the masses from their laziness. The enterprise of a firm and edified ruler may have turned the scale for reform, but Spain has had a few capable or enthusiastic rulers. The rule of the malicious Ferdinand VII (1814-33) has been portrayed already. His choice to set aside the Salic law and transmit the throne to Isabella II (1833-68) prompted the Carlists Wars (1833-40), in which the supporters of Ferdinand's sibling Charles contested the progression. Despite the fact that Isabella at last made great her claim, her tyrannical, improper life sickened the Spanish country and a progressive change in 1868 drove her from the kingdom.

Around 1888-1875, Spain persisted through multi-coloured movements as the Carlists, Liberal Monarchists, and Republicans struggled for control. In 1870, the throne was offered to Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, a move which energized a strategic emergency and hastened the Franco-Prussian War. Thus, Prince Amado of Savoy was welcomed to end up King of Spain to abandon in demoralization XII (1875-85) and restored peace to the diverted country. With the support of two remarkable statesmen, Marshal Martinez Campos and Antonio Canovas del Castillo, Alphonso initiated a more content time under a respectably liberal constitution. Emulating his initial demise (1885), the throne went to a post mortem child, Alphonso XIII, who was proclaimed of age in 1902.

With the intervention of the United States, Spain suffered a conclusive annihilation and surrendered all title to Cuba as well as to Puerto Rico and to the Philippine Islands and Guam in the Pacific in exchange for twenty million dollars. It injured the Spanish pride and the country entered the twentieth century with impoverishment and social agitation. But it did not stop Alphonso XIII and the military chief from setting out upon a crusade for the oppression of the local tribes of Spanish Morocco, an article in colonialism which brought costs so worse that in 1923 insurgency seemed impending. For the minute it was turned away by a coup d'état which built General Primo de Rivera as chief pastor of the Spanish cabinet with dictatorial authority.

2.13.1 The Crumbling Empire of the Sultan (1815-78)

The decay of the Turkish Empire, started already in the eighteenth century, proceeded in the nineteenth with the possibility of a complete disintegration approaching. All extraordinary forces were prepared for the disintegration of the Ottoman inheritance but at the same time they were wary of an adversary securing a more desired area. This resulted in ambassadors of different countries seeking 'to protect' the existence and sovereignty of the state of Turkey. However, they were trying to only prevent the other to take control of the state. It is important to note here that all states called for protecting the existence of the Ottoman Empire yet all their measures eventually led to the decrease of the sultan's belonging.

After the conclusion of the Hellenic War of Independence, the Greek Peninsula was declared as an independent kingdom through a global agreement. The other

NOTES

NOTES

powerful nation states believed that Turkey was at the brink of deterioration and Russia brought in all her military to claim the areas of Moldavia and Wallachia. At the same time, it added the domain of Georgia in the locale of the Caucasus (Treaty of Adrianople, 1829). In the meantime, the Serbs won viable freedom under their sovereign, i.e., Milosh I (1830). An examination of the maps of Europe in 1815 and Europe in 1900, will uncover the degree of the Turkish misfortunes. Greece and Serbia were the first parts of the Ottoman Empire to withdraw as autonomous principalities. Interestingly, Russia wanted to acquire both the states. However, the opposition of alternate forces prevented them from doing so.

However, the tiny minority that existed in the Turkish nation was oppressed by uncommon duties and denied common equity. Their situation made states like Russia to consider intervention. Parts of the Greek Orthodox Church in Turkey went to Russia for protection, while the Roman Catholics sought the same from France. This brought France and Russia at the tenterhooks. In 1854, as officially recorded, common contentions moved towards France with the support of the Great Britain to assault Russia in the Crimea. It was the Treaty of Paris which withheld the Crimean War. It helped save the sovereignty of the Ottoman Empire at the hands of the Russians, with the help provided by Britain.

While they helped safeguard Turkey, Britain and France did not free Serbs and the Balkan people from the sultan's mismanagement nor grant Russia to do so. The feelings of nationalism which brought together Italy and Germany together during 1860-70, entered the Balkans and drove the Serbs, the Rumanians, and the Bulgars to request autonomy in spite of the delaying of the western powers. In 1867, Serbian ruler Milan Obrenovic III secured the withdrawal of the last Turkish army from Serbia despite the fact that the sultan declined complete freedom of the state until 1878. In those years, the people of Rumania voted to create an aristocratic government led by Alexander Cuza as their ruler and announced the union of the two Danubian territories (1861). Like the Serbs, the Rumanians needed to hold up until the Congress of Berlin amassed in 1878 preceding they won affirmation of their status as a sovereign country, the autonomous principality of Rumania.

The Bulgars were the last Christian group in the Balkan Peninsula to escape Turkish abuse. A national and social recovery went before their interest for political opportunity, and the Bulgars battled to free themselves at the same time from the command of the Greeks and Turks. In 1870, the sultan allowed them to create their own particular national church, yet when they endeavoured to state their political freedom additionally (1876), they were rebuffed by slaughters. The Russian government mediated to save the Christian minorities and proclaimed war on Turkey (1877).

The British government too dispatched an army to the Bosphorus and Austria prepared an armed force to control Russian exercises in the Balkan States. To stay away from both of these forces, and to secure the additions officially made, the autocrat concluded the hurried Treaty of San Stefano with the sultan (1878). This accommodated the formation of a free Bulgaria and declared complete freedom for Serbia, Rumania, and Montenegro. However, Great Britain and Austria were not

fulfilled by this result. They saw with alert the creation of a more prominent Bulgaria under the Russian influence and demanded calling a global congress to update the Treaty of San Stefano. The Russians gave in. Berlin was picked as the gathering place for the representatives, and Bismarck, who proclaimed that Germany had no immediate stake in the Near East and was accordingly the best authority, proposed to fill the role of a 'legit handle' whose just longing was to accommodate his customers' investment. However, the Russians and the British were both unwilling to go to war. Therefore, peace was reached by making a few concessions. Great Britain and Austria were pacified by 'complementary compensation.' Russia was allowed to append the territory of Bessarabia on the Black Sea between the Danube and the Dniester deltas, furthermore the Armenian areas of Kars, Ardahan and Batum. In exchange, Austria-Hungary got the right to direct the late Turkish territories of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Britain, by a different convention with Turkey, expected ownership of the island of Cyprus. The wishes of the Balkan people groups, who were most crucially concerned in the settlement, won inadequate and unreasonable thought. Bulgaria was parted into three sections, the northernmost segment winning useful independence, the centre area managerial independence, while the southern segment, including Macedonia, was restored to Turkish control.

NOTES

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-XII

25. Which European country allowed women to vote on the same terms as men?
26. Which Christian group was the last to escape Turkish abuse in the Balkan Peninsula?

2.14 SUMMARY

- In Europe, nationalism and the rise of national identity movements were important for the development of what is presently the European society. The European continent came under the wave of Romantic nationalism in the 19th century, which led to the transformation of its countries. Romania, Italy, and Germany were some of the countries that were formed under the wave of nationalism.
- Influenced by the reforms brought in by the French Revolutionists, the unprivileged classes in other European nations sought changes in their socio-economic lives especially during the time between 1789 and 1815. After the success of the French forces, unrest gripped Europe. The French people were said to be deeply nationalist as they sought to protect their sovereignty and broaden the goals of their state.
- Edmund Burke (1729-97), was one of the first statesmen to sound a note of caution on the advancements in France. He argued that the French Revolution had 'assaulted' the standards on which the progressive ideologists assembled

NOTES

their trusts. 'They failed,' Burke submitted, 'in their conviction that society could be fundamentally changed in a concise period and that old organizations could be renovated overnight.'

- An alternate response to the Age of Rationalism took shape in the form of an artistic and innovative vitality movement known as the Romantic Movement or the Sentimental Revival. There was more than one dimension to this movement as it comprised revolutionary and reactionary components, therefore enhancing its quality from numerous sources.
- The Nootka Sound Crisis was an international incident and political dispute between the Kingdom of Great Britain and the Kingdom of Spain, triggered by a series of events that took place during the summer of 1789 at Nootka Sound.
- Minor breakouts in Germany soon gave Metternich a reason to further issue constraints on his people. In colleges, students had sorted out ties that promised the development of German freedom solidarity. These societies, or *Burschenschaften*, held a congress at the Wartburg 1817. The date was the fourth celebration of the skirmish of Leipzig and the palace been made renowned by Martin Luther at beginning of the Protestant Reform three centuries earlier.
- The Russian journalists let go of their prior dependence upon French and German displays and created in the nineteenth century writing that was particularly national. Wherever the radicals gathered, they presence evoked in-depth examination. New books were carefully scrutinized and censured unapologetically. In the hands people like Gogol (1809-52), Turgenev (1818-83), Tolstoy (1828-1910) and Dostoyevsky (1821-81), the Russian novel offered outflow to the intense political and social hypothesis of the day.
- Prior to the French Revolution, the French society was divided into three estates, namely: (i) First Estate or the clergy, (ii) Second Estate or Nobility and, (iii) Third Estate or commoners.
- All through the nineteenth century, the French people swayed between the contradicting goals of an imperious government and an equitable republic. Despite the fact that Louis XVIII tried to guide a centre course as a sacred ruler, the ultra-royalists (devotees more royalist than the lord) drove him to an arrangement of response. In 1820, the Duke of Berry, the lord's nephew, who remained in the line of progression to the throne, fell and ensued the wave of mainstream resentment that brought the ultras into force. They continued to shackle the press and amend the appointive laws in order to fortify the gathering of the Right, and having secured a mind greater part in the Chamber of Deputies, they proclaimed that the Chamber ought to stay in office for seven years.
- Driven underground by the repression of the administration, European liberals after 1815 arranged new revolts for the sake of liberty and vote based system. The monarchs watched uneasily from their thrones, and recalled the fate of Louis XVI in France. They ordered the police to torch progressive leaflets

and chase radicals. These were not orders out of fear but from examples set in other parts of the world.

- The American War of Independence had a deep impact on the French political scholars. This was also because the American War of Independence was additionally an insurgency. The war was an answer to opposition of taxes imposed by the British government on its American colonies. It had led to the overthrow of a government that was considered tyrannical and replaced it with a democratic and constitutional government which had been formed by the pioneers of the American war.
- By 1789, all French labourers were free in status. The dominant part claimed land or leased it, either for cash or in return for an offer of their harvests. A minority of landless workers who existed had the right to contract themselves out to any manager who required them. The area on which the proletariat worked was burdened by numerous vestiges of the primitive and manorial frameworks. The landowning workers needed to pay certain charges to their previous manorial rulers, who likewise kept on administering equity in minor cases to the financial inconvenience of the labourers.
- In June 1793, the Jacobins and leaders of the Commune turned on the heat on the Girondins and captured them. This occasion denoted the start of the alleged Reign of Terror, the pioneer being Maximillian Robespierre.
- Napoleon kept an effective mystery police. In his reformatory code, issued in 1810, disciplines for unlawful acts against property were made more extreme, and a few manifestations of legal torment, constantly show in codes determined from Roman law, were reintroduced in the wake of having been annulled during the Revolution.
- The rise of nationalism in Russia was an important event for the development of nationalistic fervor in the European continent. The noteworthy extension of the Russian Empire frightened and perplexed other European powers. The immoderate victories accomplished by France and Britain in the Crimean War (1854-56) weighed the Muscovite aspirations in the West, and saved Turkey from dismantling.
- Russian colonialism proceeded with its drive to the east and south. In the twenty years that emulated the Peace of Paris (1856), Russia picked up the coastland inverse Japan and enslaved Turkestan. This Asiatic domain, procured in two decades, surpassed in territory all the additions that the Russians had won in Europe in two centuries.
- Alexander's single accomplishment was his liberation of about forty million Russian serfs, a deed which won him the distinguishment of deliverer. To visit a rustic Russian group in the prior nineteenth century was similar to going to the Middle Ages. Nine-tenth of the area was held by about one hundred thousand honourable families. The serfs could be sold with the homes to view proprietors, recruited into the noble man's family to act as household servants, or even sent to the plants in the towns for their expert's benefit. Serfs were

NOTES

NOTES

badly treated; they could not marry without the assent of their masters, could not leave the bequest without authorization, and be rebuffed in the event they tried to escape.

- After 1849, the Austrian government, strengthened by its military triumphs over the Italians and the Hungarians, turned its drives to the well-known assignment of stamping out the last ashes of rebellion. The recommendations for German unification supported by the Frankfurt Assembly had tumbled because of Austrian danger to the venture; and a Prussian plan to sort out a federation of states barring Austria met with the same haughty resistance with the result that Prussia surrendered the arrangement (Humiliation of Olmiitz, 1850).
- Napoleon made peace with the Austrian ruler Francis Joseph (Treaty of Villafranca). As the Austrian powers remained unequivocally entrenched in the round of strongholds known as the Quadrilatero (Mantova, Peschiera, Verona, and Legnago), Francis Joseph presented the deal and despite the fact that he consented to surrender Lombardy, he demanded that the leaders of Modena and Tuscany held on to their thrones. The two sovereigns additionally chose to push the shaping of an Italian federation under the administration of the Pope, a step which Napoleon numbered upon to assuage the French Catholics.
- Further vote-based alterations to the constitution nullified the regal veto and allowed women to vote on the same terms as men (1913). Norway consequently turned into the first state in Europe to accord women this right. Like Sweden, Norway has endured overwhelming misfortunes through migration. The populace at the opening of the twentieth century was short of what two and one a large portion of million.
- The Bulgars were the last Christian group in the Balkan Peninsula to escape Turkish abuse. A national and social recovery went before their interest for political opportunity, and the Bulgars battled to free themselves at the same time from the command of the Greeks and Turks. In 1870, the sultan allowed them to create their own particular national church, yet when they endeavoured to state their political freedom additionally (1876), they were rebuffed by slaughters. The Russian government mediated to save the Christian minorities and proclaimed war on Turkey (1877).

2.15 KEY TERMS

- **Romantic Movement:** An artistic, literary, and intellectual movement that originated in Europe toward the end of the 18th century and in most areas was at its peak in the approximate period from 1800 to 1850.
- **Bourgeoisie:** In Marxist philosophy the bourgeoisie is the social class who owns the means of production and whose societal concerns are the value of property and the preservation of capital, in order to ensure the perpetuation of their economic supremacy in society.

- **Proletariat:** The class of wage-earners (especially industrial workers) in a capitalist society whose only possession of significant material value is their labour-power (their ability to work).
- **Third Estate:** Commoners in the French society prior to the French Revolution.
- **Carbonari:** They were groups of secret revolutionary societies founded in early 19th-century Italy and were also known as charcoal burners.
- **Jacobin:** A member of a radical society or club of revolutionaries that promoted the Reign of Terror and other extreme measures, active chiefly from 1789 to 1794: so called from the Dominican convent in Paris, where they originally met.
- **Napoleonic Code:** The French civil code established under Napoléon I in 1804. The code forbade privileges based on birth, allowed freedom of religion, and specified that government jobs should go to the most qualified.
- **Liberalism:** A political philosophy or worldview founded on ideas of liberty and equality.
- **Pan Slav Movement:** A movement advocating the political and cultural union of Slavic nations and peoples.

NOTES

2.16 ANSWERS TO ‘CHECK YOUR PROGRESS’

1. Influenced by the reforms brought in by the French Revolutionists, the unprivileged classes in other European nations sought changes in their socio-economic lives especially during the time between 1789 and 1815.
2. Edmund Burke (1729-97), was one of the first statesmen to sound a note of caution on the advancements in France. He argued that the French Revolution had ‘assaulted’ the standards on which the progressive ideologists assembled their trusts. ‘They failed,’ Burke submitted, ‘in their conviction that society could be fundamentally changed in a concise period and that old organizations could be renovated overnight.’ In their eagerness with the old and their enthusiasm for the new, he further said that ‘the Revolutionists had permitted themselves to be diverted by the conviction that it was possible to remove the jotted pages of the past and begin humankind anew with a clean sheet.’
3. An alternate response to the Age of Rationalism took shape in the form of an artistic and innovative vitality movement known as the Romantic Movement or the Sentimental Revival. There was more than one dimension to this movement as it comprised revolutionary and reactionary components, therefore enhancing its quality from numerous sources.
4. The Nootka Sound Crisis was an international incident and political dispute between the Kingdom of Great Britain and the Kingdom of Spain, triggered by a series of events that took place during the summer of 1789 at Nootka Sound.

NOTES

5. The Carlsbad Decrees were introduced in reaction to the students' protests. They marked the high tide of suppression in Germany, legalized removal of university teachers and extended the censorship of the press. This served to only further the grievances of the discontented masses.
6. Prior to the French Revolution, the French society was divided into three estates, namely: (i) First Estate or the clergy, (ii) Second Estate or Nobility and, (iii) Third Estate or commoners.
7. At the Congress of Troppau (1820), to which all the then world powers sent their delegates, those of Russia, Prussia, and Austria swore themselves to mediate, by equipped of power if essential, in any state lease by a threatening rebellion, and to restore the genuine government to power in the event that it had been ousted by a transformation.
8. The main cause of the American War of Independence was in opposition of taxes imposed by the British government on its American colonies. It had led to the overthrow of a government that was considered tyrannical and replaced it with a democratic and constitutional government which had been formed by the pioneers of the American war.
9. France had joined the American War of Independence to take revenge from Great Britain for its losses in the Seven Years' War. Historians believe that France had joined the American War of Independence as an afterthought and after Benjamin Franklin, who was the then American ambassador to France, influenced the French people to aspire for a new social order.
10. The common people who constituted the third estate generally feared that the other two classes would overrule them while making attempts at the reforms. They thus led the formation of the National Assembly which was revolutionary in nature. It was representative of the end of reservation in estates general based on traditional social classes.
11. The third estate, headed by an aristocrat called the Marquis de Mirabeau, demanded to form a separate estate to represent the nation as the other two classes spoke to just the advantaged class. They withdrew from the gathering and constituted themselves as the National Assembly, swearing a vow (Tennis Court Oath, June 20, 1789) that they would not scatter until they had coincided on a constitution and had it acknowledged by the ruler.
12. The Girondins who controlled the Legislative Assembly felt that war was certain, and they had no complaint to it. They accepted that Europe was ready for revolution under the French administration. Despite the fact that they thought little of how such a war was to be pursued, they had a sovereign scorn for the Austrian and Prussian armed forces, and longed to put an end to the fomentation of the émigrés who were behind the interventionist powers. The Assembly finally declared war in April 1792.
13. The levee forced by the Committee of Public Safety on France amid the Revolution was the first current illustration of enrollment of the labour of any European country. It was made conceivable by the way that the populace of a country identified itself with the war points of its leaders, as the people

groups had never recognized themselves with the wars of the lords. It made little distinction to the inhabitants of a nation whether they were led by one ruler or an alternate.

14. In June 1793, the Jacobins and leaders of the Commune turned on the heat on the Girondins and captured them. This occasion denoted the start of the alleged Reign of Terror, the pioneer being Maximillian Robespierre.
15. The most vital part of Napoleon's project was to acquire peace and put an end to the war keeping in mind the end goal to provide for him time to set the domestic undertakings of France in place. Next in criticalness, and an essential for acknowledgement in the nation, was to put an end to the internal religious strife. After these, the additions of the Revolution must be solidified in a lasting law code, and the accounts of the nation must be put on a safe premise.
16. Napoleon himself accepted that his greatest achievement was the law code that bore his name, the Code Napoleon. He was in charge of the way that the Code, on which legal advisors had been working through the Revolution, was at last issued.
17. The three nations where radicalism thrived most were, France, Great Britain, and the United States.
18. Mazzini's legislature proclaimed the reallocation of chapel terrains and their redistribution to the proletariat, and in addition a project of open lodging for the urban poor.
19. The Slavophil's held that Russia was a special nation, with traditions, convictions, and organizations exceptional to itself. To embrace the dress, the behaviour, the legitimate and political standards of the western European states appeared unfaithful to these nationalists whose aversion of the 'westernizers' and their servile impersonation of European society dated from the days when Peter the Great had opened his 'windows to the west.' The Slavophiles themselves had little to offer in the method for a constructive system. Their beliefs were generally ambiguous and negative yet they appealed to the nationalists, the conventional church, and the inactively conservative masses.
20. Alexander Herzen was known as the 'Father of Russian Liberalism.'
21. By the Treaty of Frankfort, France surrendered the regions of Alsace and Lorraine to Germany and consented to pay a reimbursement of five billion francs.
22. The Treaty of Prague was signed on 23 August, 1866.
23. In 1820, revolutions erupted in Naples and in 1821 in Sardinia. However, they were poorly managed and effectively extinguished by Austrian intercession. Uprisings in Parma, Modena, and the Papal States in 1831 faced the same results. The revolutionaries were sentenced to death or detained. This fanned the enthusiasm of other Italians who saw all the more obviously each one year that there could be no freedom in Italy until the Austrian yoke was broken.

NOTES

NOTES

24. Napoleon made peace with the Austrian ruler Francis Joseph (Treaty of Villafranca). As the Austrian powers remained unequivocally entrenched in the round of strongholds known as the Quadrilatero (Mantova, Peschiera, Verona, and Legnago), Francis Joseph presented the deal and despite the fact that he consented to surrender Lombardy, he demanded that the leaders of Modena and Tuscany held on to their thrones. The two sovereigns additionally chose to push the shaping of an Italian federation under the administration of the Pope, a step which Napoleon numbered upon to assuage the French Catholics.
25. Norway was the first European country which allowed women to vote on the same terms as men.
26. The Bulgars were the last Christian group in the Balkan Peninsula to escape Turkish abuse. A national and social recovery went before their interest for political opportunity, and the Bulgars battled to free themselves at the same time from the command of the Greeks and Turks.

2.17 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. Why was Napoleon's foreign policy criticized by other European nations?
2. On what basis did Edmund Burke question the Progressives?
3. What was the characteristic of the reclamation governments in 1815?
4. What was the Holy Alliance?
5. What was the condition of French labourers in 1789?
6. What were the three basis laws that were put into action by the Committee of Public Safety?
7. How did the Russian campaign lead to the downfall of Napoleon?
8. What did Code Napoleon sanctify?
9. What did the Treaty of San Stefano decide?
10. Which country received the Island of Cyprus?

Long-Answer Questions

1. Critically evaluate the Romantic Movement taking place in Europe. How did this movement contribute to the rebellion against the existing traditionalist styles?
2. Analyse the Greek Revolution. Trace the development and outcome of this revolution and its effects on Europe.
3. How did the American War of Independence inspire the French?
4. Evaluate the financial condition of France during 1789.
5. Outline the measures of the Constitution of 1791.

6. Explain the role of Robespierre in the French Revolution.
7. Describe the character and main achievements of Napoleon.
8. Discuss Alexander II's accomplishment in liberating Russian serfs.
9. Examine the conditions that prevailed during nineteenth century Spain.
10. Outline the decay of the Turkish Empire during the nineteenth century.

NOTES

2.18 FURTHER READING

- Kramer, Lloyd S. (2011). *Nationalism in Europe and America: Politics, Cultures, and Identities since 1775*. North Carolina: UNC Press Books.
- Pearson, Raymond. (2014). *The Longman Companion to European Nationalism 1789-1920*. New York: Routledge.
- Cookson, J. E. (1982). *The Friends of Peace: Anti-war Liberalism in England, 1793-1815*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Doyle, William. (2002). *The Oxford History of the French Revolution*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Furet, François, Mona Ozouf. (1989). *A Critical Dictionary of the French Revolution*. United States: Harvard University Press.
- Vovchenko, Denis Vladimirovich. (2008). *Containing Balkan Nationalism: Imperial Russia and Ottoman Christians (1856—1912)*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: ProQuest.
- Stiles, Andrina, Robert Pearce. (2006). *Access to History: The Unification of Italy*: Third Edition. London: Hachette UK.
- Collier, Martin. (2003). *Italian Unification, 1820-71*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Pflanze, Otto. (1971). *Bismarck and the Development of Germany: The Period of Unification, 1815-1871, Volume 1*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Farmer, Alan. (2007). *Access to History: The Unification of Germany 1815-1919* 3rd Edition. London: Hachette UK.

UNIT 3 EARLY STIRRINGS OF NATIONALISM

NOTES

Structure

- 3.0 Introduction
- 3.1 Unit Objectives
- 3.2 Nationalism as a Cause and Consequence of the First World War
- 3.3 Russian Revolution
 - 3.3.1 Causes for the Outbreak of the Revolution
 - 3.3.2 Course of the Revolution
 - 3.3.3 Lenin's Leadership
- 3.4 Kemalist Revolution
- 3.5 Zionism and Palestinian Nationalism
 - 3.5.1 Palestinian Nationalism
- 3.6 Growth of Nationalism in India
 - 3.6.1 Growth of Nationalism under Gandhi
 - 3.6.2 Khilafat Movement
 - 3.6.3 Non-Cooperation Movement
 - 3.6.4 Civil Disobedience Movement
- 3.7 Chinese Nationalism till the 1940s
 - 3.7.1 National Crisis
 - 3.7.2 Imperialist Inequity
 - 3.7.3 The Intellectual Response: The New Culture Movement
 - 3.7.4 Significance of the New Culture Movement
 - 3.7.5 Formation of the Republic of China and Nationalist Government
- 3.8 Japanese Nationalism
 - 3.8.1 Growth of Nationalism in the Meiji Period (1868-1911)
 - 3.8.2 Nationalist Politics
 - 3.8.3 Japan after the First World War
 - 3.8.4 Militarist Parties and Ultra-Nationalism in Japan
- 3.9 Summary
- 3.10 Key Terms
- 3.11 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 3.12 Questions and Exercises
- 3.13 Further Reading

3.0 INTRODUCTION

The early stirrings of nationalism can be traced to the rise of nationalism during the First World War. Besides the developments during the First World War, there were several other causes of the Russian Revolution. The Russian Revolution is considered as one of the most significant events in human history. It led to an end the Tsarist rule and the establishment of a Republic. After the First World War, nations of the world geared towards creating amnesty between the nations, especially Europe. The first decade post-World War I saw rampant changes in the cultural, social and political ideologies of various nations. The growth of nationalism was also seen in

NOTES

the establishment of Israel. Zionism is a nationalist and political movement of Jews and Jewish culture that supports the re-establishment of a Jewish homeland. India also witnessed the growth of nationalism during the second half of the nineteenth century. In addition, China and Japan also witnessed the growth of nationalism.

In this unit, you will learn about the growth of nationalism as a cause and consequence of the First World War, Russian Revolution, Kemalist Revolution, Zionism and Palestinian nationalism, growth of nationalism in India, Chinese nationalism till the 1940s and Japanese nationalism.

3.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Discuss nationalism as a cause and consequence of the First World War
- Explain the causes and course of the Russian Revolution
- Discuss the Kemalist Revolution
- Examine Zionism and Palestinian nationalism
- Describe the growth of nationalism in India
- Discuss Chinese nationalism till the 1940s
- Describe the growth of nationalism during the Meiji Period in Japan

3.2 NATIONALISM AS A CAUSE AND CONSEQUENCE OF THE FIRST WORLD WAR

Nationalism was a major cause of World War I. Before World War I, several Europeans strongly believed that their nation was superior culturally, economically as well as militarily. This strong belief in the cultural and military might of their nation was further reinforced by the nationalistic press. The newspapers published provocative stories about rival nations which incited the public. In addition, literature, culture, music and theatre also greatly reinforced the spirit of nationalism. Also, politicians added to the spirit of nationalism through their provocative remarks. As a result, Europeans were assured of the moral righteousness of their nation. They also nurtured the belief that rival nations were belligerent, uncivilized and untrustworthy. It strengthened the belief of the Europeans that their nation was threatened by the expansionist policies of its rival nations. It reassured them that in the event of a war, they would certainly defeat the rival nations. Hence, imperialism and militarism, along with nationalism created a false perception in the minds of the Europeans that in case of an inevitable war, they would certainly emerge triumphant.

The First World War had a serious consequence on the polity of the then contemporary world which was highly influenced by this event.

In the first place, the War gave a shattering blow to some of the autocratic monarchies functioning in various countries of Europe of the time. It paved the way

for the development of democratic system in Europe. As an upshot of the War three autocratic dynasties, namely, the Hollezzollerian in Germany, the Hapsburg in Austria-Hungary, and the Romanov in Russia were destroyed. In a number of states, monarchical system was replaced by republican system. These countries were Poland, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia and Czechoslovakia. The emergence of democratic system led to recognition of people's democratic rights.

The War encouraged the principles of nationalism and self-determination. After the War empires having people with different culture were dissociated and independent states with distinct cultures came up to the fore. Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Alsace-Lorraine, etc., which had distinct cultures of their own made their appearance and were given to France. Similarly Schleswig-Holstein was restored to Denmark. China, Turkey, Egypt and Ireland were also influenced with the impact of nationalism.

The weakening position of the colonial powers in Europe provided an opportunity to freedom movements in Asia and Africa. Colonized countries like India began to feel that in view of the weakened position of the colonial powers they could hope to gain freedom. Therefore, they intensified the campaign of freedom struggle. The prolonged freedom struggle in Asian and African countries led to a change in the policy of colonial powers towards their colonies. During the pre-war period, the colonial powers treated their colonial possessions as per their wish and without taking into account the wishes of the people. In contrast to their earlier practice, in the post World War period the colonized territories were granted certain rights and some restrictions were imposed on them under the mandate system. Overall, greater importance began to be attached to the interests of the colonial people after the War.

The First World War promoted the spirit of 'internationalism'. During the War various nations came in close contact with each other through various alliances, pacts and agreements. These relationships continued further even after the War ended, which greatly contributed to the development of the spirit of internationalism.

Five key features of Pre-War nationalist sentiments in Europe

1. Nationalism was reckoned as a powerful form of patriotism. Countries with nationalist inclinations regarded other countries as inferior to them.
2. Pre-war nationalism was reinforced by colonial conquests, rivalry, wars and provocative remarks made by politicians and diplomats.
3. Anti-German literature in Britain highlighted an anticipatory war with Germany and even a German invasion in the future.
4. German nationalism was based on the ground that Britain wanted to remove Germany from its firmly held position among the European nations.
5. Nationalism was emerging in the Balkans. In this region, Serbians and others wanted independence and full control from the political supremacy of Austria-Hungary.

NOTES

NOTES

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-I

1. Mention some features of the pre-war nationalist sentiments in Europe.
2. State the various principles promoted by the First World War.

3.3 RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

You have already learnt that ‘nationalism’ refers to the loyalty and devotion of persons or citizens to a particular nation through a sense of national consciousness that places one nation above all others. In addition, nationalism places a primary emphasis on the cultural aspects and interests of a nation as opposed to those of other nations or groups. The main reasons for nationalism are usually based on national security and defense, especially during times of war. In world history, one can find many examples of nationalism, such as during the Russian Revolution of 1917.

One of the important causes of the Russian Revolution (February Revolution and the October or Bolshevik Revolution) of 1917 was the heavy military setback suffered by the Russian army during the First World War. The losses suffered by Russia in the First World War played a definite role in the mutinies and revolts that began to occur. Russian soldiers, with lowered morale, began to fraternize with the enemy. However, the Tsar Nicholas II, the last Emperor of Russia, insisted on ruling as an autocrat. He had comprehensively failed to deal adequately with the problems facing the country. Social unrest and public discontent against the government reached a climax, leading to the Russian Revolution in 1917. The Revolution in February destroyed the Tsarist autocracy and resulted in the creation of the Soviet Union under a provisional government. However, soon Russia witnesses a period of dual power. In the dual power system, the provisional government held state power, whereas the national network of Soviets, led by socialists, had the allegiance of the lower classes and the political left. During this disordered phase, mutinies, protests and strikes became the order of the day. Finally, in the October Revolution, the Bolshevik party, under the leadership of Vladimir Lenin, deposed the provisional government. Besides the developments during the First World War, there were many other causes of the Russian Revolution.

3.3.1 Causes for the Outbreak of the Revolution

In February 1917, the Russian Revolution was an important event in the course of Russian history. It has complex causes, nature, and effect and is critical in the twentieth century international history analysis. Even the major causes of this unrest of the common people towards Tsar Nicholas II and aristocratic landowners are numerous and complicated to neatly summarize.

However, there were various factors and forces which were responsible for the Russian Revolution in 1917. The main factors were the series of bad judgements by the Tsar, the resentment at the treatment of peasants cruelly by the landowners,

experience of poor working conditions by labourers and workers in the industries, and an increasing sense of political and social awareness of the people in general because of democratic ideas that reached Russia from the West. Proletarian dissatisfaction was further combined by some immediate events of the time like shortages of food and successive military failures.

NOTES

1. Series of bad judgments by the Tsar: The system of Tsar fell for a series of bad judgements by the Tsar. In the First World War, the war against Germany meant that troops could not be deployed in force against the Russian revolutionaries, the underestimation of the extent of the revolts in Petrograd by Tsar until it was too late, and the Tsar generals convinced him that only the Duma could deal with the situation. The imposition of strict censorship laws and suppression of any and all forms of political dissidence were some another factors that became responsible for the Revolution. All of these events led to the fall of autocratic system which was centuries old and that had generated lot of anguish and discontentment among the people of Russia.

The Revolution started as a peaceful bread protest on International Women's Day. Bread shortage was there not because of low harvest, but because the 'railway system had become overloaded due to the war, and was unable to supply the northern cities with grain'. In mid-February, it was realized that the supply of flour in Petrograd was left for only 10 days. Skilled labourers were recruited by the army, while the rail network had been divided into sections, which was controlled by civil government and by the military. This, along with the general belief that the government was hoarding bread so as to drive up prices, meant that the demonstration of anger was aimed against the regime of Tsarist because of its inability to distribute the food stocks. The aggrieved people transformed into an unruly mob because their protest was supported by demonstrations by the more militant Petrograd factory workers. Along with this, the textile labourers and Putilov steel works workers went on strike and the crowds swelled from 100,000 to over 200,000 within three days. However it would be untrue to describe the protests as purely a revolt by the workers, as it bore the character of a general uprising of the people. But it would be right to state that the 'workers played a leading role in the demonstrations and were especially active in the violent aspects of the uprising'. However, in general the protest took the form of a peasant riot, as the frenzied mob frequently indulged in violent acts.

Tsar Nicholas II himself believed in autocratic principles. His ministers like Pleve had dictatorial powers who continued the old policy of Russification, persecution and reaction. The wife of Pleve and the Queen who was under the influence of Rasputin, a reactionary, interfered in the affairs of administration in 1902. A group of intellectuals who were influenced by the Western ideas published a paper called 'Liberation and in 1904'. These intellectuals also formed a party known as Union Liberator. In the same year, the autocratic minister Pleve was assassinated. For all these reasons, Tsar Nicholas II thought of changing his policy and appointed Mirski, a man of liberal ideas, as the Home Minister. The press was given greater freedom. In

NOTES

November 1904, the representatives of Zemstvos or provincial assemblies met at St Petersburg. They demanded freedom of conscience, speech, publication, public meeting and associations. They also demanded for a Parliament for the whole country empowered to pass all the laws and control the government. The Tsar did not concede the demands of common people and the discontentment continued to grow among the people. The students of the University of Moscow paraded the streets and shouted the slogans of 'down with autocracy' and 'stop the war'. On 22 January 1905, a large number of workers under the leadership of Gapon marched towards the imperial palace to present a petition to the Tsar containing their grievances. The royal troupes did not allow them to proceed and fired at them. There was loss of life and strikes were observed in various parts of the country. The incident was known as 'Slaughter of Bloody Sunday'. Subsequently there were rebellion within the army and the general Duke Sergus, the uncle of the Tsar was assassinated. At last, the Tsar Nicholas II was forced to issue a Manifesto in October 1905.

To change a mass-demonstration into a revolution required more than just workers who were protesting in the streets; it required a loss of authority for the government in the city of Petrograd. This occurred due to mutiny of troops from the Petrograd garrison in reply to a massacre. In a brutal incident in Znamenskii Square, which was a popular gathering place for conducting political rallies, the Pavlovskii Guard Regiment troupes fired upon a crowd that failed to disperse. In the massacre about forty civilians were killed, which enraged the Petrograd garrison members into mutiny. Even though a major power transfer to the workers was there, a revolution was hardly inevitable as the mutineers were described as a 'leaderless rabble', who when threatened, panicked instantly and ran for protection. It was inaction by Tsar that changed a minor rebellion into a revolution.

The revolt also needed an organization for becoming successful. Unfortunately, many of the political parties leaders who had expected most to gain from the revolt, were in exile. Most of the socialist parties were not expecting a revolution, as Lenin had predicted in January that, 'We older men perhaps will not live to see the coming revolution'. Even Sergei Mstislavsky, who was a Social Revolutionary leader, admitted: 'The revolution found us, the party members, in our sleep'. Therefore, in the early stages of the February revolution there was relatively little political involvement, especially from socialist parties. Political parties, telephoned each other to be aware of what was happening on the street. This showed the lack of organization. Due to this complete disorganization of the socialist political parties, it is difficult to describe the February 1917 revolution as a political revolution.

There was also very little confidence from the political parties that the protests were of political nature. Alexander Gavrilovich Shliapnikov, a Russian communist revolutionary best remembered as a memoirist of the October Revolution of 1917, said: 'Once the crowd got their bread they would be content and disperse'. The Tsar was also doubtful if the protests would actually

transform into a revolution. Initially, he responded to reports received from Petrograd by telling his Minister of the Courts that, 'The fat-bellied Rodzianko has written me a lot of nonsense, which I won't even bother to answer'. However, he heard that the protests were getting worse, and that the Petrograd garrison had rebelled. So on 28 February 1917, the Tsar ordered for the dissolution of Duma and for the deployment of troops against the protestors. In response, an executive committee was created by the Duma, while a Soviet was formed by the soldiers and workers, and became a rival power-base to the Duma, situated in the Tauride Palace left wing. The Soviet had the power or control in the streets, but it had no legal authority to rule, while the Duma had the legal authority to rule, but had no authority in the streets to support it. The Tsar's late reaction to the protests meant that a power base had been created in the Soviet, and this could never collaborate with the autocratic system. Only two possible outcomes were there—full revolution or full military suppression by already stretched armies.

Because of the the war with Germany, the second of the two options became a near impossibility; to withdraw troops from the front so as to suppress the revolutionaries and this would result in almost certain defeat at the hands of the Germans. However, General Ivanov was appointed by Tsar so as to send troops to Petrograd and restore order in the capital. The extent of the revolutionary action in the city was under-estimated by both Ivanov and Tsar, and this was confirmed once General Khabalov was consulted by Ivanov in Petrograd about the situation. Khabalov announced that, 'the whole city was in the hands of the revolutionaries' and that 'the ministers had been arrested by the revolutionaries'. Upon hearing this, Ivanov decided that the offensive would be futile and decided against it. In effect, the decision had been made, and Tsar had little opportunity to do anything but abdicate. Rodzianko confirmed this, and he felt that nothing short of the Tsar's abdication would pacify the rebellious troops.

The continuation of strikes and mutinies have led to supplies to the front being cut; it was also dreaded that turmoil in the capital might broaden to the front only a few hundred kilometers away, resulting in mass desertion in the army. Therefore, the generals of Tsar advised Nicholas to abdicate so as to save Russia's war effort, and to somehow satisfy the mutineers in Petrograd. So Nicholas agreed to abdicate and initially named his son, Alexis, as his successor.

Another reason for the fall of the Tsar was his overdependence on Rasputin, a self-proclaimed psychic, mystic and healer, who had unconventional ways of healing diseases and dealing with human sins. A friend of Tsarina had suggested Rasputin when doctors failed to cure her son, Alexis, of hemophilia. Somehow, Rasputin was able to provide temporary relief to the boy. Soon, he gained entry to the Russian court and became an advisor to the Tsars. Rasputin was a womanizer and was much criticized by Russian journalists for his debauched ways and orgies. He weakened the confidence of the Tsars' subjects in him. Whenever Nicholas was away, the German-born Alexandra (his wife), who was a puppet in the hands of Rasputin, added to the subjects's

NOTES

NOTES

discontent by giving power to those who did not deserve it. Rasputin had assured the Tsar that Alexis would get well, but when Nicholas saw no scope for improvement in Alexis' health, he decided to hand over the autocracy to his brother, Mikhail. But when Mikhail learned that the Soviet was violently opposed to the continuation of the rule of Romanov dynasty, he refused to accept, and the autocratic Tsar rule in Russia ended.

The workers were the most important and most active part of the February revolution which began as a general uprising of the people. Peasants and soldiers sympathy and mutiny led to power being wrested from the hands of the Tsar, and being transferred to the Soviet and the Duma. A series of bad judgements made by the Tsar, underestimating the revolution extent, as well as the war impact, showed his inability to suppress the revolution. When the Tsar's attempts to restore order in Petrograd failed, he was advised to abdicate, which he followed on March 1917, ending over three hundred years of Romanov rule in Russia.

It is interesting to note that the city of Petrograd was first known as St. Petersburg. This name was dropped later after the war with Prussia because the term 'burg' was seen as too German. During 1918, the communists were keen on getting rid of any Tsarist legacies, and Petrograd became Leningrad in the honour of Vladimir Lenin. Later in 1991, the name of St. Petersburg was restored to the city.

- 2. The economic causes:** Economic factors like poverty, misery and exploitation of the masses by the nobility played a major role in the Revolution. In the industrial sphere, Russia was backward and depended only on foreign capital. Because of the industrialisation, a number of factories were set up in Russia. A large number of peasants left their jobs to take up jobs at these factories. However, the conditions of work in these factories were quite miserable. They had to work far long hours at very deplorable wages. They had to go without any medical relief in case of an accident while on duty. They did not even have a weekly holiday. The workers were not permitted to form trade unions to bargain for better service condition and better salaries, and it was considered a crime to form trade unions. As a result, their economic condition was quite miserable. The concentration of large number of dissatisfied workers gave rise to the feeling of political consciousness and contributed to the anti-Tsarist sentiments.

The condition of peasants was not better. Russia was mainly a backward agricultural country before the Revolution. The royal family, the nobility and the clergy owned most of the agricultural land. The peasants had a very small land holding. Many of them had to earn their livelihood from that small piece of land. In addition to this, they had to make use of primitive tools and methods of cultivation which were not very effective or productive. As a result of this, the poor peasants became poorer because huge sums of rent, tax and tributes were to be paid by them to their landlords every year. Moreover, no attempt was made by the government to improve these conditions.

Due to the above economic factors there was an imbalance in the social structure. Due to this, 70 per cent of the Russian population was illiterate. The social structure of Russia was completely devoid of education, medical relief, and public health. Above all the system prevailing in the whole of Russia made Russian social life, highly miserable, inhuman and wretched. This created great discontent among the factory workers and farmers who in order to end this economic and social system were ready to revolt against the Tsarist government.

NOTES

- 3. Political causes:** Political factors also formed an important cause of the Russian Revolution of 1917. Politically, Russia was subjected to autocratic rule of the Tsar Nicholas II, who ruled the country in a ruthless and oppressive manner. No doubt as a result of the 1905 Revolution a parliament had been established in Russia but the sovereignty still rested in the hands of the Tsar and his henchmen. There were no constitutional checks on the authority of the Tsar and the people groaned under the autocratic rule. Even the church extended full support to the autocratic rule of the Tsars through the theory of divine rights of kings. The henchmen surrounding the Tsar were also in favour of the autocratic rule and opposed all kinds of reforms. The tsar also secured the support of the army by providing them numerous facilities which enabled them to lead a comfortable life. The masses on the other hand had no legal means of improving the social structure. A strike was considered to be a mutiny. The people had no media to ventilate their grievances. All this was naturally resented by the common people who wanted a democratic system of government on the pattern of western democracies be introduced in Russia. The people also insisted on effective share in the government of the country, and pleaded for the freedom of speech and press as well as equality before law. However, the Tsar Nicholas II turned down these demands.

People demonstrated against this ruthless, absolute and repressive Tsarist government in 1905. A peaceful demonstration at St. Petersburg was fired upon by the Tsarist troops. This incident further alienated the people from the Tsar Nicholas II. Widespread strikes, riots and the famous mutiny on the Battleship Potemkin ensued. Such was the climate in 1905 that Tsar Nicholas saw fit, against his will, to cede the people their wishes. In his October Manifesto, Nicholas II created Russia's first constitution and the Duma, an elected parliamentary body. The Duma (Parliament) had limited powers so it could not intervene immediately in the matters relating to the Tsar. Later the growing discontent among the masses manifested itself in all aspects of national life. Till that time the working class became highly receptive to Marxist ideas infiltrating into Russia. In 1893, the Social Democratic Party was founded and in 1903, this party was split into two; the Bolsheviks led by Nikolai Lenin, and the Mensheviks led by Martov. While the former was revolutionary and supported by Stalin, the latter was evolutionary and was supported by Trotsky. Therefore by 1917, the ground was fully prepared against the Tsar and the growing discontentment amongst the common people was waiting to burst and turn into a violent revolution. Therefore, historians have observed that

NOTES

the perversity of the Tsar and his blindness to the potential strength of the new forces, which were surging round him, produced the Revolution.

- 4. Impact of liberal Western ideas:** The material revolution in Russia was followed by a revolution in the realm of liberal thoughts and ideas. The Russian intellectuals were now divided between the two opposing groups of slavophiles and westernizers. Peter the Great was a westernizer much ahead of his times and that is why influences of Western culture are still apparent in St. Petersburg, a city created under him. The slavophiles and westernizers had completely opposite views on the Russian civilization and how it was to be carried forward. The slavophiles believed in the superiority of the Russian culture over the Western culture, and though they supported the emancipation of serfs and valued the freedom of speech and press, they still believed in an autocratic form of government. The westernizers, as the name suggests, were of the view that western technology and ideals of democracy should be adopted by Russia to march on the road to success. They also believed in socialism, liberalism and political radicalism.

Large number of Russians especially the middle class came in contact with the ideas of progressive writers and they were particularly influenced by the writing of Karl Marx who pleaded for the abolition of capitalism and establishment of a regime where the power would be in the hands of the workers and the labourers. The other notable writers and intellectuals whose writings influenced the Russians included Tolstoy, Turgnev and Dostovesky. These writings revolutionized the minds of the Russians in such a way that the educated and the enlightened people called the support of the intelligentsia and demanded political reforms on the Western lines. On the other hand, the radicals and the followers of Marx and Bukanin stood for socialism. The Russians at the same time also came in contact with the Western ideas of democracy. During the First World War the Allies declared that they are fighting the War for the welfare of general people. The Russians were greatly impressed by this declaration and were determined to fight for the establishment of people's rule in their country. As a result of the 1905 Revolution in Russia the people were assured of some sort of participation in the administration of the country. However, it was not conceded. So the people were determined to get this in actual practice. Under these circumstances nationalism also made its way into Russia which aimed at destroying everything in the existing order of the country. As a consequence of the above factors, demands started becoming louder for the establishment of constitutional and liberal form of government in Russia.

- 5. The emergence of revolutionary parties:** After 1912, various revolutionary parties, especially the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, fortune revived. Both these groups developed from an earlier Marxist movement, the Social Democrat Labour Party, and Karl Marx's ideas influenced them. Karl Marx was a German Jew (1818–83) and his political ideas were mentioned in the *Communist Manifesto* in 1848, and *Das Kapital* in 1867. According to Karl Marx economic factors are the main reason for the historical change and that

the capitalists bourgeoisie exploited proletariat (workers) everywhere. It contended that in a fully industrialized society, the workers will 'inevitably rise up against their exploiters and take control themselves, running the country in their interests'. According to Marx this was 'the dictatorship of the proletariat'.

Vladimir Lenin was one of the social democrat, who helped edit the revolutionary newspaper *Iskra* (The Spark). In 1903 over an election to the editorial board of *Iskra* the party had split into Lenin supporters, the Bolsheviks, the Russian word for the majority and the rest, the Mensheviks means the minority. The Bolsheviks wanted a small-disciplined party of professional revolutionaries who would work full time to bring about revolution, because the industrial workers were in a minority in the country. Therefore, Lenin believed that they must work with the peasants as well, and get them involved in revolutionary activity. The Mensheviks, on the other hand, were happy to have party membership open to anybody who cared to join. They believed that a revolution could not take place in Russia until the country was fully industrialised, and industrial workers were in a big majority over peasants. They had very little faith in co-operation from peasants who were actually one of the most conservative groups in society. The Mensheviks were the strict Marxists, believing in a proletarian revolution, whereas Lenin was the one moving away from the Marxism.

The Social Revolutionaries were another revolutionary party. They were not Marxists and they did not approve of increasing industrialization, and did not think in terms of a proletarian revolution. After the overthrow of the Tsarist regime, they wanted a mainly agrarian society based on peasant communities operating collectively.

- 6. Military debacle in the First World War:** The military debacle suffered by Russia during the First World War also provided a great impetus to the revolutionary movement in Russia. Historians also agree that Russian failures in the War made the revolution certain and caused the troops and the police to mutiny, as there were nobody left to defend the autocracy. The common people held the Tsar responsible for the reverses suffered by Russia. The sufferings caused to the people due to shortage of food and heavy losses of men and money in the War further agitated their minds. They appealed to the Tsar to bring necessary improvement in the condition by assuming personal responsibility for the affairs of the government. However, the Tsar did not bother about the demand and indulged in fanciful luxuries. His officials also ignored the wishes and interests of the people. All this forced the people to think in terms of getting rid of the Tsar and this made the Revolution inevitable.

The War also exposed the incompetence of the government, corrupt organization, shortage of equipment and poor transportation and distribution system in the country. Although there was plenty of food in the country during the War, it did not reach the big cities in sufficient quantities, because most of the trains were being monopolised by the military. Bread was scarce and very expensive. By January 1917, most groups in the society were disillusioned

NOTES

NOTES

with the incompetent way the Tsar was running the War. Sensing the outcome of the War, the aristocracy, the Duma, industrialists, and the army began to turn against the Tsar Nicholas II, realising that it would be better to sacrifice the Tsar to avoid a much worse revolution that might damage the entire social structure.

3.3.2 Course of the Russian Revolution

The first important event of the Revolution in Russian was the March Revolution or the February Revolution in Russia. It was a chaotic affair and it marked the termination of over a century of civil and military unrest. It is important to mention that the March and the November revolutions are till date known as the February and October revolutions in Russia. This is so as the Julian calendar was being used by the Russians, which was 13 days behind the Gregorian calendar which was used by the rest of Europe, and in 1918 Russia adopted the Gregorian calendar.

In 1905, Russia suffered humiliating losses in the Russo-Japanese War and, during a demonstration against the War in the same year, firing was opened by the Tsarist troopson an unarmed crowd and this further isolated Nicholas II from his people. There were widespread strikes, riots, and the famous mutiny on the Battleship Potemkin. Such was the atmosphere in 1905 that Tsar Nicholas saw fit, 'against his will, to cede the people their wishes'. Nicholas created Russia's first constitution and the State Duma, an elected parliamentary body in Tsar's October Manifesto. However, the belief of Nicholas's in his divine right to rule Russia meant that 'he spent much of the following years fighting to undermine or strip the Duma of its powers and to retain as much autocracy as possible'. In 1914, when Archduke Franz Ferdinand was assassinated by political activists in Serbia, the Austro-Hungarian empire declared war on its neighbours. Serbia talked to Russia for help. Tsar Nicholas II 'saw a chance to galvanize his people against a common enemy, and to atone for the humiliations suffered in the Russo-Japanese War'.

World War I

Russia's disastrous participation in World War I was the final blow in many ways to the rule of Tsar. In the very first rendezvous with the Germans (who had sided with the Austro-Hungarian Empire), the Battle of Tannenberg, the Russian army lost and there were 1,20,000 casualties to Germany's 20,000. Nicholas left St. Petersburg in the autumn of 1915 to take personal charge of the army due to continuing series of losses and setbacks. Around this time conscripts and untrained troops to the front were being sent by Russia, with 'little or no equipment and fighting in an almost continual retreat'. In 1916, morale was lowered as the pressure of waging the war was the hardest on proletarian families, 'whose sons were being slaughtered at the front, and who suffered severe food shortages at home'. The regime of Tsar and the Imperial took the blame as civil unrest heated up.

The February-March 1 Revolution (1917)

According to the Russian calendar, the March Revolution started on 23 February 1917. However, the first revolution actually started on 08 March. On that day, there

were bread riots in St. Petersburg. Soon it became a city-wide demonstration as furious industrial workers left factories and protested against shortage of food. They were soon joined by the rioters, and on the next day—encouraged by political and social activists—the crowd had enlarged and virtually every industry, shop and enterprise ceased to function as the entire populace went on strike. Tsar Nicholas wanted the police and military to intervene, but the military was no longer faithful to the Tsar and many mutinied or joined the people in demonstrations. There were fights all over the place and the whole city was in chaos. After five days over 80,000 troops from the army mutinied and looting and rioting spreaded extensively. The Duma and the generals were convinced, and further, that the Tsar who was on his way back to Petrograd, would have to leave. Nicholas senior generals suggested that he could save the monarchy by renouncing the throne. Faced with this weak situation Tsar Nicholas abdicated his throne on 15 March, and handed over the power to his brother Michael. But, Michael refused to acknowledge leadership unless he was elected by the Duma. He resigned the next day, leaving Russia without any head of state.

NOTES

The Provisional Government

A Provisional Government was quickly formed by leading members of the Duma after Romanovs abdicated and it was internationally recognised as the legal government of Russia. It was to rule Russia until elections were held. However it did not had any absolute or stable power. A trade union of workers and soldiers—the more radical Petrograd Soviet organization—wielded enormous influence. It supported full-scale socialism over more moderate democratic reforms which were favoured by the Provisional Government members. Russia was consumed with political fervour after centuries of imperial rule, but ‘the many different factions, all touting different ideas, meant that political stability was still a long way after the February Revolution’.

Emergence of Lenin

Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov—also known as Lenin was one person who was eager to take advantage of the chaotic state of affairs in St. Petersburg. Most of the time of Lenin was spent travelling, working, and campaigning in Europe—partly because of fear for his own safety, as he was known Socialist and was considered as an enemy of the Tsarist rule. However, when the Tsar was arrested, and Russian politics was in chaos, Lenin found the opportunity to lead his party, the Bolsheviks, to power. He negotiated a return to Russia from Switzerland, his home, with the help of German authorities. As a supporter of withdrawing Russia from the Great War, the Germans were willing to help Lenin’s passage back through a ‘sealed train’. The Russian people as well as many leading political figures welcomed Lenin’s return to Russia in April 1917. Lenin immediately condemned the Provisional Government and the Petrograd Soviet policies and ideologies instead of uniting the fractious parties. In his April Theses, published in the Bolshevik newspaper *Pravda*, he believed in non-cooperation with the liberals (i.e., non-hardline Communists) and an immediate end to the War. Initially, his uncompromising stance isolated both Lenin and the Bolsheviks,

NOTES

but with powerful slogans like ‘Peace, land and bread’, Lenin won the hearts of the Russian people—who were increasingly unable to ‘stomach war and poverty’.

During the summer of 1917, Lenin attempted to invoke another revolution, the likes of which had taken place in February, with the motive of overthrowing the Provisional Government. Lenin sought to maneuver the Machine Gun Regiment which refused to leave Petrograd (as St. Petersburg was then known) for the frontline. However, the coup was thwarted by Kerensky, who was the most important figure of the time and a member of both the Provisional Government and Petrograd Soviet. Experienced troops entered the city to suppress any dissidence and the Bolsheviks were accused of being involved with the Germans. Whilst Lenin escaped to Finland, many were arrested. Despite all this Lenin continued plotting and scheming. Meanwhile Kerensky suffered his own setbacks in politics and even had to appeal to the Bolsheviks for military aid when he feared his War Minister, Kornilov, was aiming for a military dictatorship. ‘By autumn the Bolsheviks were climbing into the ascendancy, winning majority votes within the Petrograd and Moscow Soviets. Leon Trotsky was elected as president of the former’.

The October-November Revolution

By the Julian calendar used in Russia at the time, the Revolution took place in November 1917, and the October Revolution is therefore often referred to as the November Revolution.

While Russian politics was still in a state of constant flux, Lenin realized that it was the time to capitalize on his party’s popularity. He planned a coup that would overthrow the Provisional Government which was increasingly ineffective and replaced them with the Bolsheviks. On 10 October, he held a famous meeting with 12 party leaders, and tried to persuade them that there was need for a revolution. Despite the fact that he received the backing of only 10 of them plotting went ahead.

Differences between the Provisional Government and the Soviets

It was only with the arrival of Lenin from Switzerland and Trotsky from America on the scene that the Russian revolutionary movement assumed new direction. They denounced the provisional government of the country as subservient to the bourgeois of England and France, and laid emphasis on true revolution. They demanded for ending the War without annexation and indemnities, and pleaded for the transfer of all powers to the Soviets and abolition of army, the police, and the bureaucracy. They supported confiscation of all estates, nationalization of all land and merger of all banks into a national bank under the Soviet control. On the other hand the provincial government headed by Kerensky continued to work for the introduction of parliamentary institutions on the Western pattern in Russia. However, the provisional government and the Soviets were sharply divided on the issues of democratization of the army and Russian foreign policy. The provisional government was opposed to democratization of army while the Soviets favoured it. On 1 March 1917, the Soviet issued an order which provided for establishment of elective committees in every army unit, the sending of delegates to the Soviet by each unit, the control of all

political activities in the army and army committees by the Soviet, the abolition of compulsory salute and simplified formulas for addressing the officers, etc. On the issue of foreign policy sharp differences existed between the Soviet and the provisional government. While the government considered the revolution as a protest against the ineffective conduct of the War by the imperial regime and insisted on pursuing the War till the victory, the Soviet stood for ending of War with immediate effect and demanded peace without annexation and indemnities. It aimed to put necessary pressure through mass demonstrations to bring the imperial foreign policy to an end.

In view of the sharp differences between the government and Soviets much could not be accomplished. However, it goes to the credit of the provisional government that it succeeded in ending the autocratic rule of the Tsars. It declared Russia as a Republic and courageously tackled the nationality problem. It also put the Poles and Finns on road to independence, encouraged cooperatives in place of private enterprises, and passed a number of laws concerning civil right, prison reforms, equal rights for women, universal suffrage, and religious freedom. But its policies in the field of land reforms were not encouraging. It also failed to exercise proper control over the armies.

Rise of the Bolsheviks

The growing unrest among the workers, peasants, soldiers, and the prevailing anarchical condition in the country were fully exploited by the Bolsheviks under Lenin. They promised nationalization of land as well as banks and industries and won the popular support. Due to this, the Bolsheviks came out victorious in the elections to towns and provincial Soviets. By promising the much desired peace they also won over the soldiers to their side. Encouraged by its growing popularity, the Bolsheviks decided to start an armed uprising. They intensified propaganda for direct action and formed their own Red Guards. As a result, large number of soldiers left the ranks and the peasants continued to capture lands from the proprietors through plunder and violence. In October 1917, Lenin created the Military Revolutionary Committee which gave the Bolsheviks an effective control over the troops in Petrograd. The Bolsheviks had already raised the armed factory workers as the Red Guards. Lenin wanted to take full advantage of the existing national mood and favoured a revolt at an early date. A Politburo, an inner group of the Committee, was formed to take necessary decision in this regard. On the other hand, the Provisional Government of Russia led by Kerensky proceeded with certain counter measures to meet the Bolshevik threat. But as the provisional government did not enjoy sufficient authority it could not succeed in containing the Bolsheviks.

Provisional Government Overthrown

Before the Revolution, the common people of Russia expected the autocracy of the Tsarist system to be replaced by a democratic republic with an elected parliament. As per the wishes of the people, Duma was set up in 1906 under the pressure of the Russian Revolution of 1905. In July 1917, Alexander Kerensky a moderate socialist took over as the Prime Minister. But, due to his limited authority, the Duma also faced several problems like the Tsars. Taking advantage of this atmosphere on 20

NOTES

NOTES

October 1917 the Bolsheviks executed the long planned coup and overthrew the Kerensky government. On 24 October crucial positions in the city were taken over by the troops loyal to the Bolsheviks. These included the main offices of telephone and telegraph, banks, railroad stations, post offices, and major bridges. Guards who were commissioned by the Provisional Government, and who had got wind of the plot, fled or surrendered without a fight. By 25 October, Bolsheviks controlled every key building in St. Petersburg, except the Winter Palace where Kerensky and the other ministers were held up. Before the Bolsheviks could catch Kerensky, he fled the Palace, never to return to Russia, but his ministers were arrested. On the 26, the Palace was seized with barely a shot fired, and October Revolution of Lenin achieved its objective with the bare minimum of violence or bloodshed. The pre-Parliament was abolished and the power passed on to the hands of Revolutionary Military Committee. Apart from Georgia, Ukraine and Cossack, the Bolsheviks did not encounter much resistance from any other part of Russia and easily captured power.

Formation of Soviet Government under Lenin

The All Russians Congress of the Soviet of Workers and Soldiers, which met on 25 October 1917, approved the coup, which was accomplished by the Bolsheviks with success. Subsequently the Congress authorized the setting up of a new government under the leadership of Lenin. The new government was to be known as the Soviet of People's Commissars. This confirmed that the Bolsheviks had acquired full control over Petrograd and Moscow. However, most of the country was still independent of control. Fighting lasted a week in Moscow before the Soviet won control and it was the end of November before other cities were brought under control. Very few people expected the Bolshevik government to last long because of the complexity of the problems facing it. As soon as the other political groups recovered from the shock of the Bolshevik coup, there was bound to be some determined opposition. At the same time, they 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.

Causes for the Victory of Bolsheviks

Despite trouble in various parts of the country and active intervention of the Allied powers, the Bolsheviks came out victorious in the October Revolution. Various factors contributed for the victory of Bolsheviks. First, the opponents of Bolsheviks were dis-united and as a result the Bolsheviks were able to shift their focus on the front where they were most needed. Second, the Bolsheviks control over the interior lines of communications and railways greatly helped them in meeting the challenges. Third, the Bolsheviks carried on an effective propaganda against their enemies, which created dissensions in the ranks of the opponents. Finally, the Red Army which was raised by the Bolsheviks fought with missionary zeal backed by Communist party members who were inspired by high sense of discipline and were willing to undertake any task assigned to them by the Party without any hope of reward. It contributed to the ultimate victory of Bolsheviks in the Revolution.

3.3.3 Lenin's Leadership

The primary basis of Lenin's brilliant successes as the Russian Revolution leader can be attributed to his deep mastery of Marxian theory. He analyzed the various objectives and subjective complexities of decaying capitalism and growing socialism, and drew the necessary practical conclusions there from. Lenin indicated clearly to the Communist Party and the common people, both in the Soviet Union and throughout the world, the unfolding path to prosperity and freedom. There was advancement and expansion of Marxism in many fields by Lenin's great theoretical work. Lenin's major achievements include his 'analysis of imperialism as parasitic, decaying capitalism; his survey and evaluation, in the light of dialectical materialism, of many branches of current science; his elaboration of the theory of the uneven development of capitalism and its effects upon imperialist war, proletarian revolution and the realization of socialism in a single country'. He explained the method of transforming imperialist war into civil war; he also analyzed the capitalist state and proletariat's dictatorship; Lenin offered a deep theoretical work on the national question; he also clarified the peasantry role in the revolution. Lenin's 'annihilating polemics' against the Narodniks, Economists, Mensheviks and the whole network of international Social-Democracy, Socialist-Revolutionaries, Anarchists, Syndicalists, Trotskyists, and other pseudo-revolutionary groups; and his ability to find solution of innumerable problems, both theoretical and practical, were of the utmost significance in welding the strength and unity—theoretical and organizational—which charted the Bolshevik Party on the course of victory.

Bold and resourceful Lenin was flexible in his political strategy. He repeatedly outlined 'separate mass actions or general courses of policy' upon the initiation and success of which depended the life of the Revolution. These policies were so original and startling that they often surprised the world. On many occasions, Lenin had to persuade opposing majorities of the Central Committee of the Party about the correctness of his proposals, as well as break through the sabotage of alien elements like Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin, Trotsky and others.

Lenin's great achievements in political strategy were his leadership in the change of the post-war struggle of the masses in 1905 into armed insurrection; in the boycott of the first Duma successfully; converting the imperialist World War into civil war within Russia; in the resolute stand by the Party against the Provisional Government in 1917, and the bold development of the Soviets into the mass organs which overthrew the capitalist, war-making regime; in the mass mobilization to defeat the Kornilov revolt, while at the same time continuing the revolt against Kerensky. Lenin as a political strategist succeeded in determining the precise time and manner for the October Revolution achievement. He gave correct Marxian leadership to the Party and the masses.

'During the following years of revolutionary struggle in the U.S.S.R., there was Lenin's political masterstroke of the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty which gave the revolution a "breathing-spell" from imperialist attack, saving it from defeat. He led the terribly difficult Civil War and in the complicated development of War Communism. There was his tremendous work of outlining and clarifying the New

NOTES

NOTES

Economic Policy as the means to get economic reconstruction underway in the devastated country. There was his brilliant attack upon the infantile Leftism of those revolutionaries who refused to work within the reactionary trade unions and bourgeois parliaments.'

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-II

3. What were the main factors responsible for the Russian Revolution in 1917?
4. Mention the factors that contributed to the victory of Bolsheviks.

3.4 KEMALIST REVOLUTION

The Kemalist Revolution broke out after Turkey's defeat in World War I, when the country was threatened with complete loss of independence. The Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia exerted great influence on the outbreak and course of the Kemalist Revolution. The revolution was centered in Anatolia, where at the end of 1918 and the beginning of 1919 a spontaneous popular movement arose against the occupation of a number of regions by the Entente powers (Great Britain, France, and Italy). After the occupation of Izmir by Greece on May 15, 1919, the movement grew into a war of liberation.

The Anatolian peasants created the first armed force of the revolution, partisan detachments called national forces. The small proletariat, concentrated chiefly in the occupied regions, was still weak and as yet lacked its own political party: the Communist Party of Turkey arose in 1920, once the national liberation struggle was under way. The Anatolian national bourgeoisie (mostly merchants), which led the Kemalist Revolution, aimed at preserving the country's territorial integrity and at creating an independent Turkish national state. The patriotic circles of the petite bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia, and especially army officers played a significant role in the Kemalist Revolution~ the leader of the revolution, Mustafa Kemal Pasha (Atatürk), was an officer.

Turkey emerged as a modern nation following the Kemalist Revolution. Mustafa Kemal was born in 1891 in an ordinary family and his father was a government servant. Since beginning, Pasha was greatly impressed by the writings of Rousseau and Voltaire, and came to believe that Turkey could be brought on the path of progress only through revolutionary changes. He was imprisoned for his revolutionary ideas by the Government of Turkey. However, in 1911-12 he was set free, after which he took an active part in the Balkan War as a military officer. He demonstrated his remarkable qualities during the First World War and won the admiration of people by scoring victory over the British at the Battle of Gallipoli (1915-16).

The enormous losses suffered by Turkey during the War and the humiliating terms accepted by the Sultan of Turkey in the form of Treaty of Sèvres, greatly

enraged Kemal Pasha. According to the Treaty, Turkey was left in possession of only one-fourth of its total area and many limitations were imposed on its sovereignty. It was not permitted any military, judicial, economic or financial independence. Though the terms of the Treaty were quite humiliating, the Sultan and his advisors believed that the only hope for salvation of Turkey lay in strict compliance with these terms.

Kemal Pasha was quite unhappy with the Treaty of Serves, so he assembled his Turkish followers to oppose the Allies. He launched a massive struggle in the remote areas of Anatolia and set up an independent government at Angora, and thus the authority of the Sultan was automatically restricted to the areas around his capital. In 1920, he freed Smyrna from the Greeks, and in 1921 he occupied western Anatolia. These victories provided a great boost to his prestige and greatly contributed to the revival of national spirit of Turkey. Pasha also won a series of victories against France, Italy and Great Britain. He then waged war against the Greeks and liberated Izmir on 9 September 1922. At the Mudanya Conference which took place in October 1922, he recovered Thrace from the Greeks without any bloodshed and even the Allies agreed to evacuate Istanbul and Straits. Thus, he succeeded in achieving the goals of national integrity and independence, and virtually tore off the Treaty of Serves. The Allies began to treat Turkey with great respect and offered them a new treaty which was signed at Laussane on 24 July 1923. As a result of this Treaty, Turkey regained all the territories in Europe and Asia-Minor which it held in 1914.

Turkish Republic—A Modernized Nation

The Turkish republic was proclaimed on 29 October 1923 and Kemal Pasha became its first president. Though, in theory the new government was a Republic based on liberal principles, in actual practice it operated as a one party dictatorship under Kemal Pasha. However, he was determined to make Turkey a westernized power, and therefore carried out various reforms in a number of fields. Kemal's main principle was the complete independence of the country. He stated that, 'By complete independence, we mean of course complete economic, financial, juridical, military, cultural independence and freedom in all matters. Being deprived of independence in any of these is equivalent to the nation and country being deprived of all its independence.' Pasha led wide-ranging reforms or changes in social, cultural, and economical aspects, and with this established the backbone of legislative, judicial, and economic structures in this new Republic.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-III

5. Name the first president of the Turkish republic.
6. When did the Kemalist Revolution take place?

3.5 ZIONISM AND PALESTINIAN NATIONALISM

Zionism is a nationalist and political movement of Jews and Jewish culture that supports the reestablishment of a Jewish homeland in the territory defined as the

NOTES

NOTES

historic Land of Israel (also referred to as Palestine, Canaan or the Holy Land). Zionism emerged in the late 19th century in central and eastern Europe as a national revival movement, and soon after this most leaders of the movement associated the main goal with creating the desired state in Palestine, then an area controlled by the Ottoman Empire. A religious variety of Zionism supports Jews upholding their Jewish identity, opposes the assimilation of Jews into other societies and has advocated the 'return' of Jews to Israel as a means for Jews to be a majority in their own nation, and to be liberated from antisemitic discrimination, exclusion, and persecution that had historically occurred in the diaspora.

The Establishment of Israel

When World War II ended, Britain was still the paramount power in the Middle East, directly controlling Egypt, Palestine, Transjordan, Iraq, southern Arabia, and the Persian Gulf. In the next decade, however, it withdrew almost completely from the region, leaving a vacuum of power that was filled by Arab nationalism, superpower rivalry, and the emergence of the state of Israel.

Britain's first withdrawal was from Palestine, where the conflict between Palestinian Arabs and Jewish settlers, compounded by an influx of refugees and Holocaust survivors, had reached a flashpoint. That conflict, in turn, represented a clash between the traditions of two great religions and the aspirations of two nascent nationalisms.

A small number of Jews had always lived in Palestine, to which the faithful believed their people would someday return to reestablish the ancient nation of Israel and await the coming of the messiah. In the mid-seventeenth century a messianic pretender, Sabbatai Zevi, had led an ill-fated expedition of thousands of Jews to Palestine. The serious immigration to the region that commenced two centuries later was spurred, however, not by millennial fervor but by a secular nationalist movement, Zionism.

Since the establishment of the State of Israel, the Zionist movement continues primarily to advocate on behalf of Israel and address threats to its continued existence and security.

The Zionist Movement

Zionism was a historic response to Jewish circumstances in nineteenth-century Europe. Emancipation had eliminated most of the civil restrictions that had confined Jews to the ghetto for centuries past without offering them a clear role or place in European society. Many Jews simply attempted to assimilate themselves into the larger nationalities among whom they lived, preserving their religious and cultural traditions while identifying themselves as Frenchmen, Germans, or Russians. To Zionist writers, however, as for other nineteenth-century nationalists, political identity as a nation was the final and necessary goal of every people's development. The Zionist position was supported negatively by anti-Semitic writers such as Count Gobineau (1816-1882), who argued that the Jews were an alien, unassimilable element that threatened the racial and cultural integrity of any nation that harbored them. The increasing tempo of anti-Semitic incidents in the late nineteenth century,

culminating in the pogroms of Russia and, in the West, in the long, drawn-out agony of the Dreyfus affair (see Chapter 32), suggested to many that assimilation was a mirage. The result was a mass exodus of European Jews, particularly from Russia, from which 3 million emigrated between 1882 and 1914.

The great majority of Jewish emigrants went to the United States, Canada, South America, and Australia;

scarcely 1 per cent joined the trickle of earlier settlers in Palestine. The real impetus for creating a Jewish state in the Holy Land came from Theodor Herzl, the founder of modern Zionism. Herzl realized that the large-scale settlement necessary to provide a critical mass of population in Palestine would require both organization and capital. His solution was the Jewish National Fund, which undertook the purchase of all land to be occupied by the settlers. He envisioned a society whose growth would be rationally planned rather than subject to the vagaries of speculators and profiteers. New towns would be erected, carefully spaced and separated by belts of collective farmland and linked by express trains and superhighways. In short, the Zionist state was to be a utopian society in which mutualistic socialism was combined with technological progress and centralized planning.

3.5.1 Palestinian Nationalism

Palestinian nationalism is the national movement of the Palestinian people. It has roots in Syrian nationalism, the rejection of colonialism and movements calling for national independence. Unlike pan-Arabism in general, Palestinian nationalism has emphasized Palestinian self-government and has rejected the historic non-domestic Arab rule by Egypt over the Gaza Strip and Jordan over the West Bank. Palestinian nationalism has been compared to other nationalist movements, such as Pan-Arabism and Zionism. Some nationalists argue that “the nation was always there, indeed it is part of the natural order, even when it was submerged in the hearts of its members.

History

The collapse of the Ottoman Empire was accompanied by an increasing sense of Arab identity in the Empire’s Arab provinces, most notably Syria, considered to include both northern Palestine and Lebanon. This development is often seen as connected to the wider reformist trend known as *al-Nahda* (“awakening”, sometimes called “the Arabrenaissance”), which in the late 19th century brought about a redefinition of Arab cultural and political identities with the unifying feature of Arabic.

Under the Ottomans, Palestine’s Arab population mostly saw themselves as Ottoman subjects. In the 1830s however, Palestine was occupied by the Egyptian vassal of the Ottomans, Muhammad Ali and his son Ibrahim Pasha. The Palestinian Arab revolt was precipitated by popular resistance against heavy demands for conscripts, as peasants were well aware that conscription was little more than a death sentence. Starting in May 1834 the rebels took many cities, among them Jerusalem, Hebron and Nablus. In response, Ibrahim Pasha sent in an army, finally defeating the last rebels on 4 August in Hebron.

NOTES

NOTES

While Arab nationalism, at least in an early form, and Syrian nationalism were the dominant tendencies along with continuing loyalty to the Ottoman state, Palestinian politics were marked by a reaction to foreign predominance and the growth of foreign immigration, particularly Zionist.

The Egyptian occupation of Palestine in the 1830s resulted in the destruction of Acre and thus, the political importance of Nablus increased. The Ottomans wrested back control of Palestine from the Egyptians in 1840-41. As a result, the Abd al-Hadi clan, who originated in Arrabah in the Sahl Arraba region in northern Samaria, rose to prominence. Loyal allies of Jezzar Pasha and the Tuqans, they gained the governorship of Jabal Nablus and other *sanjaqs*.

In 1887 the mutassariflik of Jerusalem was constituted as part of an Ottoman government policy dividing the vilayet of Greater Syria into smaller administrative units. The administration of the mutassariflik took on a distinctly local appearance.

Michelle Compos records that “Later, after the founding of Tel Aviv in 1909, conflicts over land grew in the direction of explicit national rivalry. Zionist ambitions were increasingly identified as a threat by Palestinian leaders, while cases of purchase of lands by Zionist settlers and the subsequent eviction of Palestinian peasants aggravated the issue. This anti-Zionist trend became linked to anti-British resistance, to form a nationalist movement quite particular and separate from the pan-Arab trend that was gaining strength in the Arab world, and would later be headed by Nasser, Ben Bella and other anticolonial leaders.

The programmes of four Palestinian nationalist societies *jamyyat al-Ikha' wal-'Afaf* (Brotherhood and Purity), *al-jam'iyya al-Khayriyya al-Islamiyya*, *Shirkat al-Iqtisad alFalastini al-Arabi* and *Shirkat al-Tijara al-Wataniyya al-Iqtisadiyya* were reported in the newspaper *Falastin* in June 1914 by letter from R. Abu al-Sal'ud. The four societies has similarities in function and ideals; the promotion of patriotism, educational aspirations and support for national industries.

Conflict over Palestine

Herzl's vision and Hitler's persecution combined to increase the Jewish population of Palestine tenfold between the end of World War I and the end of World War II. From less than a tenth of the total population of the territory in 1917, it had increased to a third by 1947. The Arab majority greeted the Jewish influx first with suspicion and then alarm. The entry of Western powers into the formerly Ottoman-controlled lands of the Middle East after World War I stimulated Arab nationalists. For such nationalists, the Jews were a spearhead unit of Western colonization. Their fears were underscored by the report of an American commission Woodrow Wilson sent to the area, which concluded that the Jewish National Fund intended the eventual purchase of the entire territory of Palestine, thereby dispossessing its Arab population. From an Arab perspective, Jewish socialism was simply the handmaiden of British imperialism.

Confronted by bitter and sometimes violent Arab resistance, the British government decided in 1939 to cap Jewish population in Palestine at one-third of the

whole and to limit future land purchases severely. These new controls had broader implications, as Britain, the United States, and other powers sought to restrict Jewish emigration from Nazi-held Europe in general. When the dimensions of the Holocaust were discovered at the end of World War II, there was general humanitarian pressure to establish Palestine as a refuge for the remnants of European Jewry. The British Labour party, soon to be in power, endorsed Zionist demands for the immediate creation of a Jewish commonwealth and in December 1944 called for the transfer of Palestinian Arabs to neighboring countries. Nothing came of these or more moderate post-war proposals for a federated Jewish-Arab state, which were rejected by both sides. The British, unwilling to maintain their trusteeship in the face of mounting Jewishfeist attacks and unable to contain the flood of illegal grants who ran their blockade, laid the problem before United Nations in April 1947. After months of ring and debate, the General Assembly adopted in November a proposal to divide Palestine into three Jewish Arab sectors forming a Jewish and an Arab state, Jerusalem as an international zone. All seven areas had to be linked in an economic union, be General Assembly resolution was greeted with re- by the Jews but unanimous rejection throughout the world. The British refused to implement it on the grounds that it had not been accepted by both sides and threw their troops without making provision to transfer authority to either one. When the last units departed on 14, 1948, the Jewish communal government proved the state of Israel. A general struggle immediately ensued for control of Palestine. Armies from Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq poured across the frontiers to assist the Palestinian Arabs, but the better-organized Jewish forces more than held their own. When a United Nations armistice halted the fighting in 1949, Israel controlled a third more territory than had been granted the Jews under the partition plan, while nearly 750,000 Palestinian Arabs had taken refuge in Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and the Egyptian-occupied Gaza strip in southern Palestine.

While still fighting, Israel held its first elections in January. The fiery socialist David Ben-Gurion (1886-1973), founder of the first Jewish agricultural cooperative, or *kibbutz*, became Israel's first prime minister and its dominant political figure until his retirement in 1966, and the veteran Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann (1874-1952) was installed in the ceremonial office of president.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-IV

7. Define Zionism.
8. Name the founder of the first Jewish agricultural cooperative.

3.6 GROWTH OF NATIONALISM IN INDIA

The growth of nationalism during the second half of the nineteenth century was one of the most significant features of Indian history. Various factors contributed to the growth of nationalism. Though pre-colonial India had a self-sufficient economy based largely on agriculture, Indians as such were not integrated, neither economically nor

NOTES

NOTES

socially. Colonization helped in unifying a country as diverse as India. The British conquest of India was followed by the establishment of a centralized government, which brought about political and administrative unification. Introduction of common laws and institutions gradually began to unite India. Gradually the sense of nationalism seeped in among Indians and by the year 1885, Indian National Congress was formed. In the words of Edwyn Bevan, ‘the British Raj was like a steel-frame which held the injured body of India together till the gradual process of internal growth had joined the dislocated bones, knit up the torn fibres and enabled the patient to regain inner coherence and unity’. Thus, establishment of political unity, uniform system of administration, uniform reign of law and a uniform currency system generated the idea of India as a nation.

The various factors that led to the growth of nationalism in India are explained below.

(i) Development of Means of Communication and Transport

The British came to India with a certain motive—to trade and gradually went on to become the rulers of the country. As they consolidated their position in India, they realized the need for uniting a diverse country like India. The foremost action that the British took was to develop the means of transport and communication. Modern means of transport, postal system and electric telegraph was constructed all over the country. In the words of Edwin Arnold, ‘Railways may do for India what dynasties have never done what the genius of Akbar the Magnificent could not effect by government, not the cruelty of Tipu Saheb by violence, they have made India a nation.’ For the first time geographical barriers of the country were shortened thus enabling people living in different parts of the country to maintain regular contacts. This blurring of geographical barriers was instrumental in instilling a sense of unity, which fostered the urge for an all-India movement.

(ii) Western Education and its Impact

Introduction of western education was probably the greatest contribution of British rule in India. Initiation of the English language opened a window towards Western European enlightenment. For the first time Indian intellectuals came in touch with works of European political thinkers and philosophers such as Marx, Spencer, Locke, Voltaire, Rousseau and others. The ideologies propounded by these thinkers had huge impact on the growing intelligentsia among the Indians. They were highly influenced by the ideas of nation state, liberty, equality, fraternity which in turn helped them to analyze the present political scenario of India. The study of English language not only changed the outlook of the Indians, but also empowered them to exchange views and share ideas through the medium of English. Gradually English went on to become the lingua franca for the educated Indians.

(iii) Economic Exploitation of India

Before the British came to India, the latter had a self-sufficient rural economy. As the British gradually gained grounds, the existing economy saw a downturn. From being an exporter of processed goods, India was transformed into an exporter of

raw materials and buyer of processed goods. This led to severe exploitation of the Indians and increased India's poverty. This struck a cord with the educated Indians who realized that it was the drain of wealth turning India's economy into a poverty-stricken one. Since all the social classes were suffering due to the economic exploitation, they realized that the British rule needs to be uprooted. This instilled a spirit of nationalism and the Indians now united together to stand up against the British rule.

(iv) Socio-Religious Reform Movements

The first sign of national awakening was expressed through the socio-religious reform movements also known as the Indian Renaissance. According to Zacharias; 'The Indian national movement was a part of the Indian Renaissance of India which manifested in the form of a general reform movement and produced striking religious and social reforms long before it issued in a movement for political emancipation.' Social and religious reformers such as Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Vidyasagar, Dayanand Saraswati and others revived the ancient glory of India. Organizations like Brahma Samaj, Arya Samaj, the Ramakrishna Mission and the Theosophical Society generated faith in Indian culture by abolishing the evils from the same. Similarly, the Wahabi movement among the Muslims was responsible for revivalism. Contributions of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan had a huge impact on the Muslims. These movements breathed a new life into the degenerated Hindu and Muslim communities. They boosted the self-confidence and inculcated a sense of self-respect, which in its turn brought about dissatisfaction against the British rule. The movements promoted pan-Indian feelings and spirit of nationalism.

(v) Emergence of Modern Press and Nationalist Literature

The Indian Press had an important role to play in developing nationalism among the citizens of the country. Indian nationalists used the press as a powerful media to spread the message of nationalism. They also used the press to diffuse the spirit of patriotism and political ideas. The press was highly successful in mobilising public opinion and promoting nationalism. Vernacular came to the rescue and newspapers and dailies such as *Amrit Bazar Patrika*, *Samachar Darpan* was instrumental in stimulating the growth of nationalism. The dailies blatantly exposed the fallacies of the foreign rule. In the words of B.B. Majumdar, 'Western education and the Indian press were the two of the most important agencies destined to infuse into the people of India the spirit of national unity and to inspire them to achieve independence without bloodshed.' Indian literature produced during this time was highly nationalistic and was thus responsible for creating a sense of national consciousness. The works of prominent Indian writers such as Bankim Chandra Chattopadhyaya and Rabindranath Tagore in Bengali, Vishnu Shastri Chiplunkar in Marathi, Subramanyam Bharati in Tamil and others were instrumental in instilling a spirit of nationalism in the minds of the common people.

(vi) Racial Discrimination

The British always discriminated against the natives because of the latter's skin colour. Earlier foreign invaders like the Turks and the Mughals accepted India as

NOTES

NOTES

their motherland and settled here. However, the British remained a perpetual foreigner and there prevailed a sense of superiority among them for the white skin. They considered the Indians inferior to the British and they adopted a feeling of superiority in dealing with Indians. Indians were looked down upon and branded with a badge of inferiority. The natives were not allowed to participate in any social gathering. They were kept out of European clubs, restaurants and they were not allowed to travel in same compartments with the Europeans. Clubs and joints often put on placards saying 'Indians and Dogs are not allowed.' The Indians were hurt by this kind of an attitude. They became conscious about this humiliation and united against the foreigners.

(vii) Denial of Higher Jobs to Deserving Indians

Indians were discriminated against in every field. The Charter Act of 1833 laid down fitness to be the major criterion for jobs. It was again reiterated in the Queen's proclamation of 1858. However, the British made deliberate attempts to debar Indians from higher posts especially the Indian Civil Services. Indians such as S.N. Banerjee, Aurobindo Ghosh were denied entry into Indian Civil Service on flimsy grounds. However, S.N. Banerjee went to England, cleared the exam in 1869, and was appointed as assistant magistrate in Shyllet (now in Bangladesh). After serving for a while, S.N. Banerjee was dismissed owing to racial discrimination. In 1877, the minimum age for the ICS was reduced to 19 from 21 in order to curb the prospects of Indian candidates appearing for the Indian Civil Service. This decision led to a countrywide agitation and marked the beginning of the unity of action and solidarity of purpose. S.N. Banerjee started an all-India campaign for restoring the minimum age to 21 and for simultaneously conducting civil services examination in India. It helped the educated Indians to unite for promoting their common interests.

(viii) Revival of the Glory of India

Western scholars such as William Jones, Max Muller, Mrs. Mrs. Annie Besant and others tried to rediscover India's glorious past. They emphasized on the richness of India's culture and the importance of Indian philosophy. This in turn was taken up by Indian nationalist leaders who aroused the self-respect and self-confidence in the fellow Indians. People became aware and a sense of patriotism was instilled amongst them.

(ix) Impact of Contemporary European Movements

Movements and political events across the globe were instrumental in stimulating the Indians. Contemporary strong political currents of nationalist ideas, which pervaded Europe and other continents, motivated the Indians. Revolutions in South America witnessed the formation of several new nation states on the ruins of the Spanish and Portuguese empires. The American Revolution of 1776 infused strong aspirations for nationalism and liberation. Moreover, the nationalist movements in European countries like Greece and Italy stirred the Indians. The French Revolution was also instrumental in influencing the Indians. Leaders like S.N. Banerjee and Lajpat Rai were often found referring to the activities of leaders like Garibaldi and Joseph Mazzini in their writings and speeches.

(x) Reactionary Regime of Lytton and the Ilbert Bill Controversy

Lord Lytton's reign as a governor general, (1876–80) was full of reactionary measures. Lytton held an imperial Durbar at Delhi in 1877 and announced Queen Victoria as the new Empress of India at a time when the country was ravaged by a famine. He also introduced two discriminatory acts, the Vernacular Press Act (1878) and the Indian Arms Act (1879). According to the former, the vernacular press would not publish anything, which was likely to excite the feeling of disaffection against the government. The Arms Act was an important repressive measure of the government, which declared that keeping arms without license is a criminal offence and penalty would amount to three years of imprisonment. Another discriminatory act introduced by Lord Lytton was the reduction of import duties on cotton by five percent only to appease the Lancashire mill-owners.

Later in 1883, a bill was introduced by Lord Ripon known as the Ilbert Bill. The bill allowed Indian judges and magistrates to try British offenders at the district courts. The bill sought to give equal power to the Indian members of the judiciary along with the Europeans. The introduction of the bill led to intense agitation. The British opposed the bill vehemently. Lord Ripon succumbed to the pressure and had to modify the bill, thereby almost defeating its original purpose. The controversy surrounding the Ilbert Bill acted as a revelation for the Indians. They realized the need to unite against the British and on being more insistent. For this, the Indians had to be more organized to be able to bring together an entire nation to stand up against the foreign oppressors.

A.R. Desai opines, 'Indian nationalism was the outcome of the new material conditions created in India and the new social forces which emerged as a result of the British conquest. It was the outcome of the objective conflict of interests, the interest of Britain to keep India politically, economically subjected to her and the interest of the Indian people for a free political economic and cultural evolution of the Indian society, which was intruded by the British rule.'

3.6.1 Growth of Nationalism under Gandhi

In India, as in Vietnam and many other colonies, the growth of modern nationalism is intimately connected to the anti-colonial movement. People began discovering their unity in the process of their struggle with colonialism. The sense of being oppressed under colonialism provided a shared bond that tied many different groups together. But each class and group felt the effects of colonialism differently, their experiences were varied, and their notions of freedom were not always the same. The Congress under Mahatma Gandhi tried to forge these groups together within one movement. But the unity did not emerge without conflict.

Let us discuss how explore how the Congress under Gandhi sought to develop the national movement, how different social groups participated in the movement, and how nationalism captured the imagination of people.

In the years after 1919, we see the national movement spreading to new areas, incorporating new social groups, and developing new modes of struggle. How do we understand these developments? What implications did they have?

NOTES

NOTES

First of all, the First World War created a new economic and political situation. It led to a huge increase in defence expenditure which was financed by war loans and increasing taxes: customs duties were raised and income tax introduced. Through the war years prices increased – doubling between 1913 and 1918 – leading to extreme hardship for the common people. Villages were called upon to supply soldiers, and the forced recruitment in rural areas caused widespread anger. Then in 1918-19 and 1920-21, crops failed in many parts of India, resulting in acute shortages of food. This was accompanied by an influenza epidemic. According to the census of 1921, 12 to 13 million people perished as a result of famines and the epidemic. People hoped that their hardships would end after the war was over. But that did not happen. At this stage a new leader appeared and suggested a new mode of struggle—Satyagraha.

The idea of satyagraha emphasised the power of truth and the need to search for truth. It suggested that if the cause was true, if the struggle was against injustice, then physical force was not necessary to fight the oppressor. Without seeking vengeance or being aggressive, a satyagrahi could win the battle through nonviolence. This could be done by appealing to the conscience of the oppressor. People – including the oppressors – had to be persuaded to see the truth, instead of being forced to accept truth through the use of violence. By this struggle, truth was bound to ultimately triumph. Mahatma Gandhi believed that this dharma of non-violence could unite all Indians, which, in turn, would strengthen the nation-building process.

3.6.2 Khilafat Movement

The Khilafat Movement that lasted from 1919 to 1924 was an Islamic movement that derived its inspiration from Indian nationalists. The basis of this movement lies in a pan-Islamic movement launched by Abdul Hamid II (1876–1909), the Ottoman emperor, to utilize his role as the Sultan-Khalifa of the Muslim community the world over to protect his rapidly falling apart empire from attacks by foreign powers and destroy the nationalistic democratic movement brewing within the country. Jamaluddin Afghani's, his emissary, visit to India in the late nineteenth century to spread his Islamic ideas received a favourable response from the Muslim leaders in India. The twentieth century saw the intensification of these sentiments during the following times:

- The 1905 partition of Bengal being revoked in 1911
- The Italian (1911) and Balkan (1911–1912) attacks on Turkey
- The participation of Great Britain in the First World War (1914–1918)

Turkey suffered defeat in the First World War and its territories were divided according to the provisions of the Treaty of Sevres between the European countries. This led to widespread apprehension in India over the custodianship of the Khalifa.

This was the backdrop against which the Khilafat Movement was initiated in September 1919. It was an orthodox Islamic movement that was started by the following Muslim stalwarts:

- Muhammad Ali
- Shawkat Ali

- Maulana Abul Kalam Azad
- Dr Ansari
- Hasrat Mohani

Conferences for this movement were organized in cities across northern India. The Central Khilafat Committee, with provincial branches, was set up in Bombay. The president of the central office was Seth Chotani and its secretary was Shawkat Ali. This committee also started a fund to finance the nationalist movement in Turkey and to start the Khilafat Movement here in India. In 1920, Muhammad Ali and Shawkat Ali also drafted the Khilafat Manifesto.

3.6.3 Non-Cooperation Movement

When the British government decided to partition Bengal, it led to intense agitation against the government, and the most significant pan-India agitation against the British was the Non-Cooperation Movement that lasted from 1919 to 1922. This movement was started by Mahatma Gandhi to further the cause of Indian nationalism. Under his guidance and leadership, the Indian National Congress adapted the policy of passive resistance against British rule.

The launch of the Non-Cooperation Movement was set against the backdrop of the Rowlatt Act, the Jallianwala Bagh massacre, the imposition of martial law in Punjab and the Montagu Chelmsford report with its ill-considered scheme of diarchy. At the same time, the harsh terms and conditions meted out by the Treaty of Sevres between the Allies and Turkey caused great resentment by the Indian Muslims, who started the Khilafat movement. The time was ripe for Gandhi to align with this movement and bring the Hindus and Muslims together. His skill at the political game ensured he won over the Muslims.

The Non-Cooperation Movement was officially launched on 1 August 1920, after the notice given by Gandhi to the Viceroy expired. In this notice, Gandhi had demanded the right recognized 'from time immemorial of the subject to refuse to assist a ruler who misrules'. At its session held in Kolkata in 1920, the aims and charter of the movement were determined. They involved the following:

- Surrender of the titles and offices and resignation from nominated posts in the local bodies
- Boycott of courts, government offices, durbars; withdrawal of children from government schools and colleges; and use of khadi
- Adherence to truth and non-violence

These resolutions were endorsed at the session of the Congress held at Nagpur in December 1920. In addition, other resolutions for the betterment of the party organization were also drawn up. Membership to the party was opened to all adult men and women based on the payment of 4 annas as subscription fees.

The movement enjoyed massive popular appeal, and in the first month scores of students left government schools and colleges and joined national institutions that had started all over the country. This boycott was particularly successful in Bengal under the leadership of Chitta Ranjan Das and Subhas Chandra Bose. Punjab also

NOTES

NOTES

supported this educational boycott and Lala Lajpat Rai played a monumental role there. Other states where educational boycott were seen include Bombay, United Provinces, Bihar, Orissa and Assam. Legal boycott was not as successful as educational boycott. However, many leading lawyers including CR Das, Motilal Nehru, MR Jayakar and S Kitchlew left their flourishing legal practice. The boycott of foreign cloth was the most successfully executed resolution of the programme.

Mahatma Gandhi hoped that by integrating non-cooperation with Khilafat, Hindus and Muslims, India's two major religious communities, could collectively bring an end to colonial rule. These movements certainly unleashed a surge of popular action that was altogether unprecedented in colonial India.

Students boycotted government-run schools and colleges. Lawyers did not attend court. Workers went on strike in many towns and cities. According to official sources, there were 396 strikes in 1921 that involved 600,000 workers and a loss of seven million workdays. The rural areas were seething with discontent too. Hill tribes violated the forest laws. The country saw several peasant movements: farmers in Awadh did not pay taxes; peasants in Kumaun refused to carry loads for colonial officials. Peasants and workers acted upon the call to 'non-cooperate' with colonial rule in ways that best suited their interests, rather than conform to the dictates laid down from above.

According to Louis Fischer, Mahatma Gandhi's American biographer, 'non-cooperation became the name of an epoch in the life of India and of Gandhiji. Non-cooperation was negative enough to be peaceful but positive enough to be effective. It entailed denial, renunciation, and self-discipline. It was training for self-rule.' As a consequence of the Non-Cooperation Movement, the British were shaken to their foundations for the first time since the revolt of 1857. Then, in February 1922, a group of peasants attacked and torched a police station in the hamlet of Chauri Chaura, in the United Provinces. Several constables perished in the conflagration. This act of violence prompted Gandhi to call off the movement altogether. He insisted 'no provocation can possibly justify (the) brutal murder of men who had been rendered defenceless and who had virtually thrown themselves on the mercy of the mob.'

During the Non-Cooperation Movement, thousands of Indians were put in jail. Gandhi himself was arrested in March 1922 and charged with sedition. Justice C.N. Broomfield, the judge who presided over his trial, made a remarkable speech while pronouncing his sentence. He said 'it would be impossible to ignore the fact that you are in a different category from any person I have ever tried or am likely to try. It would be impossible to ignore the fact that, in the eyes of millions of your countrymen, you are a great patriot and a leader. Even those who differ from you in politics look upon you as a man of high ideals and of even saintly life.' Since Gandhi had violated the law, it was obligatory for the bench to sentence him to six years' imprisonment, but Judge Broomfield said, 'if the course of events in India should make it possible for the Government to reduce the period and release you, no one will be better pleased than I.'

In order to protest against government repression as seen by the Rowlatt Act, 1919, and the Jallianwala Bagh massacre, 1919, Gandhi started Satyagraha, a

non-violent nationalist movement. For this he tried to garner Muslim support, and in order for this he extended his support for the Khilafat cause and became a member of the Central Khilafat Committee. In 1920, at the Nagpur session of the Indian National Congress, Gandhi integrated *Swaraj* (self-government) with Khilafat and launched the Non-Cooperation Movement.

By mid-1920, the Khilafat leaders had agreed to collaborate with Gandhi on the Non-Cooperation Movement in return for his support on the Khilafat Movement. This way both Hindus and Muslims put up a united front against British rule in India. The Muslim theologians also rallied around through the Jamiyat-al Ulama-i-Hind.

The Khilafat Movement stood for communal harmony and nonviolence, and, in 1920, these objectives suffered due to the exodus, of approximately 20,000 Muslim peasants belonging to the Sind and North Western Provinces, to Afghanistan. The belief of these Muslims was that India had committed apostasy (*Dar-ul-Harb*) due to the Moplah rebellion in South India in 1921.

The Khilafat movement received a severe blow from the Turks when Mustafa Kemal, the charismatic nationalist Turkish leader, led a secular renaissance, prevailed over invading Greek forces leading to the abolition of the Sultanate in 1922, and transformed Turkey into a republic. Around 1924, the Khilafat Movement ceased to be relevant and significant came to its natural end.

In Bengal, the Khilafat–Non-Cooperation Movement lasted from 1918 to 1924 and became a mass movement which invited participation from both Muslims and Hindus. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad propagated this movement in rural Bengal. He was helped in this by the following Bengali leaders:

- Maulana Akram Khan
- Maniruzzaman Islamabadi
- Mujibur Rahman Khan
- Maulana Abdullahil Kafi
- Maulana Abdullahil Baqi
- Ismail Hossain Shiraji
- Abul Kasem
- AK Fazlul Huq

These leaders also travelled through Bengal and organized their meetings, especially in Dhaka and Chittagong in present day Bangladesh.

The first Khilafat Day was observed on 17 October 1919 in Calcutta, during which most Indian-owned shops were shut down, prayers offered and public meetings held all over Bengal. At the first All-India Khilafat Conference held in November 1919, Delhi, the following resolutions were passed:

- There would be no participation in the proposed peace celebrations.
- British goods would be boycotted.
- A policy of non-cooperation with the government would be adopted.

The first provincial conference of this movement was held at the town hall, Bengal, which was attended by several members of the central committee. Some of

NOTES

these included AK Fazlul Huq, Abul Kasem and Mujibur Rahman, and they demanded that unless their demands were met, the nation would see more of non-cooperation and boycott from these people.

NOTES

In 1920, the second Khilafat Day was held in Bengal, and meetings organized in Dhaka, Chittagong, Mymensingh and Tangail. The meeting at Tangail was chaired by Abdul Halim Ghaznavi, a Muslim zamindar. This meeting was notable because it passed a resolution asking people to adopt Satyagraha as an integral symbol of the Khilafat movement.

Bengal saw tremendous growth of the committees of the Khilafat movement as well as the Non-Cooperation Movement. These two movements were the first of the series of significant anti-British mass movement which saw equal participation by Hindus and Muslims. The media, including *Mohammadi*, *Al-Eslam* and *The Mussalman*, also played an important role in popularizing the movement.

The Khilafat movement was instrumental in making Indian Muslims politically aware under the able guidance of Maulana Azad, Akram Khan, Maniruzzaman Islambadi, Bipin Chandra Pal and Chitta Ranjan Das. The close interaction between the Hindus and Muslims ensured that the orthodox by nature Khilafat movement create liberal ideas among Muslims. To do so, organizations were established in rural Bengal to train volunteers for the boycott of British goods, courts and offices. They were also trained to spin cloth, make their own items of necessity and raise contributions for the Khilafat movement.

The popularity of the movement ensured that the foundation of the Government of Bengal began to shake, and in a notification it declared the activities of the movement and volunteers illegal. Offices were raided, documents were confiscated and burned, meetings were banned and office bearers were arrested.

During this time, a crack developed between the leaders of both the Khilafat and Non-Cooperation movements regarding the boycott of government-owned educational institutions and legislative councils. Also, some Muslim leaders wanted to participate in the elections under the India Act, 1919, to ensure that self-governing institutions could be established in India.

Revolutionary Fervour

The spontaneous upsurge of the Non-Cooperation Movement released the great force of India's youth that were determined to wrest freedom. The youth of the country had responded eagerly to the call of Gandhi and had participated in the Non-Cooperation Movement. The sudden withdrawal of the movement was a blow to their aspirations. The secret samitis of the first phase of the revolutionary movement began to be revived in Punjab and in Bengal.

The Anushilan Samiti in Bengal was associated with Subhas Bose and the Yugantar Samiti with the J. M. Sengupta group. There was considerable amount of political rivalry between these two groups. Some smaller revolutionary groups began to be formed at about this time for example the one under Surya Sen of Chittagong that developed along much more radical lines. The most striking revolutionary action of the time was the murder of Day, an Englishman, by Gopinath Saha in January

1924. Saha had planned to kill Tegarb, the police commissioner of Kolkata, and killed Day by mistake. This incident resulted in the arrest of many nationalists.

Another centre of revolutionary ferment was northern India where Sachin Sanyal and Jogesh Chatterji and others formed the Hindustan Republican Association in the United Provinces and started raising funds through dacoities. The most renowned of which was the Kakori train robbery in August 1925 that resulted in the arrest of several members of the organization.

This organization also established links with a group of young men in the Punjab under the dynamic and brilliant student leader Bhagat Singh. The Punjab group was deeply influenced by socialist ideology. Hence, the organization was renamed Hindustan Socialist Republican Association (HSRA). The aim of the revolutionaries was to achieve complete independence and they had a vision of how the State should be after the achievement of the same. They envisaged a mass struggle of the people and for this purpose and tried to mobilize students, workers and peasants.

3.6.4 Civil Disobedience Movement

Mahatma Gandhi found in salt a powerful symbol that could unite the nation. On 31 January 1930, he sent a letter to Viceroy Irwin stating eleven demands. Some of these were of general interest; others were specific demands of different classes, from industrialists to peasants. The idea was to make the demands wide-ranging, so that all classes within Indian society could identify with them and everyone could be brought together in a united campaign. The most stirring of all was the demand to abolish the salt tax. Salt was something consumed by the rich and the poor alike, and it was one of the most essential items of food. The tax on salt and the government monopoly over its production, Mahatma Gandhi declared, revealed the most oppressive face of British rule.

Mahatma Gandhi's letter was, in a way, an ultimatum. If the demands were not fulfilled by 11 March, the letter stated, the Congress would launch a civil disobedience campaign. Irwin was unwilling to negotiate. So Mahatma Gandhi started his famous salt march accompanied by 78 of his trusted volunteers. The march was over 240 miles, from Gandhiji's ashram in Sabarmati to the Gujarati coastal town of Dandi. The volunteers walked for 24 days, about 10 miles a day. Thousands came to hear Mahatma Gandhi wherever he stopped, and he told them what he meant by swaraj and urged them to peacefully defy the British. On 6 April he reached Dandi, and ceremonially violated the law, manufacturing salt by boiling sea water.

This marked the beginning of the Civil Disobedience Movement. How was this movement different from the Non-Cooperation Movement? People were now asked not only to refuse cooperation with the British, as they had done in 1921-22, but also to break colonial laws. Thousands in different parts of the country broke the salt law, manufactured salt and demonstrated in front of government salt factories. As the movement spread, foreign cloth was boycotted, and liquor shops were picketed. Peasants refused to pay revenue and *chaukidari* taxes, village officials resigned, and in many places forest people violated forest laws – going into Reserved Forests to collect wood and graze cattle.

NOTES

NOTES

Worried by the developments, the colonial government began arresting the Congress leaders one by one. This led to violent clashes in many palaces.

Different social groups participated in the Civil Disobedience Movement. In the countryside, rich peasant communities – like the Patidars of Gujarat and the Jats of Uttar Pradesh – were active in the movement. The poorer peasantry were not just interested in the lowering of the revenue demand. Many of them were small tenants cultivating land they had rented from landlords. As the Depression continued and cash incomes dwindled, the small tenants found it difficult to pay their rent. They wanted the unpaid rent to the landlord to be remitted. They joined a variety of radical movements, often led by Socialists and Communists. Keen on expanding their business, businessmen and industrialist reacted against colonial policies that restricted business activities. They wanted protection against imports of foreign goods, and a rupee-sterling foreign exchange ratio that would discourage imports. The industrial working classes did not participate in the Civil Disobedience Movement in large numbers, except in the Nagpur region. As the industrialists came closer to the Congress, workers stayed aloof. Another important feature of the Civil Disobedience Movement was the large-scale participation of women. During Gandhiji's salt march, thousands of women came out of their homes to listen to him.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-V

9. State the various factors that led to the growth of nationalism during the second half of the nineteenth century.
10. When was the Non-Cooperation Movement officially launched in India?

3.7 CHINESE NATIONALISM TILL THE 1940S

Towards the end of the Qing rule, China witnessed the first surge of nationalism on the face of the poor response of the decaying Qing court to increasing imperialist exploitation. As you learned previously, contact with the West gave rise to a new group of nationalists in China. The old group, the traditional Confucian scholar-officials, advocated the adoption of Western knowledge for the strengthening of the military and the economy while keeping the traditional Confucian way of life intact. The new group, educated in Western countries, advocated institutional change. The newly emerged intellectuals and students trained in Western-style education played a major role in carrying forward the constitutional form of government in China with the hope of rescuing their motherland out of distress. These firebrand nationalists played a major role in the Revolution of 1911 and finally brought down the two millennia old Qing Dynasty.

Since its inception, the Republic of China went through one crisis after another. Within a few years of the establishment of the republic, conservative politicians with vested interests started hindering the transition of the country from a monarchy to a strong republic. At the same time, exploitation and injustice at the hands of imperialist

nations continued. As a result, China witnessed another surge of nationalism in the mid-1910s. This time, intellectuals advocated a thorough introspection of Chinese tradition and culture. The attempt to break free of Confucian culture resulted in the New Culture Movement which manifested itself in new literary and political ideas.

3.7.1 National Crisis

Politically and militarily powerful Yuan Shikai was a decisive factor in modern Chinese history. Yuan was born in an affluent Han family in 1859. Although he failed to qualify even for the lowest degree in the civil service examinations, he purchased an official title in 1880. During his civil service career, he went up the political ladder and held important posts such as governor general, grand councilor and prime minister in the Qing court. He was a part of Li Hongzhang's Huai Army and served in Korea in 1882. In 1885, the court appointed him the imperial resident of Seoul. In 1895, Yuan became the commander of the first New Army. In 1902, he took charge of the governorship of Zhili Province and the largest, best-trained and most effective military force in north China, the Huai Army. He renamed it the Beiyang Army. Yuan was also in charge of Qing military modernization after 1901. His position allowed him to expand the Beiyang Army. His protégés commanded a majority of the army divisions and other senior military positions. Yuan also enjoyed the good will of the foreign powers in China which made him an extremely powerful figure during the final days of the Qing Dynasty. When the Qing court summoned Yuan after the Wuchang Uprising, he delayed resuming duty to bargain for more power for himself. He was able to extract the prime ministership of the constitutional monarchy in November 1911.

With vast political and military power at his disposal, Yuan was too formidable a force to be ignored by the revolutionaries. The revolutionaries could not have taken the risk of engaging with Yuan's forces in a long civil war. Moreover, since revolutionaries mostly operated from outside China, they needed more time to build up a solid popular base in China. There was also a lack of coordination and unity among the revolutionaries themselves. It could be therefore stated that Sun Yat-sen took a wise decision to involve Yuan Shikai in the formation of the republic. However, although Yuan was pro-reform, he simply did not believe in the merit of constitutionalism. He was not an idealist either. Rather, he was open to deals as long as it was beneficial to his own interest. Yuan Shikai supported the Republic of China because he saw personal gain in doing so. Firstly, he had no real loyalty to the Qing court. In addition, by supporting the republican movement he confirmed foreign support for himself. Therefore, he had no reservation in accepting the presidency of the Republic of China in 1912.

True to his nature, immediately after assuming office, Yuan started engaging in a political conspiracy to consolidate his power. He started appointing his own men in important posts. In January 1913, Guomindang emerged victorious in parliamentary elections. With a parliament consisting of five representatives from each province and a prime minister to run the government, the president's power was curtailed. A prominent parliament member and Guomindang politician Song Jiaoren, who publicly criticized Yuan's policies and favoured further curtailing of the president's power,

NOTES

NOTES

was assassinated in March 1913. A close associate of Yuan was implicated for plotting the murder, but due to a lack of evidence, Yuan's links could not be established. Yuan stopped paying salary to Huang Xing's fifty thousand revolutionary soldiers, resulting in the disbandment of the force. In May 1913, Yuan negotiated a loan with a five-power bank consortium without the approval of the parliament. When some Guomindang members protested, Yuan simply dismissed them.

It was clear that parliamentary methods would not be effective to restrict Yuan's dictatorship. In May 1913, Sun Yat-sen and others prepared an armed uprising to remove Yuan from power. They approached the provincial military-gentry governors for support. This short-lived trumpery affair of 1913 is commonly called the Second Revolution (Dierci Geming). Yuan quickly bought the loyalty of the provincial military leaders and revamped his Beiyang Army with the money he borrowed from the foreign banks. Yuan crushed Sun's Second Revolution within months, charged the Guomindang with sedition and banned it. Sun Yat-sen fled China in August. In 1914, Yuan dissolved the National Assembly and appointed a political council to draft a new constitution. This body was composed of Yuan's cronies. The new constitution granted unlimited power to the president, including extending the terms of office to ten years which was renewable by re-election thereafter, and also power to select a successor. Yuan then tried to reign in the provinces under central rule, but achieved only limited success. Thereafter, Yuan plotted to gain absolute power by reviving the monarchy. He encouraged his men to petition him i.e. the President of the Republic, for the revival of monarchy. He then pretended to bow to the public pressure and made himself the emperor in late 1915. Yuan had calculated that in the midst of the First World War, foreign powers would not meddle too much in the internal affairs of China.



Fig. 3.1 Song Jiaoren

Source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Sung_Chiao-jen.jpg

Japan was at war with Germany during the First World War. She had captured Germany's privileges in China and in January 1915 sent Yuan a list of demands, known as the Twenty-one Demands (Ershiyi Tiao) with a threat of war if China did not comply. Yuan accepted the demands because instead of weakening his army by fighting a war with Japan, he wanted to use his military to make the provincial military gentry fall in line and strengthen his rule.

These moves, however, backfired. On the face of widespread protest from home and abroad, Yuan abandoned his plans to become emperor. He also agreed to give up absolute civil authority while retaining the formal post of the President of the Republic. Yuan Shikai died in June 1916.

The Warlord Period (1916–1928)

After Yuan Shikai proclaimed himself the emperor of China, many military generals in southern China opposed the idea. They waged an anti-monarchy war, Huoguo Zhanzheng (Save the Nation War) between 1915 and 1916. Military leaders such as Tang Jiyao and Cai E of Yunnan Province and Li Liejun of Jiangxi Province raised a special force named the National Protection Army with the mission to face Yuan militarily and declared independence from Beijing in December 1915. Before Yuan's army could reach Yunnan to tackle the issue, Guizhou, Guangxi, Guangdong, Shandong, Hunan, Shanxi, Jiangxi and Jiangsu provinces also declared independence by mid 1916. After Yuan Shikai's death, the central military authority of the Beiyang Army ended. The commanders of the Beiyang Army started operating independently in northern China. Thus, a major part of the Chinese republic became fragmented into a number of military cliques, starting the Warlord Period (Junfa Shidai) in China.

Initially, there were two major groups of warlords, those of the southern provinces who opposed Yuan Shikai and the breakaway generals of Yuan Shikai's Beiyang Army. The two groups fought for territorial expansion in the initial two years after Yuan's death. The Beiyang Army was further divided into two factions, the Anhui Clique and the Zhili Clique. The two groups fought for control over Beijing. Besides the Anhui and Zhili cliques, there were other warlord cliques in northern China. Fengtian Clique was a major clique. The southern warlords also frequently fought among themselves over territorial control. Major cliques of southern China included Yunnan Clique, Old Guangxi Clique, New Guangxi Clique and Sichuan Clique. For selfish reasons, foreign imperialist powers often supported one warlord or the other.

Besides politically fragmenting China, the infighting of the warlords had serious repercussions for China's economy and society. The warlords encouraged opium cultivation because opium trade was profitable. Private soldiers of rival warlords frequently destroyed crops and looted farm animals in each other's territory. Trade was affected in a similar fashion. Rival territories often obstructed the transport of goods from one area to another, and imposed local taxes on trade and transport of goods. Warlords often forced industrialists to contribute money. Unsure of returns, industrialists often eschewed investing in long-term projects. Warlords were not interested in social reform or welfare but were driven solely by self-interest. Not too different from the foreign imperialists, the warlords were out to exploit common people to the maximum. Peasants were forced to provide cattle and cart to the warlord soldiers; this hampered agricultural production. Forced cultivate of poppy only benefited the warlords and actually wasted arable land. Warlords also increased land tax and collected them in advance. Some warlords even collected tax up to the year 1968 in advance! They also introduced new taxes, which could be as bizarre and outrageous as such the laziness tax for not cultivating opium. Those who cultivated opium had to pay the opium tax.

NOTES

NOTES



Fig. 3.2 Beiyang Army

Source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Beiyang_Army.jpg

The political instability due to recurring civil warfare was such that between 1916 and 1928, the Chinese republic witnessed twenty-five cabinets with seven heads of state and a number of caretaker governments. The republic, instead of laying a new foundation for national strength, existed only on paper. The Warlord Era lasted until Guomindang leader Jiang Jieshi unified China in 1928.

3.7.2 Imperialist Inequity

The political disunity made the Republic of China weak and susceptible to imperialist exploitation. Imperialist Japan was particularly interested in China because of her territorial proximity with China.

The Japanese Scheme

Japan advanced her imperialistic scheme in China taking advantage of the First World War. In August 1914, the First World War began in Europe. China declared her neutrality. It meant that the Chinese territory could not be used as a base for the war. However, there were chunks of Chinese territory that were the ‘spheres’ of foreign powers. Therefore, China demarcated war zones, beyond which belligerent operations could not be carried out.

Japan joined the war in support of the British Empire on the Allied side, and declared war on Germany on August 23, 1914. The war gave Japan the opportunity to materialize her imperialist ambitions in the East Asian region without fear of intervention from other powers. The war zones in China gave Japan sufficient opportunity to establish authority in China. Japan captured German holdings in Qingdao and Shandong Province, took over Germans interests in the Jiaozhou Bay and completely ousted German presence from China by the end of 1914. In January 1915, President Yuan Shikai informed Japan that since the need of war zones ended with Japan’s complete capture of Germany’s possessions in China, China was

extending the neutrality to all over her country by abolishing the military zones. Japan immediately protested the Chinese move to end the military zones and presented a list of twenty-one demands to China on January 18, 1915.

The Twenty-one Demands were a list of twenty-one articles divided into five groups. Four articles in group one were related to Shandong. The four articles stipulated that Japan would retain the recent acquisitions from Germany in Shandong Province, expanding Japan's sphere of influence over the railways, coasts and major cities of the province. Seven articles in group two were related to the extension of leasehold to Inner Mongolia and expansion of Japan's sphere of influence in South Manchuria Railway Zone with special economic and political privileges in these areas. Two articles in group three were related to joint control of the Hanyeping Company in Hubei and special economic rights in the area. The sole article in group four barred China from ceding or leasing out any harbour, bay or island along China's coast to any foreign power except Japan. The seven articles in group five were a miscellaneous set of demands, which aimed at almost reducing China to a Japanese protectorate. These stipulated, among other things as follows:

- China's central government accept Japanese military, finance and political advisers
That China buy the bulk of its weapons from Japan
- China provide properties for Japanese schools, hospitals and temples
- China allow Japanese Buddhist preachers to conduct missionary activities in China
- China allow Japan to administer the Chinese police force jointly in major cities
- China consult Japan before determining foreign investment in all development projects in Fujian Province

Japan handed over the list of demands directly to Yuan Shikai secretly, bypassing the Chinese foreign office. But, eventually it was leaked and a wave of indignation swept across China. Britain and the United States also did not approve of some of Japan's demands. The Japanese government quickly revised the demands, deleting group five and altering the other articles on April 26, 1915. On May 7, 1915, Japan sent the revised list of demands with an ultimatum to China requiring acceptance within two days. The next day Yuan Shikai accepted the demands.

China and the First World War

China hoped to recover Germany's concessions in the Shandong peninsula from Japanese control taking advantage of the First World War. China offered to send 40,000 soldiers to Europe to fight against Germany, but England and France dismissed the proposal as impractical. However, the British government raised the *Chinese Labour Corps*, under which it enlisted approximately 140,000 *Chinese workers* to support British and French troops by performing support work.

On February 24, 1917, a German submarine sank a French ship named *Athos* in the Mediterranean. There were over 900 Chinese nationals on board, who were going to work as support staff in France. Around five hundred of them drowned.

NOTES

NOTES

Under the guidance of the United States, China lodged a formal protest with the German government citing international law. On March 10, 1917, the German government replied that Germany was unable to restrict submarine warfare campaigns to meet China's concerns. In response, China broke off diplomatic relations with Germany, joined the war on the side of the Allied forces and declared war on Germany on August 14, 1917.

After the end of the First World War, more than thirty countries met at Paris from January 18, 1919 to January 21, 1920 to discuss peace terms. It is known as the Paris Peace Conference. A series of treaties were signed, which are known as the Paris Peace Treaties. One of them, the Treaty of Versailles (signed on June 28, 1919) concerned the German Empire, and therefore had direct implications for China.

The Shandong Problem (Shandong Wenti)

The Shandong Problem refers to the articles of the Treaty of Versailles which dealt with the German concession of the Shandong peninsula. Articles 156 to 158 in Part IV, Section VIII of the Treaty dealt specifically with Shandong. The articles read:

- **Article 156:** Germany renounces, in favour of Japan, all her rights, title and privileges particularly those concerning the territory of Jiaozhou, railways, mines and submarine cables which she acquired in virtue of the Treaty concluded by her with China on March 6, 1898, and of all other arrangements relative to the Province of Shandong.

All German rights in the Qingdao-Qianfu Railway, including its branch lines together with its subsidiary property of all kinds, stations, shops, fixed and rolling stock, mines, plant and material for the exploitation of the mines, are and remain acquired by Japan, together with all rights and privileges attaching thereto.

The German State submarine cables from Qingdao to Shanghai and from Qingdao to Chefoo, with all the rights, privileges and properties attaching thereto, are similarly acquired by Japan, free and clear of all charges and encumbrances.

- **Article 157:** The movable and immovable property owned by the German State in the territory of Jiaozhou, as well as all the rights which Germany might claim in consequence of the works or improvements made or of the expenses incurred by her, directly or indirectly, in connection with this territory, are and remain acquired by Japan, free and clear of all charges and encumbrances.
- **Article 158:** Germany shall hand over to Japan within three months from the coming into force of the present Treaty the archives, registers, plans, title-deeds and documents of every kind, wherever they may be, relating to the administration, whether civil, military, financial, judicial or other, of the territory of Jiaozhou. Within the same period, Germany shall give particulars to Japan of all treaties, arrangements or agreements relating to the rights, title or privileges referred to in the two preceding Articles.

In 1917, Japan entered into a secret agreement with Britain, France, United States and Italy, by which the Western powers promised to support Japanese claims in Shandong in return of Japan's military help to the Allied Powers. Accordingly, the victorious countries dismissed China's claim of restoring German concessions to the sovereign authority of China as one of the victorious party. Instead, Japan acquired Germany's rights and privileges in the Shandong peninsula. One of the rationales Japan used to justify her claim over Shandong was that Chinese Premier Duan Qirui had borrowed money from Japan to strengthen his army, and transferring the German concession of the Shandong peninsula should be considered as the repayment of the loan.

NOTES

3.7.3 The Intellectual Response: The New Culture Movement

Conscious attempts to alter China's Confucian way of life had started after China lost the Sino-Japanese War in 1895. Reformers from the Confucian scholar official circle endorsed Western learning for practical knowledge, keeping intact the traditional way of life. China's repeated defeats against imperialist nations and Japan's victory against the very same imperialist powers brought about a striking change in the thinking of Chinese intellectual and political circles.

The New Culture Movement (Xin Wenhua Yundong)

In 1898, reformers such as Kang Youwei and Liang Qichao proposed to break away from the Confucian tradition. China's humiliation in the hands of the eight-nation allied forces during the Boxer Rebellion exposed the demerits of orthodox Confucian notions and Chinese traditional military strategies in a changed world scenario. The Revolution of 1911 was in essence a political revolt. The revolutionaries believed that a changed political system would result in China becoming stronger. However, the realities of the first few years proved otherwise. Before 1912, many blamed the moral and political corruption of the Manchu rule and a monarchic system for China's misfortune. The political change did not bring in desired changes in China. Consequently, a section of Chinese intellectuals engaged in introspection. Convinced that political change would be ineffective unless China's Confucian tradition was replaced, they called for a rejection of traditional values and creation of a new culture by inculcating some aspects of Western culture such as science and democracy. This intellectual ferment is known as the New Culture Movement.

In the midst of the depressing socio-political environment of the day, warlordism played a positive role in the New Culture Movement. Though all warlords only cared about their own interest, the southern warlords did promote anti-imperialistic nationalistic feelings during their campaign against the northern warlords. While the warlords were masters of the territory over which they ruled, no one among them was strong enough to unify China militarily. The northern warlords did try hard to capture the centre of power, as they were closer to Beijing. On the other hand, capturing Beijing was not possible for the southern warlords. Therefore, promoting nationalistic ideas in their regions was not detrimental to the interest of the southern warlords. In fact, they often used nationalistic ideas to project themselves as national heroes.

NOTES

The scope of the New Culture Movement was wide. The movement called for rejection of Confucian ideas, values and institutions such as patriarchal social and family norms and the prevailing norm of creating a past-oriented literature on a limited number of themes written in a classical language, etc. The New Culture Movement also called for rejection of the view that China was culturally unique. Chinese intellectuals envisioned a Chinese culture in which reason would replace customs, and individual freedom would replace familial and social authority. In a decisive break with the tradition, the movement promoted a new literature with new and diversified themes written in the language of the people. The movement called for the re-examination of ancient classics using modern textual and critical methods (known as the Doubting Antiquity School) and promoted democratic, scientific and egalitarian values including women's liberation and individual freedom. The leading intellectuals of the day promoted all these values in their writings to create a future-orientated vernacular literature.

Almost all the advocates of the New Culture Movement were associated with Beijing University. These revolutionary intellectuals had been publishing articles in a number of newspapers and journals within and outside China espousing and experimenting with new ideas to salvage China since the beginning of the twentieth century. However, the beginning of the movement was the launching of a journal called *The Youth* (later named *The New Youth*) in Shanghai in 1915. Chen Duxiu, an experienced revolutionary and former Tongmeng Hui member was the founder editor of the journal. It started as an intellectual response to President Yuan Shikai's acceptance of Japan's Twenty-one Demands.



Fig. 3.3 Chen Duxiu

Source: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Chen2.jpg>

Literary establishments such as publishing houses and journals, and scholastic institutes such as literary societies and universities across China provided a base for dynamic literary and other intellectual activities. The *New Youth* journal was the principal medium for deliberating the causes of China's weaknesses. Around 300 intellectuals published their works in the *New Youth*. They included Hu Shi, Chen Duxiu, Cai Yuanpei, Li Dazhao, Zhou Zuoren and many other like-minded intellectuals who were at the forefront of the movement. Gradually a number of literary societies

came up. The most famous ones were established during the May Fourth era including Chuangzao She (the Creation Society, 1921–29), Moming She (the Unnamed Society, 1925–30) and Xinyue She (the Crescent Moon Society, 1923–31). During this time a large number of magazines also sprang up to spread new thoughts. In an article titled ‘*Some Tentative Suggestions for the Reform of Chinese Literature*’, published simultaneously in *The Quarterly* (published by overseas Chinese students in America) and *The Youth* on January 1, 1917, Dr. Hu Shi laid down eight principles, setting the trend of new literature in China.

Language played a very important role in the New Culture Movement. For more than two thousand years, classical Chinese language (wenyan) had been the sole medium of education, literature and official communication. Only scholars could understand and use the language. For this reason, education and literary activities were limited to a handful of people. Literature written in vernacular Chinese (baihua) was not accepted as pure. Dramas and novels, which were written in vernacular Chinese, were considered as vulgar. The New Culture Movement attacked this tradition. Hu Shi proclaimed ‘A dead language cannot produce a living literature.’ The movement vehemently promoted the use of vernacular Chinese in all written communication. This move finally allowed people with little education to enjoy literature and gain knowledge by reading. Lu Xun’s short story, *The Madman’s Diary* (Kuangren Riji) is considered the first piece of literature written in vernacular Chinese in 1918. The New Culture Movement and other new ideological trends reached their peaks in 1919 after the May Fourth Movement.

The May Fourth Movement (Wusi Yundong)

When the news of the government’s sellout to Japan and other imperialist injustices during the Paris Peace Conference leaked out, it outraged the Chinese people. China was no more a country of passive people of oppressed peasants. The New Culture Movement was in full swing. Therefore, the reaction against the Treaty of Versailles was very strong. A massive student protest broke out in Beijing against the pro-Japan government of China and the government of imperialist Japan on May 4, 1919, earning the movement its name, the May Fourth Movement. On that day, thousands of Chinese college and school students marched in Beijing to protest the possible signing of the Treaty of Versailles. During their demonstration, students broke into the house of a pro-Japan minister, set fire to the house, and beat up the Chinese minister to Tokyo. The government arrested a number of student protesters. But, the student activism, coupled with reformist intellectual currents, blossomed into a national awakening. Traders in Shanghai and other cities closed their shops in support of the students. People were urged to boycott Japanese goods. On the face of strong demonstration of national sentiment by intellectuals, students and merchants, the government released the arrested students and took action against some recognized pro-Japan ministers. Chinese students studying in France besieged the Chinese embassy in Paris to persuade the Chinese delegation members not to sign the treaty. Giving in to the pressure, the Chinese delegation returned home without signing the peace treaty.

NOTES

NOTES



Fig. 3.4 Students burning Japanese books during the May Fourth Movement

Source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Burn_Japanese_goods,_Tsinghua_School,_1919.jpg

China declared the end of its war against Germany in September 1919 and signed a separate treaty with Germany in 1921. The Western imperialist powers also realized the strength of Chinese nationalism. Although they supported Japan in the Paris Conference, later they advised Japan to return Shandong to China. During the Washington Naval Conference (also known as Washington Arms Conference and Washington Disarmament Conference) of 1921–22, the effects of the Twenty-one Demands were annulled, and Shandong was formally restored to China.

Often, the May Fourth and the New Culture movements are used synonymously. In fact, the May Fourth Movement developed under the intellectual milieu of the New Culture Movement. The call to inject new ideas to rejuvenate China became more popular. The May Fourth Movement was a significant turning point in Chinese history. It was a cultural, political and anti-imperialist movement all at the same time. The movement quickened the break from the Confucian tradition and gave rise to Communism in China. It also turned the cultural orientation of the New Culture Movement into a political one, which in turn, paved the way for the formation of the Communist Party of China.

3.7.4 Significance of the New Culture Movement

The following points outline the significance of the New Culture Movement:

- (i) The New Culture Movement marked the upsurge of Chinese nationalism, out of which new political and intellectual ideas were born. The movement shifted academic, literary and political activities away from the elite intellectual circle to the common people, giving it a populist orientation. Scholars like Hu Shi termed the New Culture Movement and the May Fourth Movement as Chinese Renaissance.

- (ii) In the literary front, the movement initiated a new kind of literature. New themes, such as evils of tradition, woman's rights, individual freedom and the celebration of life were experimented with. A vast body of literature, known as modern Chinese literature was created. Literary masters such as Lu Xun, Mao Dun, Lao She, Bing Xin and Ding Ling created a sensation with their masterpieces.
- (iii) The literary revolution expanded the availability of all literature written in vernacular languages and created a body of progressive works that introduced and familiarized progressive cultural and scientific ideas to common people, and thus developed awareness among the people.
- (iv) The New Culture Movement fueled literary movements outside China. For example, former Tongmeng Hui member Li Shizeng started a work-study programme in France in the 1910s for Chinese students who would work to support themselves financially, while studying political and philosophical ideologies. The movement later spread to Germany. Thousands of overseas Chinese students enrolled in the programme. Many of these participants later became frontline Communist leaders including Zhou Enlai and Deng Xiaoping.
- (v) The spoken Chinese language was elevated to the position of the national language of China. In 1920, the Ministry of Education proclaimed that, from the fall of the next year, the textbooks for the first two grades in the primary schools were to be written in the national language. In 1922, all the elementary and secondary textbooks were ordered to be rewritten in the national language.
- (vi) Nationalist leaders such as Jiang Jieshi opposed the outright rejection of Chinese tradition and values. Jiang did not support the radicalism of the movement. For this reason, he did not like communists, who traced their root to these movements and drew organizational strength from the radical intellectuals who were product of these movements. This opposition later culminated into a serious civil war in China.

NOTES

3.7.5 Formation of the Republic of China and Nationalist Government

The Revolution of 1911 culminated, with great expectations, in the founding of the Republic of China in 1912. In terms of transformation of the political system from a monarchy to a parliamentary democracy, the Revolution of 1911 was a success as it led to the formation of the Republic of China in 1912. However, the republican system collapsed even before being built up. The damaging effects of Yuan Shikai's political ambitions and self-seeking rapacious warlords coupled with political inexperience and disunity of progressive forces and a lack of mass support failed to bring any creditable change towards nation building. After the death of President Yuan Shikai in 1916, Li Yuanhong became the president, Feng Guozhang the vice president and Duan Qirui the premier of the Republic. Duan Qirui and Feng Guozhang were two of the most powerful military generals of the Beiyang Army. President Li tried to revive the Constitution of 1912, and opposed Premier Duan's plan for China to join the First World War, but failed as the premier openly defied the president.

NOTES

Premier Duan took loan from Japan secretly. When this was exposed, President Li forced him to resign on May 23, 1917. Premier Duan's military colleagues rallied behind him and challenged the president. President Li sought the help of another powerful military general of the Beiyang Army Zhang Xun. Warlord Zhang responded by restoring the abdicated Qing emperor, Emperor Xuantong on July 1, 1917. Duan Qirui, Feng Guozhang and other northern warlords joined force to depose Emperor Xuantong once again. Duan Qirui returned to the office of premier on July 14, 1918. Vice President Feng Guozhang became the president on July 17, 1918. The regime survived until 1920. From then on until 1928, northern warlords formed alliances and fought against each other in a bid to control Beijing. The political scenario in Beijing was marred by a series of presidents, vice presidents and premiers. The southern warlords also constantly made and broke alliances and fought among themselves for personal benefit. In addition, imperialist prejudice worsened the national crisis that started in the later half of the nineteenth century.

The Reconstruction Effort

In August 1928, the fifth plenary session of the Central Executive Committee of the Nationalist Party was held. In October, the Organic Law of the National Government was promulgated. With this, Jiang started the second stage of the revolution, the period of political tutelage under the leadership of the Nationalist Party. As Sun Yat-sen had charted out, under the Organic Law, the Central Political Council supervised the organs of government, composed of the Central Executive Committee members and the members of the Central State Council. The highest organ of the government was the State Council. Under it, a scheme of governmental organization was introduced which embodied Sun's five-power formation of separate administrative branches (Yuan). They were: Executive Yuan, Legislative Yuan, Judicial Yuan, Examination Yuan and control Yuan. A similar structure was erected for the provincial governments to unify the provincial establishments under the provincial councils. A National People's Convention enacted a provisional constitution on May 12, 1931. The chapters of the provisional constitution elaborately specified the rules and regulation of the Republic. The period of political tutelage for the Chinese people to prepare them for democracy continued supposedly until 1935.

However, the efforts of the Jiang Jieshi government to reconstruct the nation were retarded due to political vulnerability of the time. Although the country was officially under the Nationalist rule, in effect Jiang Jieshi only controlled the provinces at the mouth of the Yangze River. Other provinces were under various warlords, with whom the Nationalist government had unreliable alliance. Besides, the 1927 purge did not wipe out the Communists. They had merely gone away from the cities, and in fact grown stronger. Some left-leaning military officers still remained within Jiang's right-wing Nationalist Party. Although they did not oppose the new developments openly, they did not like it and mostly remained neutral. Therefore, the government spent much of its energy just for its survival.

Nevertheless, in the midst of a highly volatile socio-political situation and threats to its survival, the Nationalist government managed some constructive achievements.

The government developed a national anthem and a new flag. The government put emphasis on economic modernization. It also encouraged setting up of factories. Other measures included nationalization of banks, centralization of the railway administration and introduction of a new education system. The government constituted commissions with foreign aid including the League of Nations for studying various socio-economic issues including public health, education and opium control. In the legal and judicial field, many Western style courts and prisons were constructed. However, the Jiang government's achievements were most remarkable in the field of foreign affairs. The government was able to revise some provisions of the unequal treaties and was able to mitigate some of the foreign concessions in China.

The New Life Movement

For a long time, the Chinese political and bureaucratic circles had been besieged with corruption and factionalism. The common people were chronically addicted to opium; they were prone to commit crime and were also disease prone due to their drug addiction and poverty. In 1927, Jiang Jieshi set up a separate department to promote moral and ideological reform. The campaign aimed to build up the morale of the country. In 1934, the scope of the campaign was broadened and came to be known as the New Life Movement (Xin Shenghuo Yundong). The movement combined components of traditional Confucian values and Western mannerisms. While rejecting individualism, the campaign also rejected socialist and communist ideals.

Hundreds of groups were formed to diffuse the values of the Movement to the people. Its volunteers educated the common Chinese on general hygiene and discipline as well as their duties towards the nation. The campaign urged people to show courtesy and politeness to neighbours, keep streets clean, follow rules set by the government, be punctual at work, be compassionate to fellow human beings, contribute to nation building by conserving energy, etc.

A section of the Nationalists viewed the inclusion of Confucian morality and self-cultivation as contrary to the teachings of Sun Yat-sen. The Communists viewed the campaign as fundamentally anti-communist in its values to counter the spread of communism. Some appreciated Jiang's attempt to raise the quality of life through the Movement, while others criticized him for misplacing the priorities by setting lofty ideals that were out of sync with the immediate concerns of the distressed general populace.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-VI

11. What was the 'Shandong Problem'?
12. Mention some of the significant points of the New Culture Movement.

NOTES

3.8 JAPANESE NATIONALISM

NOTES

Japanese nationalism covers a wide range of notions and opinions held by the Japanese people over the last two centuries with regard to their native country, its cultural identity and political structure. Nationalist ideology, in Meiji period Japan, comprised a mix of national and international political philosophies. Primarily, this ideology was developed by the Meiji government to boost national strength and feeling of unity, first in the fight against colonization by Western powers and later in a bid to acquire equal status with the Great Powers. It grew through the Taishô and Shôwa periods. It aimed to validate a totalitarian government and expansionist policies abroad, and provided a political and ideological groundwork for the actions of the Japanese military in the years leading up to World War II.

3.8.1 Growth of Nationalism in the Meiji Period (1868-1911)

During the final days of the Tokugawa shogunate, the identified risk of foreign infringement, in particular after the arrival of Commodore Matthew C. Perry and the signing of the Kanagawa Accord, led to enhanced significance to the development of nationalist ideologies. Some well-known *daimyô* promoted the notion of *fukko* (a return to the past), while others promoted *ôsei* (the Emperor's utmost authority). The terms were not mutually exclusive, integrating into the *sonnô jôi* (respect the emperor, drive out the barbarians) concept. This was a major driving force in beginning the Meiji Restoration. The Meiji Constitution of 1889 termed loyalty to the State as the highest duty of the citizen. As the constitution consisted of a blend of political western practices and conventional Japanese political notions, government philosophy all the more laid emphasis on promoting social harmony and a sense of distinctiveness of the Japanese people (*kokutai*).

The Meiji Restoration in 1868 propelled a turning point in the history of Japan. The incident not only marked the shift of power within the traditional power structure, in a broader perspective, the feudal lords were robbed of their power and a modern state under the monarch was established. Several reformists' steps were taken by the Restoration leaders to strengthen the central institutions. The changes put Japan on the road to regional and world power, which, in turn, gave impetus to nationalist feelings in the country. The Restoration, hence, constituted a major event for the history of Japan, East Asia, and the world. The work of historians has been undergirded by a vast apparatus of sources preserved by a history-minded government concerned with its own origins, and the scholarship that has been produced illuminates the intellectual history of Japan's most recent century.

Important factors that led to the evolution of political ideologies during the Meiji period may be discussed under the following heads:

1. Constitutional Changes

The 1894 general election was fought on the issue of Japan's treaties with foreign powers. Public opposition to concession to other parties to the treaties strengthened the hand of the Japanese government and the nationalist feelings in the country. So

did the cumulative effect of the changes which had intervened since 1868, and which, in the wake of the Iwakura mission, purposely sought to model Japanese legal structures on a western pattern. One of the conclusions of the mission had been that if Japan were to wring concessions from the west, it would have to create institutions recognizably like western ones and hence reassuring to outsiders. Codes of criminal law and of practices for criminal courts were adopted in 1882. Progress with criminal law was of course straightforward, as all were in agreement on the protection of the community against crime. Civil law was more difficult as it affected delicate areas of marriage and property. Hence a draft code, ready in 1879, had to be redrafted, and in turn a redraft of 1889 after a tortuous passage was adopted only in 1898. However, procedures for the civil courts had already been implemented by 1890, and finalization of the law code itself was in sight. From 1894, diplomatic acquiescence from other countries (made possible by these developments) resulted in new treaties radically different from those envisaged in previous negotiations.

NOTES

2. Internal Political Changes

More widespread and lasting than the risings was the emergence of political parties which were intended to harness both support for national constitutional progress and opposition to Choshu and Satsuma dominance. Itagaki Taisuke (1837-1919) of Tosa had admired the views of Saigo on both treaty revision and Korea's relationship with China, but was not prepared to go as far as armed resistance. He founded political parties in 1873 and 1874. His 1873 party was founded in association with Eto Shimpei (1834-74) of Saga (who, however, in the following year led a revolt). Itagaki, his party interest temporarily interrupted by a return to government, resumed his activity from 1878 stressing the principle of consultation with the people. In 1881 he founded the Jiyuto (Liberal Party). Another party was formed in 1882 under the name of Rikken Kaishinto (Progressive Constitutional Party) by Okuma of Saga, a member of the governing clique squeezed out of government shortly before this. In the main the support base of the Jiyuto was rural, coming from the larger payers of land tax, which ensured that it was geographically widespread. The Kaishinto was more urban and intellectual, and consciously modeled on the English party pattern. Okuma founded a college, the Tokyo Senmon Gakko (the future Waseda University), in 1882, which became an important centre for training politicians and was very open to outside thought. Fukuzawa Yukichi (1835-1901), writer, journalist and newspaper owner who had already founded a college which later became Keio University, also attached himself to the party, thus further enhancing its urban and intellectual support. He visited the United States three times, was a strong advocate of modernization on Western lines, and his books sold 250,000 copies.

3. Evolution of Educational Systems

The absence in Tokugawa times of a state higher education system, of an established state religion and of state-promoted cultural values, far from being a handicap, was a major advantage. The Tokugawa School of 1862 had been turned into the Imperial University in 1877, an official university in effect for training the administrators of the new state. However, the first private universities rivaled it in prestige for other employment, and laid the basis for the powerful private sector in Japanese higher

NOTES

education. They also ensured that much of the educational system remained beyond state control. Thus after Kume Kunitake (1839-1931), formerly secretary to the Iwakura mission and professor at the University of Tokyo, lost his post for an article entitled '*Shinto is Ancient Custom of Heaven Worship*', which in 1891 questioned in intellectual terms the politically inspired emphasis on Shinto, central to the refurbished divinity of the emperor, he found employment in 1899 at Waseda. The private universities not only brought in outside ideas (as all Japanese universities did), but also deviant forms of thought such as in the early 1920s Marxism or socialism. The universities left, despite official alarm caused by socialism's associations with Russia (the security bugbear of Japan), a powerful imprint on Japanese teaching and intellectual thought.

4. Impact of Printing Press on Political Structure

It was also a powerful factor in overcoming caution or foot-dragging in regard to the introduction of the constitution, and gave weight to the discontents voiced by political parties. The activity or inactivity of parties, led by ambitious men, did somewhat less than justice to popular expectations. Awareness of this discontent explains why prefectural and local government from the outset provided for elections and public participation. Public opinion was supported by a vigorous press (the first modern Japanese-language paper appeared in 1871). It covered a broad range of interests; its appeal was added to by the fiction it published, and the work of the great novelists of the end of the century mostly first featured in installments in the press. This aspect points to the fact that the rapid development of the press had been helped by the tradition of *kawaraban*, a form of news-sheet published throughout Tokugawa times by booksellers or woodblock printers, originally largely devoted to scandal or colourful stories (and sometimes engaging in political innuendo) and in the final decades of the Shogunate featuring real political news. Hence, public opinion was not satisfied with formal changes, and grew restive with the dominance of political life by politicians from Choshu and Satsuma which parliamentary institutions made much more visible. The term Satcho (a collective and pejorative word for Satsuma and Choshu) made its appearance in the political vocabulary.

With restiveness over this dominion and rifts within the Satcho alliance itself, the management of political life was bound to prove difficult in the 1890s. Government was now at the mercy of the fickle will of the people and the behaviour of parliamentarians. The lower house in particular had the budgetary powers of modern states, and hence despite some constitutional restraints, had, in theory, the ability to impose its will. To cope with the risks inherent in introducing parliamentary democracy, two steps were taken. The first was to emphasize still further the authority of the emperor (the second, considered later, to protect the continuity of the existing ruling interest). In the constitution, the imperial authority was dealt with in summary fashion, the divine nature of the emperor itself touched on vaguely in an isolated paragraph. However, the imperial re-script on education appeared in 1890. It was not, of course, drafted by the Emperor, and a re-script was exhortatory rather than executive. It emphasized the concept of loyalty to a divine emperor in a few words.

As Marius Jansen has said, however, the document itself ‘seems rather innocuous and platitudinous’. It gained its effectiveness from the general thrust of government policy, marking a further stage in the process, begun in 1868, of manipulating the imperial institution in defence of the legitimacy of power, and its timing was accounted for by the urge to reduce the risks of a leap into the dark with the introduction in 1889 of the novel concept of parliamentary democracy.

From the outset of the Meiji regime, in contrast to the older pattern in which the Emperor rarely if ever left his palace in Kyoto, a sustained program of visits throughout Japan was planned for the Emperor. They were part of the effort to build up the ceremonial functions of the Emperor, and in the process to create a public role for the Emperor unknown in the past history of the institution. As part of this policy, the Emperor also began to participate in the rites at the great shrine in Ise, a step which served both to emphasize his divinity and to strengthen the link with Shinto. The cabinet was far ahead of public opinion. A requirement of registering at Shinto temples proved so unpopular that it had to be abandoned. Policy also represented a break with Japanese intellectual thought. From the 17th century into the 19th century, writers from Razan to Banto had dealt briefly with the question of imperial origins or even had openly expressed skepticism about the legends. Scepticism was still evident in 1891–92 when doubts cast on Shinto were the occasion of the dismissal of Kunitake. The issue remained a preoccupation of the cabinet. In 1911, in the face of school textbooks failing for decades to say which of two imperial courts in a quarrel in the 14th century had been the legitimate one, the cabinet decreed that the ‘southern’ court was to be identified as the legitimate one and that this was to be stated in school textbooks.

5. Emergence of Modern Japanese Party System

The ambition of the Meiji constitution makers, whether in exalting the status of the Emperor or in protecting executive office from direct parliamentary or political interference, proved powerless to halt the growth, or more accurately, the revival, of party. The 1890 election itself, with an electorate of nearly half a million functioned satisfactorily. Okuma had already rejoined the Rikken Kaishinto in 1889 in anticipation of the election. Other groupings were brought into activity by the prospect of an election, and Itakagi, reappearing in 1889, laid the basis of a revived Jiyuto. Many of those elected to the lower house already had political experience: more than half of them had been elected at one stage in their career to a local assembly. Nearly half of them too were drawn from the class of economically successful figures at local level: well-off peasants of landlord status, or local businessmen. They laid the basis for a more solid political system, and in turn led to the reliance of the parties on strong local figures for their grass-roots support: the strengths and weaknesses of the modern Japanese party system had begun to emerge (and the early Jiyuto well illustrated how parties were factions rather than a monolithic structure).

The Matsukata cabinet in 1896–97 and the Okuma cabinet in 1898, in breaching, within the first decade of parliament, the Satcho monopoly of power, meant that even Satcho politicians had to endorse party for the future. Ito became titular chairman of the Jiyuto in 1900: its name now became the Rikken Seiyukai (Constitutional

NOTES

NOTES

Political Comrades Party). It was a powerful party combining Ito's authority as one of the founding fathers of Meiji Japan and the politically active rural interests: as the countryside was more politically aware than the towns, its parliamentary base was large. It dominated Japanese life for a decade or more with two of its senior figures, Saionji Kimmochi (1849-1940) and Katsura, alternating in the prime ministership for eight of the years between 1901 and 1913.

Revenue issues had already sharply divided the Diet and government in the 1890s; the costs of the Russian war strained the relationship further. In 1911-13 budgetary and specifically naval expenditure acquired a key significance. When a Saionji cabinet fell in 1911 in an attempt to cut back expenditure, his successor Katsura (a Choshu general) had to deal with army and navy resistance. Faced with blackmail from the navy, which refused to appoint a minister from its ranks, he appointed by imperial re-script a retired officer. This step, though actually intended to confront the vested interests of the navy, led to a barrage of criticism, prompted by growing resentment of Satcho dominance, against Katsura for highhandedness.

6. Struggle for Equality with Western Nations

The most important feature of the Meiji period was Japan's struggle for recognition of its considerable achievement and for equality with Western nations. Japan was highly successful in organizing an industrial, capitalist state on Western models. But when Japan also began to apply the lessons it learned from European imperialism, the West reacted negatively. In a sense Japan's chief handicap was that it entered into the Western dominated world order at a late stage. Colonialism and the racist ideology that accompanied it, were too entrenched in Western countries to allow an 'upstart,' nonwhite nation to enter the race for natural resources and markets as an equal. Many of the misunderstandings between the West and Japan stemmed from Japan's sense of alienation from the West, which seemed to use a different standard in dealing with European nations than it did with a rising Asian power like Japan.

7. Role of Shinto

In the development of modern notion of State Shintoism and emperor worship, various Japanese philosophers attempted to renew national beliefs by removing foreign notions, which were mainly taken from Chinese philosophy. The 'Restoration Shintôist Movement' began with Motoori Norinaga in the 18th century. Motoori Norinaga, and later Hirata Atsutane, based their research on the *Kojiki* and other classic Shintô texts which teach the supremacy of the Sun Goddess *Amaterasu*. This paved the ground for State Shintôism, as the Japanese emperor claimed direct lineage from *Amaterasu*. Hence, the emperor himself was holy and all announcements made by the emperor had a spiritual implication.

After the Meiji Restoration, the newly established imperial government required to increasingly modernize the polity and economy of Japan. In addition, the Meiji oligarchy realized that these goals could only be achieved through a strong sense of national unity and cultural uniqueness. This was to be assisted with State Shintôism acting as an essential counterbalance to the presence of Buddhism of the past, Christianity and other western philosophies of the present.

3.8.2 Nationalist Politics

In 1882, the Japanese Government organized the Teiseito (Imperial Gubernative Party), one of first nationalist parties in the country. Starting from the Russo-Japanese War, Japan adopted the name 'Dai Nippon Teikoku', attaining a colonial empire, with the possession of Formosa (1895), the Liaodong Peninsula and Karafuto (1905), the South Pacific Mandate islands (1918-19) and Joseon (Korea) (1905-10).

The wars against China and Russia were modern wars. These wars demanded a nationalist expression of patriotic sentiment. From this period onwards, the Yasukuni Shrine (initially founded in 1869) was changed into a centre for nationalist outlook, and was given patronage from state until the end of World War II. Yasukuni was devoted to those Japanese and non-Japanese (Korean and Taiwanese) who had lost their lives serving Japan. It also dedicated itself to deaths that resulted from wars both at the domestic and international front from 1869-1945 (and none from any conflicts since 1945), also civilians (women and students) and civil administration in colonies and occupied territories.

The central government, organized the 'Peace Preservation Department' between 1926 and 1928, (an anti-subversive police section), and took legal action against all local communists who suggested a socialist form of government. The Japanese Army organized the *Kempeitai* (military police service). Political and press suppression was used to control opposition. Also, the Peace Preservation Law allowed police to curb freedom of expression and freedom to assemble.

Realities of political power

The emperor became the key figure of the State ever since the Meiji restoration. As per the Constitution, the emperor was Head of State (Article 4) and Supreme Commander of Army and Navy (Article 11). From 1937, Emperor Shôwa was also the commander of the Imperial General Headquarters. In 1890 democratic institutions were established with the promulgation of a constitution and continued to obtain legitimacy until the 1920s, after which they began to be disrespected.

Apprehensions that irresponsible political parties could exert a greater influence over important military matters, led to the introduction of a rule that the army alone should have the authority to nominate the army minister in civilian government. This rule gave the army a *de facto* veto over civilian governments by having the authority to deny nominating a candidate. This policy was implemented as law in 1900 however, it was abolished in 1913. It was again implemented in 1936, strengthening military influence over government after that time.

The military destabilized the political system of Japan throughout the 1930s. This destabilization resulted from recurring coups and military intrusions. The army fabricated an incident to justify a takeover which resulted in the acceptance of the invasion of Manchuria by the Tokyo government. This reflected the inability of the civilian government to exert any influence over the army inclinations. The emperor's role was highly influential with various groups competing to promote their interpretation of what the emperor 'truly' wanted.

NOTES

NOTES

The emperor's position in the war and militarism were examined after the war by many historians such as Akira Fujiwara, Akira Yamada, Peter Wetzler, Herbert Bix and John Dower. The work done by Douglas MacArthur and SCAP during the first few months of the activity of Japan was to pardon Hirohito and all the imperial family from criminal hearings in the Tokyo tribunal. This was a major aspect in the campaign to decline in retrospect the role played by the emperor during the war. They argued that post-war view laid emphasis on the imperial conferences and ignored the several 'behind the chrysanthemum curtain' meetings where the real decisions were made between Emperor Shôwa, his chiefs of staff and the cabinet.

3.8.3 Japan after the First World War

In 1910, Japan had established its control over Korea and according to Russo-Japanese Pact, the open-door policy was ended in Manchuria. Russia and Japan had established their sway over Manchuria and Korea respectively. In 1914, when the entire world was engulfed in the flames of War, Japan began to occupy those provinces of China, which were under the control of Germany. First, Japan established her control over Shantung and presented 21 demands before the Government of China just to make her realise the superiority of Japan. In case, China had consented to those demands, its entire freedom would have been lost, and China might have become a part of the Japanese empire.

In 1917, according to a secret pact, the Allies promised to Japan that at the time of Peace Conference as a return for the help given by the Japanese naval power, Japan would be rewarded and her right on the German islands would be confirmed. Japan endeavoured to expand her territory towards Vladivostok but later she had to give up the idea. During the First World War Japan and America were friends but they were foes in matters of the Far East. America had become doubtful towards Japan owing to her policies towards China. By the year 1919, when the Paris Peace Conference was inaugurated, Japan had captured many German islands. The Peace Settlement increased rivalry between Japan and America. However, immediately after the First World War period at the Paris Peace Conference, Japan made an effort to establish its claims on China and German colonies on a firm basis. Though USA President Woodrow Wilson offered some resistance, Japan ultimately succeeded in getting her position recognised with regard to Shantung.

As a consequence of the World War, Japan got some rights on the German islands in North Pacific Sea. She also received some facilities in Manchuria. This strengthened the position of Japan. Besides, Japan was made a permanent member of the League of Nations. It proved that Japan was rising as a powerful country after the First World War. She began to be counted among the six big nations of the world. Thus, Japan emerged much stronger after the First World War and became the greatest naval power in the East. This development caused much worry to the US, which was keen to check the advance of Japan in the Far East. Hence, the relations between America and Japan became far from cordial for three years after the Peace Settlement. The fundamental question was not of Shantung but the issue of Yap Island. This Island was situated in the Western Caroline Islands. It being a

communication centre had great significance. As this Island was usurped forcibly from Germany and handed over to Japan for administration, America was dissatisfied with this development.

In the post-World War period, Japan found herself without political friends. While Soviet Union, Germany and China resented Japan because it had deprived them of their territories, the victorious Allies also grew distrustful of Japan. Great Britain, who had concluded an alliance with Japan in 1902, also felt the need for curtailing Japan in the Far East, particularly after the elimination of Germany from the region. Therefore, a conference of the Western States was convened by America in Washington to reconsider the Treaty of Versailles and to discuss the disarmament problem.

The summoning of Washington Conference was also motivated by various other attitudes of the big powers. America wanted to end the naval race, which was going on since long with Great Britain. With the participation of Japan in this race, it seemed that the forces of both the countries would fight against each other. America was fully aware that after the Treaty of 1911 between England and Japan, if a war broke out between America and Japan, England would help its friend Japan. The behaviour of both the countries had proved during the Peace Settlement that this Treaty was the foundation of Japan's Asian policy. Therefore, when in 1920 England and Japan began to reconsider this Treaty, it caused worry to America. Despite the assurance given to America by Britain that this Treaty was in no way against her, America considered it a conspiracy against her.

In the beginning, this Treaty was concluded against Germany and Russia, but since no action was taken against these countries, America began to understand that the Treaty was actually concluded against her. America was, therefore, very much worried by this Treaty. Britain also wanted some amendments in this Treaty, so the Conference of Washington was summoned. The American President Harding invited Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan for taking part in the Washington Conference. China was also invited and later on Belgium, the Netherlands, and Portugal were also asked to take part in the proceedings of the Washington Conference.

The Washington Conference

The Washington Conference was held on 11 November 1921, and was attended by Great Britain, USA, France, Belgium, China, Japan, Italy, Holland, and Portugal. In this Conference problem of disarmament, Pacific Sea, and the political foundation of the Far East were discussed. Three treaties were concluded at Washington; that were: Four Power Treaty, Five Power Treaty, and the Nine Power Treaty.

The Four Power Treaty was signed in 1923 by USA, Great Britain, France, and Japan who agreed to respect the rights of one another in relation to their insular possessions in the Pacific, and to settle all their disputes by peaceful means. The signatory powers also agreed to consult each other in case of threat of war from any other power. This Treaty buried the Anglo-Japanese alliance of 1902.

NOTES

NOTES

The Five Power Treaty was signed in 1923 by USA, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan. All these five powers made an effort for disarmament. Japan navy was to be 60 per cent of the naval strength of England and USA, and the Italian and the French navies were to be 35 per cent of their navies. It is worthy to note that these limitations related to the capital ships and did not apply to the light cruisers, destroyers and the submarines. The contracting parties also agreed not to establish naval base in any part of the Pacific excepting in the Panama Canal and the Hawaiian Islands.

Great Britain, USA, France, Belgium, China, Japan, Italy, Holland, and Portugal signed the Nine Power Treaty in 1922. The Treaty 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 kind in China and also to help China to develop a strong and stable government. This Treaty also recognised equal trade rights of all countries in China.

At the Washington Conference China demanded the restoration of Shantung to her. At the instance of the US and Great Britain, Japan signed a treaty with China in 1922 by which Japan handed back Shantung to China in return for a vast amount of compensation. However, Japan was permitted to retain control over Shing-Tao Railways. In short, the Washington Conference put a check on the growing naval power of Japan and also forced it to surrender the gains of the First World War. By these treaties, the Western powers recognised China's sovereignty, independence and its control over the customs.

Commenting on this development, historian KM Pannikar observes:

'It will be noticed that these provisions were meant less to uphold the sovereignty of China than to safeguard the commercial and economic rights of foreign nations against encroachments by Japan. It was an attempt on the part of the Western nations collectively to safeguard their interests. All the same, however selfish the object, so far as China was concerned, it secured two very substantial gains. It buried the Twenty-one Demands; for Japan, in signing the Washington Treaty, had, in effect, to renounce the principles on which these demands were based. Secondly, even in respect of the claims of Western nations, it was clear that the Treaty was only a defensive action, trying to protect what it was possible to protect and not a further encroachment on China's rights'.

The Washington Conference also led to a demand for an aggressive policy. This demand was further strengthened when in 1924 the US government restricted the entry of the Japanese labourers into America. However, Japan reconciled with these setbacks and tried to develop co-operation with USA and China because it had to exploit their markets. To reconcile China, Japan even restored Kiao-Chow to her and closed down all Japanese post offices in China. Japan also tried to improve its relation with Russia and concluded a pact with Russia in 1925. Japan co-operated with the League and signed the Kellogg-Briand Pact in 1928, which outlawed the war. In 1930, Japan signed the London Naval Agreement to lighten the burden of armaments. Thus, from 1919 to 1930 Japan made no efforts to conquer fresh territories. However, this should not indicate that Japan had abandoned her traditional

policy of imperialism. After 1930, it once again embarked on an aggressive policy. Whatever treaties Japan had signed 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 twentieth century caused great dislocation in the lives of the common people of Japan. A large number of them were forced to shift to urban areas because adequate facilities were not available in their own place. The post-World War trade recession in certain industries further added to the miseries of the working people. Due to this situation there were large-scale strikes, demonstrations and lockouts in 1921. In view of the growing unemployment crisis the workers had to struggle hard to retain their jobs.

The rural areas and countryside were even more adversely affected. As a consequence of the trade recession, the price of a *Koku* of rice fell from 55 yen in 1920 to 25.5 yen in 1921. Even the wholesale index considerably dropped. This caused untold miseries and hardships to the poor farmers. Undoubtedly the government tried its best to provide some relief to the poor peasants through the price support programmes; however, the competition from the colonial rice growers which the government was obliged to import for the sake of the urban poor nullified the impact of the relief measures. Further as the tenant farmers were required to pay rents in kind, this added to their miseries. Prior to the World War these tenants did not feel the pinch of the rent loss because there was a rapid expansion of agrarian production in the country. But in the post-World War period the agrarian production considerably slowed down and the tenancy agreements became focus of rising tension. This resulted in the formation of tenants unions. These conditions in the rural and urban areas of Japan were undoubtedly quite conducive to the growth of militaristic nationalism. The other important factors which encouraged the militaristic activities were revolutions in Russia and Germany. The plan for militaristic nationalism in Japan was also influenced by the Western literature.

Regarding the factors which were responsible for the growth of militaristic nationalism in Japan, historian KM Pannikar has observed, 'With disillusionment in respect of the west, following the Washington Treaty and the social economic disturbance caused by the changeover to an industrialized society with the depression which affected the peasantry from whom the armed forces were recruited the doctrine of *pure Shinto* revived again in a new form' 2.

3.8.4 Militarist Parties and Ultra-Nationalism in Japan

Japanese ultra-nationalism and militarism steadily developed from the early period to the start of war with China in 1937. The reasons like Japan's desire to be a Western-style imperialist power, and Japan's concerns for its security and safety played important roles in the growth of militarism up to the end of the Russo-Japanese War in 1905. Japan's belief in its leadership role for Asia and frequent provocations by the Western powers, gave rise to an expansion of militarism and imperialism from 1905 to the 1930s.

NOTES

NOTES

Western imperialism also played a vital part in Japan's aggression toward foreign countries. The stubborn and provocative attitude of the imperialist Western nations towards Japan provided a favourable environment for Japan's advance toward militarism and imperialism, which ultimately led to the Second World War.

In contrast to the 1920s, which was a period of intellectual liberalism in Japan the next decade of 1930s was the period of ultra-nationalism and militarism. In the 1920s scarcely any genuine effort was made by the government to improve the political and economic powers of the common people of Japan or to set up a truly representative Diet. However, this period witnessed increase in the powers to act as the representative of the popular movement and merely made a bid to promote interests of *Zaibatsu*. In 1925 universal adult franchise was introduced but in the same year the Peace Prevention Act was also passed to suppress the leftist groups.

Factors Responsible for the Rise of Militarism and Ultra-nationalism

Many factors were responsible for the rise of militarism and ultra-nationalism in Japan, which can be outlined as follows:

- 1. Japan's aspiration for Western-style imperialism:** The Meiji leaders wanted to make Japan a *ittô koku* or a 'first-rate nation', which integrated the prestige and power connected with foreign territorial possessions. The Western powers like Great Britain, Germany, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, America, Russia, and Italy made various overseas territorial acquisitions and many times through military means during the nineteenth century. Being fully aware of the long history of Western imperialism, which started in the sixteenth century, the ruling class wanted to join the Western powers in demands for rights and privileges in other Asian countries. But, the ruling oligarchs realised that there was need to modernise and strengthen its military before an attempt was made to assert its demands to the Western powers. Although Japan had been building its military for many years, but it was in 1895 the Japanese leaders realised that the country still had not reached the same level as the imperialist Western powers. Although the Sino-Japanese War (1894–95) was won by Japan and as a result Japan acquired Formosa and forced China to pay a large indemnity, it could not stand up to the other Western powers when Russia, Germany, and France compelled Japan in the Triple Intervention to give up the Liaotung Peninsula captured during the War. This led Japan to a fast increase in military expenditures between 1895 and 1904.
- 2. Security concerns:** The militaristic attitude of Japan intensified as government leaders recognised that there was need to ensure the defense of the country against Russia and other Western powers. Considering the latest technological achievements and superior military and naval power of the West, Japan feared of being invaded by a Western country such as Russia. On the other hand, in the nineteenth century, China was very weak militarily and economically. According to the Japanese leaders the rival Western powers could supply better arms and ammunition to China, which would have profound implications on Japan's security.

Yamagata Aritomo, who was known as the 'father of the modern Japanese army', believed in expansionism for security reasons rather than for 'conquest as an end in itself or for other reasons'. According to Yamagata Japan not only had to protect its 'line of sovereignty', but also strive toward its 'line of advantage', which meant that Japan needed to extend its influence and control further than its national borders in order to ensure its security.

Control over Korea showed an important element in Japan's protection against the Western countries due to the geographical proximity of the two countries' and looseness of Korea with both China and Russia. It was soon realized by Japan that it needed to control the Liaotung Peninsula in southern Manchuria to ensure the defense of Korea. Though the Liaotung Peninsula was captured by Japan in the Sino-Japanese War, but the Triple Intervention in 1895 forced Japan to give up its position and claim. In 1898, Russia moved into Port Arthur at the tip of the Liaotung Peninsula, and this further increased Japan's sense of insecurity. Although the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902 provided Japan a potential ally in the case of attack, but the persisting tensions with Russia soon led to the Russo-Japanese War in 1904–05.

3. **Autonomy of the armed forces:** The autonomous status enjoyed by the armed forces in Japan's political structure facilitated the growth of militarism. In Japan the armed forces were considered as the personal army or navy of the Emperor and enjoyed a status of equality with the civil employees. Thus, the army always claimed that they were acting according to the true will of the Emperor. Both the army and navy also enjoyed considerable independence in relation to the cabinet and often took to plea that the army and navy ministers were active officers of their rank and subject to military discipline. They could serve in the cabinet only if the army and navy approved. Through the effective use of this power the armed forces could destroy the cabinet or prevent undesirable leaders from assuming office by refusing to permit any qualified officer to accept portfolios in the government. By these means the army acted not only independently but virtually enjoyed veto power over the cabinet and civil government.
4. **Failure of political leadership:** The failure of the political leaders to gauge the seriousness of the threat posed by the reactionary ultra nationalist and the militarists, largely contributed to the growth of militarism in Japan. The political leadership also failed to take drastic measures essential to deal with the situation. On the contrary very light punishments were given to the assassins. The political leadership also failed to take a united stand against the reactionaries and allowed them to gain popular sympathy in Japan.
5. **Popular support for military expansion:** There was a popular swing in the country in favour of militarism and imperialistic aggrandizement. Direct frontal attacks were made on liberal beliefs and democratic institutions by individuals and small organisations in peaceful manner, but these attacks proved quite ineffective. They not only stirred up popular support for the militarists but also snatched and hacked away the foundations of parliamentary government. During that time liberalism and the parliamentary system of

NOTES

NOTES

government had not taken deep roots into the soil as yet. Democracy was also not popular with many influential groups in the Japanese society, such as the army and the conservatives who were strongly entrenched in the Upper House of Parliament, the Peers, and the Privy Council. They seized every opportunity to discredit the government. Weakening of the parliamentary institutions and liberal thoughts further aggravated the clamour for militarism in the country.

6. **Belief in the role Asian leadership:** In the late nineteenth century, many Japanese leaders came to believe that Japan had a clear destiny to free other Asian countries from ‘Western imperialist powers and to lead these countries to collective strength and prosperity’. Fukuzawa Yukichi and other late-nineteenth century writers supported ‘foreign expansionism and Social Darwinism’, as this promoted ‘survival of the strongest cultures by a process of natural selection’.

In 1905, Japan—the first Asian country—defeated Russia in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904–05, which strengthened Japan’s belief in its destiny to lead Asia and this further encouraged leaders in other Asian countries that they too had a chance to stand against the Western imperialist designs.

Many ultra-nationalist groups and writers, such as the Black Dragon Society and Kita Ikki, gained popularity because of their views and opinions that in Asia, Japan should take leadership to drive out foreign powers by using a righteous war if necessary and required. According to these ultra-nationalist groups ‘the moral purity of the Yamato race and Japan’s unique ancestry as descendants of the sun goddess Amaterasu entitled the Japanese to such a leadership role in Asia’.

7. **Provocation by the Western powers:** From the 1850s to the 1930s, a chain of coercive acts, insults, and provocations by the Western imperialist countries caused great anger among the Japanese people. In 1858, according to the unequal treaties signed by Japan with America, France, Holland, and Russia restrictions were placed on Japan’s national sovereignty, such as extraterritoriality, which meant that ‘foreigners in Japan had immunity from the jurisdiction of the Japanese legal system’. According to the Washington Conference (1921–22) naval treaties forced on Japan an ‘unfavourable battleship ratio’ of 5:5:3 for the US, Britain, and Japan respectively, and the Western powers at the London Naval Conference of 1930 forced Japan to accept the same ratio for its heavy cruisers.

Westerners strong racial prejudice towards Japanese along with the Chinese and other Asians, led to many incidents that were severely insulting for the Japanese people. In the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, the simple Japanese request to include a racial equality clause in the League of Nations Covenant was rejected by the Western countries. An anti-Japanese legislation was passed by California in 1905. In the following year, the Japanese and other Asian children were ordered by the school board in San Francisco to attend segregated schools. In 1924, the Japanese Exclusion Act was passed by

America to shut off Japanese immigration into the US. ‘This series of international affronts to Japanese pride and status provided fuel to the militaristic and imperialist sentiments of Japanese government leaders and ultranationalists.’

8. **Economic interests:** The world’s depression that started in 1929 led to great economic hardships for the Japanese people. This great worldwide depression was the result of the devastating Kantô earthquake in 1923 and stagnating economy during the 1920s, which especially damaged farmers and workers in small shops. But in the 1930s, Japan’s imperialism’s economic motives became very strong so as to ensure continued foreign trade.

There was a need for strong export markets for the Japanese textiles and other goods with the growth in economy. There were best market opportunities for the Japanese export products in other Asian countries, especially China, and thus the Japanese government needed to ensure that this trade would not be disrupted by getting commercial and transportation rights in China. As per Japan’s economy there was need for import of raw materials so that it could be supplied to its manufacturing industries.

A ready solution to Japan’s problem of overpopulation and its requirement for raw materials to support its heavy industries, which focused on military equipment buildup was provided by Manchuria’s extensive land area and abundant natural resources such as iron and coal. In 1931, Manchuria was seized by Japan. Japan later moved into other countries in south Asia so as to ensure sufficient supply of resources to maintain its self-sufficiency. For example, oil from the Dutch East Indies was required by Japan in order to keep its industry and military supplied.

9. **Impact of economic depression:** The Economic Depression of 1929 and then resultant collapse of international trade also contributed to the growth of militarism in Japan. As a result of the Depression protective tariffs were introduced by various countries. This seriously affected the trade and prosperity of Japan because it was dependent on other countries for raw materials as well as the consumption of its products. The things assumed serious dimension because in the meanwhile the population had tremendously increased in Japan, which could not be supported by the agrarian economy alone. For the sustenance of the growing population, foreign markets and exports were essential for supporting the large population. Therefore, the leaders thought that the only way out of the situation for Japan was to resume its old programme of colonial expansion, and secure the source of raw material and market to sustain the Japanese economy.
10. **Lack of faith in representative institutions:** Democracy was not popular with many influential groups in the Japanese society, such as the army and the conservatives who were strongly attached to the upper house of Parliament or the Peers and the Privy Council. They seized every opportunity to discredit the government. Apart from the influential groups, large sections of the Japanese population also did not have faith in the Representative Institutions

NOTES

NOTES

of the time. This led to the establishment of number of ultra-nationalistic secret societies, which believed in direct action, and therefore indulged in activities of terrorism. These secret societies looked to the armed forces for leadership, hoping that the army officers, who represented the lower classes, could address the miseries of peasants and members of other lower classes. Further, these army officers were highly resentful towards the political and economic domination of the trading class. They also did not have faith in capitalism and favoured radical programme to improve the economic condition of the under-privileged classes and peasantry.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS-VII

13. What are the major factors that led to the evolution of political ideologies during the Meiji period?
14. What were the problems discussed in the Washington conference?

3.9 SUMMARY

- Nationalism was a major cause of World War I. Before World War I, several Europeans strongly believed that their nation was superior culturally, economically as well as militarily.
- One of the important causes of the Russian Revolution (February Revolution and the October or Bolshevik Revolution) of 1917 was the heavy military setback suffered by the Russian army during the First World War.
- In February 1917, the Russian Revolution was an important event in the course of Russian history.
- After 1912, various revolutionary parties', especially the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, fortune revived. Both these groups developed from an earlier Marxist movement, the Social Democrat Labour Party, and Karl Marx's ideas influenced them.
- The first important event of the Revolution in Russia was the March Revolution or the February Revolution in Russia.
- The primary basis of Lenin's brilliant success as the Russian Revolution leader can be attributed to his deep mastery of Marxian theory.
- The Kemalist Revolution broke out after Turkey's defeat in World War I, when the country was threatened with complete loss of independence. The Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia exerted great influence on the outbreak and course of the Kemalist Revolution.
- The Turkish republic was proclaimed on 29 October 1923 and Kemal Pasha became its first president. Though, in theory, the new government was a Republic based on liberal principles, in actual practice, it operated as a one party dictatorship under Kemal Pasha.

- Zionism is a nationalist and political movement of Jews and Jewish culture that supports the re-establishment of a Jewish homeland in the territory defined as the historic Land of Israel.
- Palestinian nationalism is the national movement of the Palestinian people. It has roots in Syrian nationalism, the rejection of colonialism and movements calling for national independence.
- The growth of nationalism during the second half of the nineteenth century was one of the most significant features of Indian history. Several factors contributed to the growth of nationalism.
- In India, as in Vietnam and many other colonies, the growth of modern nationalism is intimately connected to the anti-colonial movement. People began discovering their unity in the process of their struggle with colonialism.
- The Khilafat Movement that lasted from 1919 to 1924 was an Islamic movement that derived its inspiration from Indian nationalists.
- Mahatma Gandhi hoped that by integrating non-cooperation with Khilafat, Hindus and Muslims, India's two major religious communities, could collectively bring an end to colonial rule.
- Towards the end of the Qing rule, China witnessed the first surge of nationalism in the face of the poor response of the decaying Qing court to increasing imperialist exploitation.
- After Yun Shikai proclaimed himself the Emperor of China, many military generals in Southern China opposed the idea.
- The 'Shandong Problem' refers to the articles of the Treaty of Versailles which dealt with the German concession of the Shandong peninsula.
- The Revolution of 1911 culminated, with great expectations, in the founding of the Republic of China in 1912. In terms of transformation of the political system from a monarchy to a parliamentary democracy, the Revolution of 1911 was a success as it led to the formation of the Republic of China in 1912.
- Japanese nationalism covers a wide range of notions and opinions held by the Japanese people over the last two centuries with regard to their native country, cultural identity and political structure.

NOTES

3.10 KEY TERMS

- **Militarism:** The term militarism means a strong military spirit or policy, or the principle or policy of maintaining a large military establishment.
- **Treaty:** A treaty is an express agreement under international law entered into by actors in international law, namely, sovereign states and international organizations.
- **Ultra-nationalism:** It refers to extreme nationalism especially when it is opposed to international cooperation.

NOTES

- **Communism:** Communism is a revolutionary socialist movement to create a classless, moneyless and stateless social order.
- **Duma:** The Duma was the council assemblies and was created by the Tsar of Russia.

3.11 ANSWERS TO ‘CHECK YOUR PROGRESS’

1. The Features of pre-war nationalist sentiments in Europe are as follows:
 - i. Nationalism was reckoned as a powerful form of patriotism. Countries with nationalist inclinations regarded other countries as inferior to them.
 - ii. Pre-war nationalism was reinforced by colonial conquests, rivalry, wars and provocative remarks made by politicians and diplomats.
 - iii. Anti-German literature in Britain highlighted an anticipatory war with Germany along with a German invasion in the future.
2. The First World War promoted principles of nationalism, internationalism and self-determination.
3. The main factors responsible for the Russian Revolution in 1917 were the series of bad judgements by the Tsar, the resentment at the cruel treatment of peasants by the landowners, experience of poor working conditions by labourers and workers in the industries, and an increasing sense of political and social awareness of the people in general due to democratic ideas that reached Russia from the West.
4. The Factors that contributed to the victory of Bolsheviks are as follows:
 - i. The opponents of Bolsheviks were disunited, and, as a result, the Bolsheviks were able to shift their focus on the front where they were most needed.
 - ii. The Bolsheviks control over the interior lines of communication and railways greatly helped them in meeting the challenges which contributed to their victory.
 - iii. The Bolsheviks carried on an effective propaganda against their enemies, which created dissensions in the ranks of the opponents.
5. Kemal Pasha became the first president of the Turkish republic.
6. The Kemalist Revolution took place after Turkey’s defeat in World War I, when the country was threatened with complete loss of independence.
7. Zionism is a nationalist and political movement of Jews and Jewish culture that supports the reestablishment of a Jewish homeland in the territory, defined as the historic Land of Israel.
8. David Ben-Gurion was the founder of the first Jewish agricultural cooperative.
9. The various factors that led to the growth of nationalism during the second half of the nineteenth century are as follows:
 - i. Development of means of communication and transport
 - ii. Western education and its impact

- iii. Economic exploitation of India
 - iv. Socio-religious reform movements
 - v. Emergence of modern press and nationalist literature
10. The Non-Cooperation Movement was officially launched in India on 1 August 1920.
11. The 'Shandong Problem' refers to the articles of the Treaty of Versailles which dealt with the German concession of the Shandong peninsula.
12. Some of the significant points of the New Culture Movement are as follows:
- i. New Culture Movement marked the upsurge of Chinese nationalism, out of which new political and intellectual ideas were born.
 - ii. In the literary front, the movement initiated a new kind of literature.
 - iii. The spoken Chinese language was elevated to the position of the national language of China.
 - iv. Nationalist leaders such as Jiang Jieshi opposed the outright rejection of Chinese tradition and values. Jiang did not support the radicalism of the movement.
13. The major factors that led to the evolution of political ideologies during the Meiji period are as follows:
- i. Constitutional changes
 - ii. Internal political changes
 - iii. Evolution of educational system
 - iv. Impact of printing press on political structure
 - v. Emergence of modern Japanese party system
 - vi. Struggle for equality with western nations
 - vii. Role of *Shinto*
14. The Washington Conference held in 1921 discussed problems of disarmament, Pacific Sea and the political foundation of the Far East.

NOTES

3.12 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. Briefly explain the causes for the outbreak of the Russian Revolution.
2. Write a short note on the formation of the Soviet Government under Lenin.
3. Write short notes on the following:
(a) Zionism (b) Palestinian Nationalism
4. What was the basis of the Khilafat Movement?
5. Under what circumstances did the New Culture Movement take place in China?

NOTES

6. What is the May Fourth Movement? What are the causes of the May Fourth Movement?
7. Mention the factors responsible for the rise of nationalism and ultra-nationalism in Japan.

Long-Answer Questions

1. Discuss the political impact of the First World War.
2. Explain the The February-March Revolution (1917).
3. Describe the modernisation of Turkey in detail.
4. Discuss the various factors that led to the growth of nationalism in India in the second half of the nineteenth century.
5. Summarize the popularity and mass appeal enjoyed by the Non-Cooperation Movement.
6. Discuss the history and significance of the Civil Disobedience Movement.
7. Discuss the important factors that led to the evolution of political ideologies during the Meiji period.
8. Describe Japan's status after the First World War.
9. Discuss the Washington Conference.

3.13 FURTHER READING

- Gellner, Ernest. (2008). *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Cornell University Press.
- Rosenthal, Lawrence, Vesna Rodic.(edited) (2014). *The New Nationalism and the First World War*. Hampshire, United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tucker, Spencer C. (2013). *The European Powers in the First World War: An Encyclopedia*. New York: Routledge.
- Trotsky, Leon. (2008). *History of the Russian Revolution*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.
- Wade, Rex A. (2005). *The Russian Revolution, 1917*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kieser, Hans-Lukas. (2006). *Turkey Beyond Nationalism: Towards Post-Nationalist Identities*. London: I.B.Tauris.
- Parla, Taha, Andrew Davison. (2004). *Corporatist Ideology In Kemalist Turkey: Progress Or Order?* New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Reagan, Donna L. (2008). *The Evolution of Palestinian Nationalism in Response to Zionism*. California: California State University, Dominguez Hills.
- Jamal, Amal. (2011). *Arab Minority Nationalism in Israel: The Politics of Indigeneity*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

- Seal, Anil. (1971). *The Emergence of Indian Nationalism: Competition and Collaboration in the Later Nineteenth Century*. London: CUP Archive.
- Pradhâna, Râmacandra. (2008). *Raj to Swaraj: A Textbook on Colonialism and Nationalism in India*. New Delhi: Macmillan.
- Zheng, Yongnian. (1999). *Discovering Chinese Nationalism in China: Modernization, Identity, and International Relations*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, Sandra. (2013). *Nation and Nationalism in Japan*. Oxon, Cambridge: Routledge.

NOTES

UNIT 4 NATIONALIST MOVEMENTS IN ASIA AND AFRICA

NOTES

Structure

- 4.0 Introduction
- 4.1 Unit Objectives
- 4.2 Second World War and Impact on Nationalist Movements in Asia and Africa
 - 4.2.1 Patriotism, Decolonization and Autonomy in Southeast Asia
 - 4.2.2 Patriotism, Decolonization and Autonomy in Africa
- 4.3 Safety and Insurgency in Latin America
 - 4.3.1 The Mexican Revolution
 - 4.3.2 The Cuban Revolution
 - 4.3.3 Insurgency in Nicaragua
 - 4.3.4 Revolutions in Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador
 - 4.3.5 Reliance, Military and Transformation in South America
- 4.4 Decolonization and Arab Patriotism
- 4.5 Nationalist encounters in East Asia
 - 4.5.1 Nationalism in Japan
 - 4.5.2 Progressive Patriotism and the People's Republic of China
- 4.6 Nationalistic Development in Europe and the United States
- 4.7 Summary
- 4.8 Key Terms
- 4.9 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 4.10 Questions and Exercises
- 4.11 Further Reading

4.0 INTRODUCTION

World War I gave hope for a new world to several Asian and African colonies. Nationalist movements – also known as independence movements – between 1919 and 1939 took over the entire world as national leaders in colonies struggled to fight and win over foreign domination and ensure freedom for their countries. These movements sought the destruction of the old world order, wherein it had become 'natural' to imagine the power of the foreigner over the Oriental. The freedom movements found inspiration in the struggle to liberate the homeland as well as seek rights of sovereignty over its own affairs. Therefore, the nationalist movements in Asia and Africa are often studied vis-à-vis freedom as well as unity struggles in these continents. This unit discusses such movements across several countries of the two continents.

4.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Discuss the impact of the Second World War on nationalist movements in Asia and Africa

- Explain the problems of insurgency and nationalism revolutions in Latin America
- Examine the rise of nationalism and decolonization in the Arab world
- Discuss the nationalist movements in East Asia

NOTES

4.2 SECOND WORLD WAR AND IMPACT ON NATIONALIST MOVEMENTS IN ASIA AND AFRICA

After the end of World War II, the Vietnamese leader, Ho Chi Minh (1890-1969), composed the following in the prologue to the Vietnamese Declaration of Independence:

‘All men are made equivalent; they are supplied by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; among these are Life, Liberty, and the quest for Happiness.’

A similar declaration to freedom as well as the right of human beings had been made in the Declaration of Independence of the United States of America in 1776. This implied that all people in the world are equal and possess the right to live as well as be euphoric and free. On a similar note, the Declaration of the French Revolution in 1791 on the Rights of Man and the Citizen stated that — ‘All men are conceived free and with equivalent rights, and must dependably stay free and have measure up to rights those are certain truths.’

Ho Chi Minh had used the French and American declarations to reveal the mistreatment of the Vietnamese people at the hands of the French and Japanese colonists. The country had been liberated of the French domination after the Japanese occupation in the middle of World War II. However, once the triumph of the Allied Powers was declared, France reasserted its claims to ‘French Indochina’. When the French were defeated, the United States endeavored to control Vietnam in a long and severe war guided against socialism in Asia. It was eventually fought under the leadership of national leaders like Ho Chi Minh.

Being dominated by the foreign rulers was not new for the people of Vietnam, even in the nineteenth century, when France initially colonized their territory. For more than 1,000 years (111 BCE-939 BCE), Vietnam was under the domination of the Chinese. It was in the tenth century that Vietnam was able to build its autonomy and fight against China. Yet, they remained in the social shadow of China, drawing upon the Chinese supreme government model to create their own. In fact, the current name for Vietnam is derived from the Chinese name ‘Yue nan’, south of Yue, which is the southernmost locale in China at the time Vietnam was under Chinese control. This topographical term depicted a locale that was inhabited by distinctive ethnic gatherings which had different dialects and belonged to different geographical areas, ranging from mountains and slopes to stream deltas and coastlines.

After World War II, Vietnam presented its declaration of independence in order to affirm its status as a free country. It was based on the struggles of the late

freedom fighters, written in the dialect of the country and signifying unity among its many ethnicities. Their inspiration also came from the American and French progressive models. The Vietnamese model shows how new countries erupted in nationalistic movements, rose from domination to resistance models of the government and took to changing the world order, pushing it towards progressive changes.

Safety and insurgency

The two World Wars and a worldwide despondency undermined European dominion. Its political and monetary strength was further tested by nationalist movements in various colonies across the world. This section explores the social and political nationalism that ensured the end of European administration in Asia and Africa. The reactions to European dominion changed manifold after the two World Wars, comprising nationalistic fervor in frontier domains, which, in the long-run, gained independence, like India, to the progressive developments in the post-war period that toppled conventional rulers while dislodging European as well as other outside forces, like some previous settlements in Africa and Southeast Asia.

In East Asia, the Chinese upheaval was experienced in two stages — a nationalistic unrest that denoted the end of the customary government (1911) and a social insurgency, or the Chinese Civil War, (1949) which supplanted a nationalistic military with a Chinese Marxist government that was committed to the Russian model of development as well as the formation of a communist society. Conversely, Japan's rise as a current modern democratic state, with emperors still holding an important position, began in the mid-nineteenth century with the upheaval of the military government that had ruled for more than 200 years. People's faith in the monarchy was restored and they perceived it as a vehicle for swift changes in political, monetary as well as social life. Despite the fact that the political and social foundation of the Meiji Restoration (1868) was unprecedented in terms of the violence induced, it can be perceived as an 'upheaval' that also brought some progressive change in the country. In the meantime, like both China and Japan, Korea was impacted by the Western thoughts and forces; yet, Korea was the site of political clashes between its two compelling neighbours. However, Latin America exhibited an alternate situation of nationalism and unrest that was influenced by its past. Freedom developments in the early nineteenth century had liberated Latin Americans from the Spanish and Portuguese empires, and independence had not destroyed the frontier social structures and financial reliance on outside forces even a century later. The waiting conditions led to a neo-colonial attempt which was opposed by numerous people through radical and nationalistic activities.

It is important to remember that even as the new colonies erupted in nationalism, the progressive changes sought by them were additionally impacted by different recorded and theoretical models, ranging from the American and French Revolutions to the ideological teachings of Marxism and Leninism.

NOTES

NOTES

Marxism and other models for progressive change in the twentieth century were commenced with the American revolutionary battle for freedom from Britain, the eighteenth century mainstream uprisings of the French Revolution along with the social, ethnic and political complexities of the Haitian Revolution. The insurgencies of 1848 in Europe motivated Marx's writings on the relationship between modern free enterprise as well as the country state and prompted the plan of the Marxist model of progressive change. As indicated by this model, modes of generation of monetary frameworks as well as the class connections produced by them provide the means to strive for progressive change. The main effect of the Marxist political belief system, accompanied the Russian Revolution, was translated through the viewpoint of Lenin's thought. At the point when Marx created his model for progressive change, focussing around the mid-nineteenth century European industrialist modern culture, he was dismissive of the non-European world as well as Russia, which was 'regressive' in contrast to Western Europe at that time. In some parts of the non-European world, for example India and China, he saw samples of the 'Asiatic mode of creation', which was focussed around primitive proprietor inhabitant relations.

In his writings, Marx accorded no progressive part to labourer cultivators, including that of Europe as he believed that these people, who comprised the local rural working class, were, due to their occupation, confined, individualistic and concerned with what they could create on their own plots or area. Marx argued that such a populace needed cognizance of their state of mistreatment as a class, and till then, would maintain conservative constraint in the public arena. Conversely, the urban working class — the modern working population — due to their work in manufacturing plants, subject to the onerous administration of entrepreneurs who demanded surplus quality work, would create a class cognizance, which was important for progressive change.

Marx possessed very little knowledge about the non-European world and could not anticipate the effect of imperialism as well as colonial powers on the mechanical free enterprise with which he was acquainted in Europe. In the post-Marx era, with the backdrop of European Industrial Revolution that commenced at the turn of the century, Lenin perceived Marx's vision to have a substance of its own. While World War I was in progress, Lenin said that imperialism was the highest stage of capitalism, contending that colonialism had amplified the life of a free market system by enhancing conditions for working class in the advanced industrialized country, upsetting the industrialist social orders in its wake.

As indicated by Lenin, Marx's expectation that the declining state of common labourers would lead to a revolution had not worked on the grounds that nation states permitted the development of industrialist finance. Despite the fact that financial disparities persisted, general development implied that conditions for common labourers had not intensified. Lenin inferred that though Marx was not wrong about the ways of capitalistic development, he did not see the unforeseen impacts of the government which led to the expansion of free market system. Nonetheless, in Lenin's perspective, imperialism carried the seeds of its own pulverization. He accepted that he was seeing this annihilation in World War I,

the after-effect of the crash of major competitions that prompted militarism, war as well as widespread discontent. The World War I led to the breakdown of Russian government and gave the Bolsheviks an opportunity to seize power. Similarly, he anticipated that imperialism would lead to discontent across continents. Lenin had also said that rivalry of the nation-states under the imperial system will intensify sentiments of nationalism among the working class. While this would weaken a class struggle, it would also make the bourgeoisie stronger. Lenin then argued that while this system would work initially, but later, would weaken the forces of imperialism as well as capitalism. The rivalry of the nation states would lead to inter-imperial wars. In the end, this would mean that nations will no longer be able to exploit their colonies, which would lead to the stagnation of imperialism. Lenin's theory of imperialism and exploitation of colonies by capitalist powers for financial development has been very influential. We will now discuss the nationalist movements in Asia and Africa through this purview.

NOTES

4.2.1 Patriotism, Decolonization and Autonomy in Southeast Asia

Clashes between nationalists and provincial government powers occurred in the fallout of World War II in very nearly every state in Southeast Asia. The only exemption was Thailand, which had stayed free notwithstanding the British and French dominion in the nineteenth century. The customary Thai monarchy was formally brought to an end by an overthrowing in 1932, which secured a sacred monarchy that proceeded in the post- Bellum period. The post-Bellum freedom came rapidly in the former British provinces. In the parts of Southeast Asia that had been colonized by the French, more battles broke out after the War. Freedom fighters tested the French colonial power and attempted to topple more seasoned political as well as social requests. The histories of nationalistic developments and the techniques of decolonization across Southeast Asia were overpowered by the knowledge of Japanese provinciality, compounding that of the British, French, Dutch and Americans, which ruled over the Philippines. Let us now discuss the freedom struggles in some of these colonies.

British States: Burma and Malaysia

Like Ceylon (presently Sri Lanka), Burma was also liberated from British control in 1948. After freedom, the Burmese patriot pioneers were embroiled in battles within their state with the military. In 1989, the name of the nation was formally changed to Myanmar, drawing on the conventional relationship, just as Ceylon was renamed Sri Lanka. In the same year, Aung San Su Kyi, the daughter of the early pioneers of the patriot development against the Japanese in Burma, was put under house arrest for her leadership in the fair resistance.

Malaysia gained its independence from Britain in 1957, and obtained its present name from the Malayan promontory in 1963. It joined the states of Sabah and Sarawak on the island of Borneo. The pressures between Muslims, who were in political control, and the ethnic Chinese, who ruled the economy in Malaysia, had often deterred the process of development; however, it still remains a multiethnic

NOTES

Islamic state. The city-state of Singapore, majorly dominated by the Chinese, gained its autonomy from Malaysia in 1965 under the leadership of Lee Kuan Yew. He remains one of the most influential political figures in Asia as he led Singapore from being an underdeveloped economy to one of the most highly developed economies of the Third World. He was solely responsible for creating an environment where people of multiple ethnicities could assimilate and achieve harmony.

French Provinces: Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos

Vietnam, which was a French province since 1857, was seized by patriotic fervor in the early twentieth century under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh. This movement was known as Viet Minh. When Japan surrendered in 1945, Viet Minh gripped the Vietnamese capital of Hanoi and the leaders of the state announced the Democratic Republic of Vietnam with Ho Chi Minh as its leader. Despite the fact that France recognized the new state first, clashes between the French and Vietnamese erupted at the end of 1946, when transactions over the political and monetary association with France fell apart. In 1949, the French established a different state, South Vietnam, with its capital at Saigon and its ruler, the removed sovereign Bao Dai.

Fearing the spread of socialism in Asia, particularly in the wake of the Korean War and Cold War, the United States backed the French in Vietnam until they were finally defeated at Dien Bien Phu in 1954. A gathering of the world leaders in Geneva after the defeat of the French divided Vietnam at the seventeenth parallel, with North Vietnam under the rule of the Communists and South Vietnam controlled by the Saigon government. The United States supported the legislature of the South under the leadership of Ngo Dinh Diem, a Catholic leader supporting the French. In the following two decades, the US involvement in Vietnam consistently increased and varied from sending military counsels as well as equipments supporting the rise of the military in the state.

The opposition within Vietnam against the Diem government solidified in the face of resistance against Buddhist friars to the Catholic-headed government, some of whom burnt themselves alive to show their support. However, the guerrilla exercises of the Viet Cong, a socialist organization that penetrated the South, were, by a wide margin, the most genuine risk to the South Vietnamese government. In 1963, Diem was ousted and killed in a military operation, and the succeeding Vietnamese military governments were dependent on the United States to help them maintain their stronghold in the country.

The Vietnamese communists claimed victory in 1975 with the fall of the Southern capital. Saigon was renamed Ho Chi Minh City after their patriot leader. The Vietnam War conveyed to the United States its first military defeat, which proved to be quite costly to both Vietnamese and Americans. A higher amount of ammunition was used for this war than that by the Allied Powers during World War II, and the utilization of defoliants during the War led to far reaching demolition and contamination of the agricultural field.

The Vietnam War's leadership, comprising mainly the guerrillas and utilization of the helicopter in troublesome territory, denoted a significant defining moment in modern fighting, despite the fact that the procedure of guerrilla fighting had been sharpened by the Chinese communists under Mao battling against the Japanese in North China. It was an 'individual war', as Mao had portrayed guerrilla fighting on the grounds that there was no clear division between the regular citizen and the military populace.

Vietnam demonstrated the strengthened guerrilla support on its home turf against even the United States, which had enormous monetary, material and human assets. The Vietnam War divided the American culture as well, since clashes emitted between the era which recollected World War II with its agreeable adversaries as well as the era of the 1960s, wherein its people emphatically dissented the war. Various parts of the previous French Indochina were drawn into the Vietnam clash and experienced comparative encounters with the communist developments to crusade for national liberation in the wake of Japan's surrender at the end of World War II. Both legacies of customary governments as well as the force of recently developing military pioneers involved the battles for national liberation, for example, Laos, which was a French state from 1896 till 1953 and held its government through an arrangement of military overthrows in the 1950s and 1960s, which prompted a common war.

Norodom Sihanouk became Cambodia's first prime minister in 1945, at a young age of twenty-two. This occurred after the Japanese introduced a legislature in the same year. Sihanouk had several nationalistic aspirations and was the key figure in demanding freedom from the French colonists. He also vied for complete freedom in French Indochina, which included the state of Vietnam, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam as well as the Kingdom of Laos. However, he introduced many repressed policies after coming to power and was removed by force in a military operation by the then prime minister of Cambodia, Lon Nol, in 1970. This led to the formation of the Khmer Republic, which was, at that time, immediately recognized by the United States.

The Khmer Republic (South Vietnam) was crushed by Khmer Rouge in 1975. It was a Cambodian communist development. The Khmer Reign ('Red Khmer') occupied Phnom Penh and headed the 600 year-old government, calling the gathering by their conventional name, Kampuchea Kampuchean. The administration of Pol Pot, who was the general secretary of the central committee of the communist party, reordered Cambodian culture, bringing about the death of more than one million individuals through constrained work. Vietnam attacked Cambodia in 1979. After more than a decade of battle between Vietnamese components and the Khmer Rouge, Prince Sihanouk was restored as a pioneer of another coalition government in 1993.

Dutch and American Settlements: Indonesia and the Philippines

In Indonesia and the Philippines, the combination of nationalistic legacies with complex ethnic and religious sections molded new political and social requests. These legacies additionally made the premise for continuous strains between two prominent

NOTES

NOTES

movements, the military and political leaders, who were also the dictators. The development for Indonesian independence from Dutch guideline commenced in 1927 with the foundation of the Indonesian National Party, headed by a junior architect named Sukarno (1901-70). The Dutch restraint of Indonesian patriotism reached its peak in 1940, when Dutch provincial powers denied the utilization of the name 'Indonesia'. Amid World War II, when Indonesia was overpowered by the Japanese, the degree of resistance to the Dutch surfaced in an uninvolved acknowledgement of Japanese tenet, which was viewed as no better than the Dutch. Despite the fact that the Indonesian autonomy was pronounced by a consumer Japanese government in 1943, and again by Sukarno after the War ended in 1945, the Dutch recognition of the Indonesian freedom came about only in 1949. With the backing of the military, Sukarno turned into the leader of the recently autonomous state until he was unseated by Suharto, a military officer, who accrued power in 1967 after the concealment of a communist-headed revolt.

The nationalist history of the Philippines began with the Spanish command in the sixteenth century, emulated by the American hegemony after the Spanish-American War in 1898, and later, the Japanese success amid World War II. A firm imperviousness to the American control surfaced under the initiative of Emilio Aguinaldo between 1899 and 1902. The United States tried to conquer the Philippines again from the Japanese after World War II. It was upheld by guerrilla gatherings, for example, the Communist Hukbalahap (the 'Individuals' Army against the Japanese') development. The Huks, as they were known, spoke of an essential provincial safety development in the same way as the Viet Minh, which tested the social and financial imbalances in the agricultural fields.

4.2.2 Patriotism, Decolonization and Autonomy in Africa

The various writers of African nationalism have often felt that this context is quite unique and incompatible with the national question in Europe. For example, Worsley has argued that there exists a dichotomy that differentiates between the European and Afro-Asian nationalism. According to him, African nationalism was concerned mainly with the process of decolonization, independence as well as the development of the largely backward continent, while European nationalism was underlined with power and prestige struggles. Others have argued that European models of nationalism do not go hand-in-hand with the African social, cultural or political traditions. However, even the process of decolonization of Africa needs to be perceived in connection to two worldwide occasions of the twentieth century — the Great Depression and World War II. Both these events changed the world political economy as well as ushered the social and financial changes that influenced the lives of Africans.

Amid the military showdowns of the twentieth century, Britain and France depended intensely on their African assets and troops. The nationalist endeavours, however, constrained their work within Kenya, Tanganyika, Nigeria and French West Africa. The Africans mined assets as well as endured huge nourishment deficiencies and starvation conditions that were created from the monetary

introduction of the colonizers' war economy. The African natives suffered at the hands of the colonizers, both socially and economically.

Between 1951 and 1980, nearly forty-eight autonomous country states were created in Africa as a result of numerous successful patriot developments. The changing financial and social conditions made a more positive connection to African political developments. More specifically, the strengths of urbanization and industrialization paved the way for introduction to Western training, and conversion to Christianity gave wide access to patriotism. In the urban communities and towns of Africa, the elites and intellectuals started vocalizing their discontent with the unfulfilled promises by the Western rule. The disagreements increased after World War II, during which, the colonized Africans were denied the rights and opportunities for which they had battled in the European-driven clashes. The Africans were well aware that the war had cleared away European frontiers in Asia. A key image of the European hegemony in Africa was Algeria, a French province since the mid-nineteenth century. Nationalistic battles in the region prompted almost ten years of common war. The Algerian freedom in 1962 was in synchronization with the culmination of mass political gatherings of the *Front de Libération Nationale* (FLN) between 1937-1946. The Algerian women, socially and politically discriminated by the customary society, assumed a greater role in the uprisings. They acted as spies, bootleggers, and even undertook battles. The acceleration of the battle in Algeria, where nearly two million French nationals resided, forced the French government to give freedom to several different regions of the continent.

In French West Africa, African political activity in the end included representation in the National Assembly in Paris after 1946. Work associations were progressively political and the composed strikes and blacklists by African specialists realized the breakdown of the hegemonic framework. In the Gold Coast, which was under the British rule, Kwame Nkrumah returned from the United States, where he had gone for educational purposes, in 1949 and framed the Convention People's Party (CPP), which would turn into a mass gathering and the impetus of the freedom development, delivering sub-Saharan Africa's first free country state (Ghana) in 1957.

The development of autonomy also brought an end to the majority of the customary, aristocratic leaderships that had originated before the colonial period. Officially undermined by the shipper white-collar class, the minister and frontier-instructed elites, only a few conventional African monarchies remained. The survivors were the main focus of the mass political activity, for example, in the illustration of the furnished Mau revolt in Kenya between 1940 and 1955, which started with Waruhiu, and the onset of guerrilla warfare. Amid the Mau battle, the fierce country activity terrified the British colonizers. The British were forced to acknowledge the power of the African people and their struggle for freedom. In other regions of Africa, the focus of freedom was on the representatives of enterprises, for example, the concessionary elastic social event firms of the Congo Independent State, whose African military units had utilized power to gain control over the Central African political economy since the 1920s.

NOTES

NOTES

In different locales, the legacy of provincial standards had proceeded during the greater part of the twentieth century. Unreasonable dependence on costly administrations and military as well as the continuing reliance on Western innovation and capital diminished the accomplishment of political security. In the former Belgian Congo (and also former Zaire), a dangerous blending of these powers of underdevelopment and secret Western meditation into the African politics led to half a century of violence and financial destabilization despite freedom.

The rapid Belgian decolonization in Congo strengthened European social and monetary dominance of urban and mining districts. The discourse by the Belgian ruler, Baudouin, on independence day in 1960, was in praise of the provincial past. His words miffed the Africans, which included Patrice Lumumba (1925-1961) who was a radical patriot and soon turned into a revolutionary. In his battle for freedom, Lumumba passionately specified the grievances against the frontier administration, following which, common agitation, mobs and strikes began.

In the wake of being quickly imprisoned by the frontier rulers, Lumumba was liberated; yet, the former forces were anxious to keep their control over the nation's vital minerals and were fearful of his radical message. Lumumba's political mission for solidarity in his nation was shut down when he was assassinated after an order was issued by the United States Central Intelligence Agency. Lumumba turned into a national saint, while incognito military and financial aid from the United States and European governments underpinned consequent progressive administrations. This included that of Mobutu Seseseko, a pioneer of the 'Popular Movement' of the revolution, with a specific end goal to ensure United States mining benefits in the rich Shaba (Katanga) region. In 1997, Mobutu was dismissed, and a popularity based republic renamed the region as the Congo.

In Africa, autonomy was not 'given' to the settlements by the European powers, nor was it the 'blissful completion' to the battles of the twentieth century. Autonomy was attained by Africans who restricted the imperialist. Not long after freedom was finally accomplished, the Africans realized that the former era of imperial control had turned into neo-imperialism in the form of a 'more up-to-date government', in which atheism and class structure were predominant under the same worldwide arrangement of capital and fund, controlled by multinational partnerships. No experience displays this proceeding with battle against a worldwide framework more plainly than that of nationalism in South Africa.

Nationalism in South Africa

The political and social position of South Africa varied enormously from the African mainland, where European colonial populace was constrained due to the environment and geology. The South African economy had been industrialized since the late nineteenth century, owing to the effect of the revelations of precious stones and gold. The mineral abuse prompted British radical venture into the inner parts of South Africa, where it was met with resistance from Africans and Boers, the relative 'white' ranchers from Dutch, and racially blended wilderness trade and cultivating social orders at the Cape.

This clash brought about the Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902) and set the stage for the social, political and financial remaking after the British triumph in 1902 as well as for the unitary white government under the British crown in 1910. The colonial state hardly coincided with the territorial limits of indigenous politics. The boundaries of indigenous societies were fluid and permeable, and fission and fusion were not uncommon. The Xhosa of South Africa expressed themselves through the saying — ‘land is plentiful but men are scarce’ — which means that power and prestige of a chiefdom were measured by its population and that chiefs who alienated their people could anticipate the sanction of a segment hiving-off as well as affiliating to another chiefdom. With white encroachment and extensive land alienation, African land holdings were increasingly restricted to ‘reserves’ that represented but a fraction of the territory to which they could originally lay claim. Besides being alienated from their land, the Native Africans were also not given a part in governance or allowed to participate in the government. Thus, they were denied voting rights or the right to open offices and pursue business.

A significant defining moment in South African history was the national decision of 1948, through which the nationalist party came into force. The oppressive work laws and practices of the jewel and gold mining commercial enterprises as well as agricultural divisions were inflexibly characterized between 1913 and 1922. After 1948, they were extended by a national approach of isolation and persecution, known as ‘politically-sanctioned racial segregation’. Apartheid arrangements upheld a shade code that supported ‘whites’ over all others and managed where the greater part of African populace could live, travel and work. The natives were methodically restrained from holding political office and voting; yet, their work was vital to the industrialization process. They were obliged to convey character passes that uncovered their racial order. The ‘whites’, despite being the minority, instituted ‘pass laws’ to limit African development and control the convergence of labourers from country to urban zones. Inward security laws sanctioned immunity to terrible human rights infringement on the rights of the native Africans.

Among the individuals who contradicted the legislature and politically-sanctioned racial segregation were two men, who, in the end, won the Nobel Peace Prize for their dissensions — Albert Luthuli and Nelson Mandela. Luthuli headed a deep-rooted, non-violent battle against racial segregation and treachery. His principle of a multi-racial society brought about his detainment and outcast. Mandela was additionally dynamic in the battle against financial and political treachery through his administration position in the African National Congress (ANC). Established in 1912, on standards of non-participation, the Congress, at first, worked through peaceful strategies of mass safety, and inevitably received a system of terrorism administered against the repressive South African state. The points of the ANC and other workers’ organization as well as political pioneers powered overall judgment of the legislature of South Africa. A worldwide anti-apartheid development spread over the industrialized world and focussed on multinational partnerships for supporting the colonizers.

NOTES

NOTES

The battle for freedom in South Africa was prolonged due to the deep crisis that of its economy in the industrialist framework. The diversions of the world economy profited those in force and financial development came at the cost of social equity. However, the resistance of the common people won and was extended to groups like women and children. Mandela, detained for more than twenty years on charges of treachery, in the end, gathered world support for battle against the politically-sanctioned racial segregation framework. Released from jail in 1990, Mandela headed the ANC for political triumph, leading to the end of the politically-sanctioned racial segregation time. As the first 'black' president of South Africa, and being chosen by means of multi-racial elections, Mandela remained one of the world's most commended safety warriors against twentieth-century racial oppression.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS - I

1. What were the two stages of the Chinese upheaval in East Asia?
2. In which year was Burma liberated from British control?
3. Who was the famous leader of the Viet Minh movement in Vietnam?
4. Which clash sparked the Anglo-Boer War in South Africa?

4.3 SAFETY AND INSURGENCY IN LATIN AMERICA

The problems of Latin Americans were completely different from that of the Asian and African colonies. Thus, the procedures of decolonization and development of national freedom within Latin America deserve a special mention. The Latin Americans accomplished an alternate battle against neocolonialism and military-upheld dictatorial governments in the years following the Second World War.

The United States continued using military power to secure its financial and political interests throughout Latin America and the Caribbean in the post-War period. The Organization of American States (OAS), established in 1948, was one of numerous multinational associations established in the aftermath of World War II to encourage rational local advancement approaches. As it was commanded by the US, the OAS can also be perceived as a development of the US approach, defined in the 1823 Monroe Doctrine, which was a policy regarding Latin American countries. It warned the European states to not interfere or try to colonize the North and American states. Such an act would require the US to intervene, as stated by the document.

In their mission for financial improvement and political self-governance, Latin Americans were pulled in the middle of reformist and progressive alternatives. These progressive battles occurred for a few decades in the twentieth century Latin America, namely, Mexico, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Cuba, Bolivia, Peru, Chile and Argentina. These altogether different transformations imparted basic objectives of accomplishing national monetary as well as political freedom.

4.3.1 The Mexican Revolution

The summit of the nineteenth century struggle for autonomy from Spain and control of the Mexican governmental issues accompanied the administration of Porfirio Diaz (1830-1915). The violence of Diaz (1876-1911) saw political steadiness, spectacular monetary advancement for business elites and extraordinary benefits for remote industrialist speculation. However, the poor and indigenous people suffered greatly at the hands of Diaz, who created an army of bandits to carry out attacks. Disappointment over the imbalances brought about by such uneven economic development that profited just the most diminutive minority led to an upheaval that overthrew Diaz in 1910. The new pioneer, Francisco Madero (1873- 1913), crossed the borders of the United States to become the new president in 1911. Madero was upheld by Emiliano Zapata (1879- 1919), who turned into one of Latin America's most famous and powerful agrarian pioneers, right from the beginning.

Zapata, in a manner similar to his predecessors, started his life as a non-literate sharecropper of Native American plunger. He bolstered the exchanging area to the landless labourers. Zapata mobilized Native Americans to Madero's revolution in 1910 as Francisco 'Pancho' Villa (1878-1923) headed Mexican troops northward in support of the insurgency against Diaz. Zapata lost to Madero's strategies when it became clear that the social and monetary change would not occur. Zapata defined his own particular arrangement for agrarian change, called the 'Plan of Ayala', in 1911. With his supporters, he demanded a land area for labourers and seized the haciendas of several elites. Amid the administration that took after Madero, Zapata proceeded with his imperviousness to the legislature, spreading his power to Southern Mexico, while Villa guided the distress in the North. In the wake of walking in Mexico City three times in 1914, Zapata was compelled to withdraw and was murdered after five years by an administration operator. His co-revolutionist, Villa, was killed in 1923. However, the agrarian revolution and endeavours at change did not end here.

Another constitution in 1917 seized religious property, restored public terrains to Native Americans and guaranteed several radical social as well as financial changes. The transactions with US organizations were urgent for political achievement of the National Revolutionary Party (PNR), which came to power with the Mexican Revolution. Moreover, the issue of control over Mexico's oil assets continued to plague Mexico's leaders. Under the leadership of President Lazaro Cardenas (in office, 1934-1940), the redistribution of the area was accelerated. The routes alongside the sub-soil privileges of remote oil organizations were nationalized in 1937. After the work debate in 1938, remote oil properties were seized and the privileges of urban labourers were maintained. Despite the fact that reliant on the offer of selling oil to Germany, Italy and Japan after commencement of World War II, Mexico joined the United States against the Axis controls in 1942.

Since the end of World War II, the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI), renamed from the pre-war PNR, has commanded the administration instead of the legislature being controlled by effective people. Financial battles and political

NOTES

NOTES

defilement have continued to plague Mexican governmental issues. In the 1990s, the former President, Carlos Salinas de Gortari, became involved in a debasement outrage that undermined the guideline of the PRI. In 1994, the Zapatista National Liberation Army, named after the progressive legend Zapata, captured towns in the Southern Mexican state of Chiapas, proceeding with the interest for area change and recognition of the privileges of Native Americans.

4.3.2 The Cuban Revolution

The Cuban progressive, Fidel Castro (b. 1926), headed a dissident development with popular, mainstream support to topple the despotic government led by Fulgencio Batista between 1953 and 1959. The Cuban progressive development objectives were nationalistic — power, financial development and social self-governance. The people of Cuba were distressed with the administration of the totalitarian government, especially in Eastern Cuba. The local workers called for complete insurgency against the past policies of the government that had made the lives of the people miserable, leaving out only a portion of the elites. A moderate liberal in the beginning, Castro became progressively antagonistic to the United States, which sometimes interceded in Cuban issues. He also supported Batista, who contradicted the changes sought by the people of the country. Castro's seizure of American-claimed organizations miffed the United States, who retaliated by dispatching an unsuccessful attack of Cuba in 1961.

Castro became progressively subject to the Soviet Union in the 1960s and gave dynamic support to progressive developments throughout Latin America and Africa. Cuba became the first Western Hemisphere country to adjust itself completely to the Soviet Union. The Argentine progressive scholar and guerrilla pioneer, Che Guevara (1928-67), helped Castro in his ascent to power and eagerly upheld worker-based progressive developments in creating nations, including Angola, Portuguese Guinea, Mozambique and Congo. He turned into a guerilla pioneer in Bolivia, where he established a preparation camp for his adherents in 1966. In the following year, he was caught and executed by the Bolivian armed force, with support from the United States Army.

The American strategy worked against everything Guevara and Castro stood for; yet, they were both recognized as legends to the new left radicals of the 1960s in the United States. As the main reasons for the Cuban Revolution were discovered broadly in the destitution, underdevelopment, abuse and reliance of the Third World, the progressive results engaged several people in distant parts of the globe. The Cuban Revolution attained achievement in pushing women's rights and making training as well as human services accessible to the vast majority.

4.3.3 Insurgency in Nicaragua

The powers of insurgency in the Central American country of Nicaragua rose in the 1930s in the form of a battle against imperialism. The bases of grievances and safety dated to the early years of the nineteenth century (1909-1933), when the United States occupied the country and was involved in battle with guerrilla warriors, headed by Augusto Cesar Sandino (1895-1934). Sandino's requests for

political independence from power and monetary recuperation were taken up in 1961 by the originators of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN). This group was inspired by the Cuban revolutions of Guevara and Castro; thus, it was a political-military group whose objective was to seize power by destroying the bureaucratic and military dictatorship. The group comprised students, who sought to change the dictatorial ways of the past leaders. They were also outraged with the intervention of the United States in the internal matters of the country. The group sought to bring together workers and peasants — as students were greatly inspired by the Marxist-Leninist teachings — to end the system of oppression and exploitation. They were successful in overthrowing the dictatorial government in 1979 and encouraged the formation of a democratic government by organizing people from different sections of the society into mass organizations. They also popularized literacy across the country so that people could fight their oppression at the hands of the capitalists. However, the group continued to use radical and violent methods during its rule.

NOTES

4.3.4 Revolutions in Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador

In Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador, battles between US-upheld administrations and prevalent restriction gatherings reflected the Sandinista insurgency in Nicaragua. The assassination of El Salvador's catholic diocese supervisor, Oscar Romero, in 1980 sparked a common war between the military government and the colonizers. At the point when Oscar Arias, the president of Costa Rica, proposed a peace arrange, the United States withdrew help, apparently to contradict a 'socialist risk' (the Sandinistas). In El Salvador, a conflict broke out, giving way to a full-fledged civil war for twelve years. Civilians were shot dead by death squads and human rights were widely violated by the military. The financial and vital political diversions of the United States managed its approaches, which specifically influenced legislative issues all through Central America. The US is said to have supported the conflict in the country by providing military aid to the government. These Central America countries experienced widespread socio-economic inequality. For instance, in El Salvador, coffee was the major crop that contributed to the national income. However, profits were being made by only the powerful elites. The poor people were further oppressed, finally breaking into protests against the government. The governments of these countries further suppressed people with violence. Other crises like ethnic violence, oil crisis and subsequent rise in prices of food commodities also contributed to the conflict. The repression of the state was met with military action. It will be interesting to note here that the expression 'Banana Republic' portrays the reliance of Central American national economies on solitary merchandise, for example bananas, which permitted multinational enterprises like the United Fruit Company to influence the political lives of the people as well the economies of small nations.

4.3.5 Reliance, Military and Transformation in South America

Latin American economies, like different parts of the worldwide economies, were drawn into world markets in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, extending creation of specific items and misusing assets to meet the requests of a

NOTES

‘universal business’. For instance, in the late nineteenth century, Bolivia, Chile and Peru combated over control of the nitrate stores in the Atacama Desert in light of world interest for nitrate. Chile won the rights for these nitrate stores. However, when the business sector for nitrate fell apart post-World War I due to peace treaties (diminishment sought after) and manufactured substitutes, the Chilean economy was gravely affected. The discovery of oil in Venezuela in 1914 prompted extreme conflict between the rich and the poor in the nation. As in Mexico, oil in Venezuela became a nationalized industry.

Chile

Roughness and upheavals were widespread in achieving political changes in South America. In Chile, the socialist applicant for the presidential post, Salvador Allende (1908-73), won the election in 1970, backed by a liberal coalition. Allende ventured to change Chile by nationalizing commercial enterprises and bringing in social changes, which were treated safely by the right-wing parties as well as the radical left. The military coup in 1973 was successful and Chile entered a long term military management contract under General Augusto Pinochet (1915-2006). In 1993, Eduardo Frei Ruiz-Tagle, the son of the president before Allende, was chosen president. Michelle Bachelet (b. 1951), the first lady president of Chile, was chosen in 2006. She was the daughter of a Chilean official under Allende who was tormented and jailed because of the Pinochet government, and Bachelet was captured and tormented before being banished as well.

Argentina

In Argentina, about a half century of republicanism (1890-1930) was brought to an end after the coalition of military officers and aristocratic people seized force (September 1930). For the accompanying half century, the military was in control of Argentina, building up and finally ending up with the increasingly dictatorial principles of Colonel Juan Peron (1895-1974), who rose as the leader after World War II. In 1955, an overthrow by the military sent Peron into the oblivion, from which he rose to power again in 1973. At the point when Peron ceded power in 1974, his third wife, Isabel, was made the president. Argentina plunged into financial and political turmoil under her administration, and in 1976, she was expelled from office. The following few years saw an arrangement of military juntas that fiercely subdued political restriction by a rule of fear, which incorporated the homicide and vanishing of thousands of individuals. In 1982, officers embraced to rally nationalistic support by endeavouring to reoccupy the Malvinas Islands in the South Atlantic, over which Argentine guaranteed sway, but which the British (who called them the Falkland Islands) possessed and ruled. The annihilation of Argentina in the Malvinas/Falkland War created confusion among the junta and prompted the guarantee of democracy (1983) as well as a return to non-military personnel government (1984). Raul Alfonsin, who was chosen president, was effective in prosecuting the officers in charge of the abusing and savaging the juntas.

Peru

Peru also accomplished shifts in the middle of military and regular citizen government during the course of development of nationalistic identities. The financial policies of Alberto Fujimori (b. 1938) in 1990, related towards restoration of monetary requests, prompted heightened terrorist kidnappings and assaults by the Maoist rebels, known as the Sendero Luminoso or the 'Sparkling Path' guerrillas. A later indigenous radical development, the Tupac Amaru, adopts its name from an eighteenth century defiant Spanish pioneer, who was executed by the Spanish. Like the 'Shining Path' guerrillas, the Tupac Amaru was composed among the workers and looked for support from the Peruvian poor, who had not imparted in the financial additions of the post-War period. In 1996, their attack on the Japanese consulate in Lima and holding of prisoners for four months to help request for the release of Tupac Amaru political detainees brought about a furnished assault by the Peruvian armed force, which killed all revolutionaries and released the prisoners. Consequent governments have attempted to manage political defilement as well as social challenges and financial issues.

NOTES

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS - II

5. What were the Cuban progressive development objectives?
6. What does the expression 'Banana Republic' portray?
7. When was Argentinean republicanism brought to an end?

4.4 DECOLONIZATION AND ARAB PATRIOTISM

The responses of nationalism in the Arab world were characterized by ambivalence and uncertainty. In the early twentieth century, Arab nationalism was still in its infancy, and before the commencement of the First World War, the people of the Arab world, including its intellectuals and notables class members, did not seek the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire. While the possibility of creating an independent Syria had been contemplated in the middle of the nineteenth century, it was done more out of the sense that the Ottoman Empire could be sinking than the attraction of forging an independent state or having political independence. There was no anti-Turkish backlash among the Arab social, cultural and political elites. Regional nationalism began in the form of a possibility of avoiding Istanbul's encroachment on the local authorities. Sayyid Tayib in Basra and Shareif Hussian of the Hejas rejected such ideas, but they were rooted in the traditional patterns of the Empire and not a modern nationalistic sensibility.

Initially, cosmopolitan cities like Beirut manifested such ideas among members of commercial elites. Dissatisfied groups, comprising students and officers, formed secret societies such as Al-Fatat (the young Arab nation society) and Al-Ahd (the covenant) and openly propagated their views from political forums like the Ottoman Administrative Decentralization Party. These people were not more than 100 in 1914, and moreover, did not advocate complete independence of

NOTES

the Arab nation. They protested more against centralized activities and corruption among the elite. The groups sought to promote cultural renaissance as well as self-rule within the context of the Ottoman Empire. The organizations drew their inspiration from the intellectual movement which was older than their own, called Arabism. Arabism comprised many issues, one of which was how to define the relationship between Arab identity and Islam. Yet, the common belief was the revitalization as well as consciousness of the Arab culture and to resist any attempt at westernization.

Syria born Rashid Rida wrote extensively on Arabism of the twentieth century. He argued that it was the Arabs who had brought the word 'Islam' and a national-cultural revolution was necessary to revitalize the Islamic civilization. He also criticized Turkish nationalism. By 1922, he wrote treatises advocating a liberal rule in the Arab world based on Western democracy mixed with Arab national consciousness as well as Islamic values.

This is the backdrop in which Arab nationalism expanded after the First World War. Most Arab politicians shared the view that the identity of the country was rooted in Islam. Thus, it was argued that a distinct Arab nationality could be made within the framework of a decentralized Ottoman Empire. Thus, Arab nationalism developed within the multiethnic empires that shared similar problems and common borders.

4.5 NATIONALIST ENCOUNTERS IN EAST ASIA

Nationalist encounters and related activity in East Asia were the result of domination and oppression by the Western powers and Japanese dominion in the nineteenth and twentieth century respectively. Western colonialism only flared up Japanese patriotism in the mid-nineteenth century, while Japanese dominion in China during the course of World War II offered ascent to Chinese progressive or mass patriotism. Despite the fact that China was never specifically colonized by any Western power, the effect of Western powers starting from the mid-nineteenth century began a century-long battle for national autonomy against the powers of both Western and Japanese colonialism, and in addition, customary society, nationalism and safety in advanced Japan.

4.5.1 Nationalism in Japan

Modern Japanese nationalistic fervour was the result of the 1868 Meiji Restoration, an 'insurgency from above' headed by upper class people who changed the Japanese political, monetary as well as social landscape. Notwithstanding people who believed in the Samurai tradition and contradicted the ouster of the old powers, popularity for the new Meiji government, led by Emperor Meiji, grew manifold from different classes in the Japanese society. These included, for example, ranchers, who could relate to a legacy of nationalism that dated to the Tokugawa period (1600-1868), which was characterized by labour uprisings against the administration of the 'shogun'. The Meiji restoration strengthened the emperor system in Japan. The goals were expressed by the creators of the Meiji Constitution

(1889), who rejected requests of the well-known rights development in the 1880s. They called for more prominent voice and representation in the overseeing of the nation. The declaration of the Meiji Constitution as well as the financial, political and natural popular support for the Meiji state persisted. The Meiji restoration increased industrial output in Japan, but at the same time, gave undue powers to the government, which further increase its military powers. The members of this government consolidated their powers against the remaining members of the samurai class, daimyo and the shogunate. In 1884, agriculturists in Chichibu (Saitama prefecture), who relied on the crude silk generation for their employment, were struck by rural depression, leading to their movement against corruption as well as reduction in expenses. When this conflict came to an end, around 7,000 to 10,000 agitators broke into homes and business locales of moneylenders, taking control over the prefecture. The uprising was soon squashed, four of its pioneers executed, and 3,000 members were either fined or detained. Thus, the Meiji government gained military powers.

One situation which caused widespread indignation in Japan was the modification of the peace treaty between Japan and China in 1895, following a Sino-Japanese War fought largely in Korea. While Japan won the island of Taiwan after the war, it had to give it up later due to international pressure. Another source of grievance was the extra rights to foreign nationals in Japan. This was due to the fact that Japanese laws were deemed inferior to those of the West. However, the extremist groups in Japan were miffed with these privileges and formed groups that sought to reject foreign ideas in Japan. These societies took direct action and killed many government officials.

The Hibiya Riots in 1905 occurred in Hibiya Park in Tokyo and challenged the terms of the Portsmouth Treaty after the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905). The demonstrators assaulted and blazed open work places and structures, including police headquarters. The armed forces were put into action and military law was announced in the Tokyo region. The Japanese government closed down daily papers and magazines that were disparaging of the legislature and restricted shows as well as political exercises in downtown Tokyo near the government headquarters.

At the end of the First World War, which Japan authoritatively joined as an associate of Britain, Japanese women protested against the rising cost of rice in mid-1918. The wages had reduced to keep pace with the inflationary blast of the post-Bellum period, increasing the value of rice which was the main dietary staple. It led to causing hardships for urban specialists, and in addition, for poor ranchers and occupants in the farmland as well. Discontent over rising prices gripped the entire country as mobs protested in more than 300 spots in thirty prefectures. Thousands of people were captured, a large portion of them comprising the Burakumin (the untouchables), which was a minority gathering of the Tokugawa period (1600-1868), who were seriously oppressed in the Japanese society. Some of them were also sentenced to capital punishment. However, the government reacted by diminishing the cost of rice, expanding household generation and importing rice.

NOTES

NOTES

The growth of modern nationalism in Japan until the end of the Second World War is intersected by two themes that are also interrelated:

- The growth of imperialism, culminating in a wartime empire of vast extent
- The victory of ultra-nationalism over liberalism in domestic politics between the two world wars

The economic background of a major industrial revolution commencing from the late nineteenth century needs to be kept in mind as well.

Japanese nationalism can be studied vis-à-vis the Chinese nationalism. When the Chinese protested against the Japanese interests in the Dragon country, a counter attitude emerged in the Japanese army. Moreover, friction between Japan and China arose over several issues. The official Japanese policy hardened against China, and Japan launched a series of attacks on the Chinese frontiers. Thus, in 1931, the attack on Pearl Harbour took place, leading the conquest and occupation of South-East Asia in the Second World War.

Japanese nationalism can be perceived in the context of the South Asian setting, where Japan introduced the concept of the 'New Order' after the World War. The new order was to be achieved under the leadership of Japan. The new order damaged Western prestige, but the Japanese military administration did not gain widespread support for the same. The surrender of Japan to the Allies in August 1945 created a 'soul-searching situation' in the history of Japan. The unity of Japan and the rule of the emperor did not hold good as America ruled the country for the next seven years. The monarchy was retained but it became truly constitutional and informal. Japan was also demilitarized and politically realigned. The atomic bomb attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki created terror in the minds of the people. Japan finally became independent in 1952 with a new constitution and a complex political structure.

4.5.2 Progressive Patriotism and the People's Republic of China

Chinese patriotism developed in two stages — before and after World War II. Nationalism in China turned into a progressive compel that overthrew the customary social traditions and developed the model of mass patriotism manufactured in the wake of the Sino-Japanese War (1937-45). The May Fourth Movement indicated the scholarly rebellion against customary society and government issues, conceived by the Chinese Communist Party (CCP). At first, the developmental model of the Marxists, a significant number of whom were educated in Europe, the CCP, under the administration of Mao Zedong in the 1930s, turned the working class into a well-spring of insurgency. During World War II, Chinese communist guerrillas battled the Japanese and slowly gathered the support of the labour masses. With the defeat of Japan in 1945, the Sino-Japanese War, which was the East Asian 'theater' of World War II, ended. In China, the end of the worldwide clash denoted the commencement of the Common War. The nationalistic fervour, initially motivated by Western imperialism, and later by Japanese colonialism, adopted a progressive structure in the socialist

development. The Communist Party vanquished their rivals in the Common War, or the Chinese Civil War, on the grounds that they could win the support of most of the Chinese individuals as patriots, addressing China against the powers of the Japanese government.

Unrest in the twentieth century

With the triumph of the communists in 1949, the establishment of the People's Republic of China (PRC) was formally put into place. The objective of the new government was the building of a communist society under the leadership of Mao Zedong, who took over as administrator of the CCP. The premier of the country at that time was Zhou Enlai and the most important ally of the Chinese was the Soviet Union. The PRC and the Soviets began a bargain of cooperation and support in 1951 and the two socialist titans established ties between them after the World War. The relationship with the Soviets formed the initial stages of monetary improvement in the PRC, establishing that the Chinese would take after the Soviet model of unified arranging and industrialization.

The Korean War in 1950 added to the nationalistic fervour of the country. The PRC intervened strongly in the Korean War from the North Korean side. The Chinese army also defeated the American troops in the first American-China confrontation in the war. In fact, the Korean War became a new kind of war as the strong Chinese army defeated the American and Japanese troops. China wanted to preserve the communist state of North Korea as it could serve as a buffer between South Korea, which was dominated by the US and Manchuria. As China continued to sponsor the North and the US underpinned the South, there was a fear of World War III taking place. The threat of destabilization and counter-unrest in view of the vicinity of antagonistic strengths led the Chinese communist administration towards a movement, from an initial liberal strategy to experts — supervisors, industrialists, brokers — and finally, to oppression of expert elites related to the previous administration.

The Chinese Civil War further deteriorated the conditions in the country. After Japan surrendered post-World War II, the sovereignty of the people came under attack. The government, led by Chiang Kai-shek, was moved to Taiwan, where numerous government officials and experts also fled in the wake of the Civil War. Chiang remained the president of China in Taiwan and claimed sovereignty over the entire country. The nationalists kept trying to make Taiwan a region of China, anticipating re-unification with the territory. Taiwan thrived monetarily, supported by the United States and the financial framework created by the Japanese during the course of the half-century pioneer occupation (1895-1945).

By 1952, after the end of the Korean War, the new government in China turned its policies towards issues of monetary advancement as well as the communist transformation of society. The communists, under Mao's administration, began to empathize with the worker class and land reform was one of the first projects undertaken and completed by the new government. Land reform had officially begun in a few territories in the late 1940s, and it was seen

NOTES

NOTES

as a national approach after 1949. The Chinese Communist Party increased its peasant support with the help of land reforms, when they came to power in 1949. It also managed to oust the nationalists from power who then took refuge in Taiwan. However, the existence of the CCP came under threat due to ambiguities related to the development of the country. Initially, the CCP adopted the Russian developmental model. However, it only alienated the party from the urban population. Contention was also prevalent over issues of foreign policy and ideology. This led to a break in the CCP, even as the party hastened development by introducing some major programmes.

The clash between the development of the urban classes, and simultaneously, the rural classes, is one of the major issues that remain throughout the historical backdrop of the PRC. This clash can likewise be seen as one between the needs of farming advancement and industrialization. The First Five-Year Plan of the country, formed in 1952, was majorly influenced by the Soviet Plan. The overwhelming industry needed to be underscored and capital financing had to be drawn from the horticulture business. The labourers, who had supported the communists in their ascent to power, had to pay for monetary advancement.

Despite the fact that industrialization continued, the condition of the lower classes remained miserable. In 1955, Mao called for the acceleration of the collectivization of agro business, one of the essential steps around the formation of a communist society. Revamping individual worker ranches into co-agents, aggregates and cooperatives, farming was decided as the best approach to communism. By 1958, Mao presented a more radical arrangement, which was later known as the 'Incredible Leap Forward'. These strategies were intended to adjust the needs of agro business and industry by bringing industry to the farmland. A standout among the most generally exposed and emotional illustrations of this development was the 'terrace steel heater', which obliged workers to deliver iron for industry during the horticulture period. The monetary results of these strategies were quite unsatisfactory. However, the plan failed as it did in the Soviet Union and the people of the country suffered. This harmful policy of Mao is also termed as the 'Great Leap Forward', as it was believed to accelerate growth in the country.

The monetary disappointments of the Great Leap Forward incapacitated Mao's position in the government, and he withdrew from the political spotlight. Notwithstanding the financial issues of the Great Leap Forward, another vision of communist society had been made and vast amounts of individuals had begun to take an interest in legislative issues as well as managerial decision-making. Despite the fact that Mao had lost power in the CCP, he retained the initiative quality among individuals and a base of force in the People's Liberation Army (PLA). By 1964, a political fight to 'gain from the PLA' began, utilizing the armed forces as a model, like in the 1940s, when the Red army led a guerrilla war against the Japanese.

The Cultural Revolution in China

By 1966, Mao had come to serious disagreements with the leaders in the CCP. Regarding the issues pertained to the country's economic and social development.

Mao then called for a cultural revolution, which gave way to serious unrest between the radical wing of the CCP, led by Mao, Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping. The Cultural Revolution boiled over for a few years, most viciously from 1966 to 1968. The most radical declaration of the Cultural Revolution was the Red Guards, mainly comprising adolescents who were roused by Mao's call for a social distress. They closed down colleges and defeated the supporters of the old Chinese society. The Red Guards wrecked libraries, assaulted educators and scoured sanctuaries. The CCP lost control of the circumstances, and the armed forces began attacking the Red Guards, bringing a near war-like situation in the country. When it became clear to Mao that the Red Guards had outlasted their convenience and were under threat of becoming excessively problematic and influential, he withdrew help and attempted to restore peace. The Cultural Revolution took a decimating toll on China, not just financially due to the serious disturbance in horticultural and modern generation, but socially as well. The interruption of education for nearly a decade meant that students were denied access to higher training. Scholarly people, essayists and craftsmen had been aggrieved and assaulted, and many of them committed suicide due to the treatment at the hands of the guards.

After the demise of Mao in 1976, his dowager and three others were assaulted as the notorious 'pack of four' for their radicalism during the Cultural Revolution. The new era of development was then led by Deng Xiaoping, who developed China's new technique for advancement, the four modernizations, namely, horticulture, science and technology, protection as well as industry. Embracing a few aspects of the business economy, and eventually, a free market system, China headed towards an economic improvement model, designed significantly after the Western model than the ideological teachings of Marxism. The thought of a halfway arranged economy, symbolized in the First Five-Year Plan demonstrated after the Soviet Union, was simultaneously surrendered. Respecting various financial requests and assets in diverse territorial economies, the legislature permitted a measure of autonomy in arranging.

China's monetary future started to improve, and after the standardization of relations with the United States in 1978, American support and venture began to support the financial development of the PRC. Along with the arrangements of the four modernizations, which perceived financial improvement as a necessity and ignored the communist change of society, a level of liberalization became evident in China's politics and the academic writings in the early 1980s.

Despite these changes, no real political change had been achieved. In 1989, the 'Majority Rules System Movement' was bloodily smothered with the Tiananmen slaughter on 4 June 1989. The protests at the Tiananmen Square were led by students and supported by a large majority in the country, as it exposed the conflict between political leaders in the nation. While the liberals were seeking reforms at that time, protests had also grown against inflation, unemployment as well as corruption in politics. The protests were triggered after the death of one such liberal reformist, Hu Yaobang. Protesters demanded that the government be accountable for its misdeed and also sought freedom to the press, along with workers' rights over industry. The protests spread to as many as 400 cities, invoking

NOTES

NOTES

the government to use force on the protesters. The government cracked down on the protesters, sending back foreign journalists and imposing guidelines on the press. Hundreds of people were killed by the army and no new reforms were announced. The underlying topic of the conflict was resounded in the historical backdrop of each new nation — the relationship between economic advancement and political rights — between financial improvement and social transformation.

At the point when safety is challenged, as it was in the twentieth century China, political, social and financial policies need to be changed. However, the clash between the old and the new as well as the progressives and the traditionalists may emerge anytime. Tibet was a casualty of the Western dominion in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. After the Chinese Revolution in 1949, the new Chinese government attacked and possessed Tibet. In 1959, Chinese troops mercilessly stifled a Tibetan uprising headed by the Dalai Lama, who fled to India, where he managed a Tibetan government in a state of banishment. Like Gandhi, the Dalai Lama became famous for his peaceful restriction to the Chinese occupation of Tibet, and in 1989, was honored the Nobel Peace Prize. It was the same year when the learner development was stifled at Tiananmen. Progressive patriotism in China induced its own particular nationalistic development, both inside and remotely.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS - III

8. List the two themes that intersect the growth of modern nationalism in Japan until the end of the Second World War.
9. What did the May Fourth Movement in China indicate?
10. Who founded the policy of 'Great Leap Forward'?

4.6 NATIONALISTIC DEVELOPMENT IN EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES

As in China, other socialist social orders created their own nationalistic development. After the demise of Stalin in 1953, specialists in East Germany rose up against their comrade pioneers. The Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev's discourse in 1956, which condemned Stalin, unleashed unforeseen levels of restriction to the Soviet power. In 1956, the hardest test to the Soviet alliance occurred with the Hungarian Revolt, which started in solidarity with a strike by the Polish mechanical labourers. It soon developed into an expansive scale uprising against the Soviets. The Soviets ultimately used the military to end the Hungarian uprising.

As opposed to the disappointment brought by these uprisings, the capability of composed, non-violent work to realize political change was perceived in socialist Poland in the 1980s, when scattered strikes ballooned into a working population revolt. Several unions united under the name 'Solidarity', a national development

that brought up the issues of monetary defects of the nation. It sought to change Poland from a state run by the communist party to the one administered by the chosen delegates of individuals, that is, a democracy. By the summer of 1989, parts of the Solidarity development had been chosen for the Polish parliament (earlier controlled entirely by the Polish Communist Party). They became the first openly chosen party in a socialist nation.

In the post-Bellum world, several countries battled for social and financial equity inside the fringes of the equitable country state, which, in this case, was the United States. Inconsistencies in the local financial conditions pulled in immigrants and led to further division between the rich and the poor. Regardless of the annulment of subjugation and ban on racialism, African-Americans continued to struggle for monetary value, social equity and complete political support in the 1960s. The famous Jim Crow laws that secured isolation of the natives in training, medicinal services, lodging and transportation was established in aftermath of the Civil War. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) was established by a gathering, including W.E.B. Du Bois (1868-1963), mostly in light of the Jim Crow laws. Harvard educated Du Bois was a persuasive and adroit representative for his vision of racial uniformity.

By the 1940s, the native African leaders and non-violent believers began application of the peaceful techniques of Mahatma Gandhi to the racial battle in the United States, advertising non-violent protests. In 1954, a unanimous Supreme Court choice in the Brown versus Leading Group of Education case made racial isolation unlawful. The activities of Rosa Parks, an African American woman, who had defied a city law in Montgomery, Alabama, by declining to surrender her seat on a city transport to a white man started the Civil Rights Movement. The Movement was pioneered by Martin Luther King, Jr. (1929-68) who found in the incident involving Rosa Parks the long lasting duty to common insubordination and peacefulness. In 1963, King was imprisoned for participating in an exhibit against African American isolation. Composed in jail, King's renowned 'Letter from Birmingham Jail' tested commentators on his resistance development. He provided a further impetus to the growth of the 'Black Movement' in America:

'Oppressed individuals can't stay oppressed for eternity. The urge for opportunity will in the long run come... In the event that his quelled feelings don't turn out in these peaceful ways, they will turn out in unfavorable outflows of roughness. This is not a risk; it is a certainty of past.'

While African Americans were brought to the US for slave work in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Asian (especially Chinese) foreigners in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries provided labour to fabricate railroads and mine gold. In the twentieth century, male workers from Mexico were enrolled to work in the United States during World War I (1917). At the point when the United States was engaged in World War II in 1941, the system to bring Mexican labourers into the United States, the Bracero project, was stretched to meet the requests of wartime creation. Enrollment specialists would cross the Mexican outskirts into towns where they would look for men to come to the North and act as transient workers under fleeting contracts.

NOTES

NOTES

The Bracero system ended in 1964, but the undocumented men from Mexico were kept on the fringes of the American society. Their movement for integration from Mexico and Puerto Rico as well as the support of the Cubans after the 1959 transformation brought Fidel Castro to power. Like Asian workers who originated from changed social foundations, Hispanic settlers spoke of differing political, financial and social foundations. While the Cubans, who had fled their national upheaval, settled in urban areas like Miami, Puerto Ricans were amassed in the Hispanic ghettos of New York City. Mexican Americans were the biggest section of the Hispanic populace. Despite the fact that they were initially country workers in the West and Southwest, by the 1950s, the procedure of urbanization had started influencing them, almost as the African Americans, when moved to Northern modern urban communities.

Hispanics became politically dynamic in the social equality developments of the 1960s. Mexican Americans called themselves 'Chicanos'. Cesar Chavez (1927-93) sorted out vagrant workers into the United Farm Workers, which the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO) authoritatively perceived in 1965. In 1968, Chavez headed an across the nation blacklist of California table grapes and lettuce to accomplish work contracts for exploited workers. By the late 1960s, the arrangement of 'La Razaunida' (The Race United) displayed the developing ethnic and political awareness of Hispanic Americans along with their deliberations to accomplish political objectives inside the United States. The 'Tan Berets' were Hispanic activists whose strategies reflected the radical thoughts of the African American Black Panthers, a radical progressive gathering established in 1966 to advertise an independent black state.

Local Americans were additionally politically conscious and dynamic during the 1960s with the establishment of the American Indian Movement (AIM) by urban activists. In 1973, AIM coordinators, Russell Means and Dennis Banks, assumed control over the exchanging post at Wounded Knee, the site of the 1890 slaughter of Sioux individuals by the white cavalry on the Sioux reservation in South Dakota. The Wounded Knee was an effective image of the disloyalties of Native Americans towards the US government, yet it was an additional image of divisions among Native Americans that the AIM promised to address. Different tribes sought diverse agendas and methods to attain their objectives, and by the 1970s, more than 100 separate associations spoke of tribal diversions.

Besides these minorities and the challenge of their integration, women were also a focal point of various nationalist movements. After World War I, women were given the right to vote in the United States, the Soviet Union as well as other European nations after years of activism. After World War II, women displayed an interest in industry and finance in the United States, but were relegated back to oblivion. By the 1960s, the second wave of American women's liberation made utilization of the Marxist idea of class to speak of gender equality. In 1969, a statement of a gathering known as the 'New York Red Tights' claimed that women were an oppressed class. Women's oppression was becoming a political issue, and at the same time, homosexuals started to seek equivalent rights. In the same year, the US police raided a homosexuals' bar in New York's Greenwich Village.

This was the time when supporters resisted the attack on the state on homosexuals and called for their liberation as well as equality in the political and social arena.

‘Independence is the fetish, fad and totem of the times. Everybody who can muster a quorum in a colony wants Freedom Now – and such is the temper of the age that they can usually have it.’

—*Time*, 11 March 1966

Nationalistic movements in Asia and Africa were inspired by union, freedom and independence. Countries that were held as colonies for centuries were seeking their own identities and wanted to write their own destinies. They wanted to be modern states, held together by feelings of nationalism. After the First World War, there was a rapid escalation of nationalist sentiments, activities and expectations across a broad range of social classes, political organizations and military formations across the Russian empire, the Middle East and Central Europe. This trend was further reinforced by the grind of the next war, political and cultural repression as well as economic exactions. However, the framework of the war created opportunities for small and highly motivated groups to shape their nationalistic dreams.

In the formation of these modern states, it became essential to bring together people from diverse backgrounds, speaking different languages and belonging to diverse cultures. In this process, many were forced to accept the domination of a central authority and assimilate in order to strengthen the central figures. The nationalism of Asia and Africa had another feature — it was superimposed on the framework of the national state by unsatisfied people who possessed their own experience of nationalism. Thus, the larger issue of nationalism in Asia and Africa should be discussed along with the smaller nationalism experiences forged by people who believed that they were being held against their will and called for separate identity based on religion, historical background, culture and linguistics. Scholars believe that these mini-nationalisms have not yet come of age and they pose a challenge to the modern nation-states, which were cemented on the ideas of nationalism. Some examples of mini-nationalisms have been discussed earlier, such as, the struggles of the African Americans in America, equality of rights for homosexuals and the attack on Tiananmen Square. Nonetheless, nationalism in Asia and Africa depicted that freedom was the enforceable right of everyone and national societies have the right to determine their own directions and purposes. Thus, the idea of equality underlines the nationalism in Asia and Africa.

Nonetheless, the nationalism of Asia and Africa provided an impetus for creation of modern nation-states. Self-determination and national freedom were their main goals, yet, as these nations ventured into a risk-laden transition in an unfamiliar landscape as well as an exciting and treacherous new terrain, they were confronted with several challenges. They had to repair the ethno-cultural divisions, a factor that caused greater rifts in the new states. As revealed in the above sections, despite attaining freedom from foreign powers, the path to nation-building was not an easy task. The minorities often came under attack in these new states as political powers sought to reconcile political cohesion with cultural diversity. Many believed that all the pieces of a modern state — institutions of

NOTES

democracy, national identity and other such structures — will fit into a perfect puzzle. However, the conflicts in new states show that this has not yet occurred and mini-nationalism experiences continue to challenge their authority.

NOTES

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS - IV

11. In which year did the Hungarian Revolt occur?
12. How was the Civil Rights Movement triggered in America?
13. In which year did the Bracero system come to an end?

4.7 SUMMARY

- The two World Wars and a worldwide despondency undermined European dominion. Its political and monetary strength was further tested by nationalist movements in various colonies across the world.
- The reactions to European dominion changed manifold after the two World Wars, comprising nationalistic fervor in frontier domains, which, in the long-run, gained independence, like India, to the progressive developments in the post-war period that toppled conventional rulers while dislodging European as well as other outside forces, like some previous settlements in Africa and Southeast Asia.
- In East Asia, the Chinese upheaval was experienced in two stages — a nationalistic unrest that denoted the end of the customary government (1911) and a social insurgency, or the Chinese Civil War, (1949) which supplanted a nationalistic military with a Chinese Marxist government that was committed to the Russian model of development as well as the formation of a communist society.
- Marxism and other models for progressive change in the twentieth century were commenced with the American revolutionary battle for freedom from Britain, the eighteenth century mainstream uprisings of the French Revolution along with the social, ethnic and political complexities of the Haitian Revolution. The insurgencies of 1848 in Europe motivated Marx's writings on the relationship between modern free enterprise as well as the country state and prompted the plan of the Marxist model of progressive change.
- Marx's expectation that the declining state of common labourers would lead to a revolution had not worked on the grounds that nation states permitted the development of industrialist finance. Despite the fact that financial disparities persisted, general development implied that conditions for common labourers had not intensified. Lenin inferred that though Marx was not wrong about the ways of capitalistic development, he did not see the unforeseen impacts of the government which led to the expansion of free market system.

- Clashes between nationalists and provincial government powers occurred in the fallout of World War II in very nearly every state in Southeast Asia. The only exemption was Thailand, which had stayed free notwithstanding the British and French dominion in the nineteenth century. The customary Thai monarchy was formally brought to an end by an overthrowing in 1932, which secured a sacred monarchy that proceeded in the post- Bellum period.
- Vietnam, which was a French province since 1857, was seized by patriotic fervor in the early twentieth century under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh. This movement was known as Viet Minh. When Japan surrendered in 1945, Viet Minh gripped the Vietnamese capital of Hanoi and the leaders of the state announced the Democratic Republic of Vietnam with Ho Chi Minh as its leader.
- The Vietnamese communists claimed victory in 1975 with the fall of the Southern capital. Saigon was renamed Ho Chi Minh City after their patriot leader. The Vietnam War gave the United States its first military defeat, which proved to be quite costly to both Vietnamese and Americans. A higher amount of ammunition was used for this war than that by the Allied Powers during World War II, and the utilization of defoliants during the War led to far reaching demolition and contamination of the agricultural field.
- In Indonesia and the Philippines, the combination of nationalistic legacies with complex ethnic and religious sections molded new political and social requests. These legacies additionally made the premise for continuous strains between two prominent movements, the military and political leaders, who were also the dictators. The development for Indonesian independence from Dutch guideline commenced in 1927 with the foundation of the Indonesian National Party.
- African nationalism was concerned mainly with the process of decolonization, independence as well as the development of the largely backward continent, while European nationalism was underlined with power and prestige struggles. Others have argued that European models of nationalism do not go hand-in-hand with the African social, cultural or political traditions. However, even the process of decolonization of Africa needs to be perceived in connection to two worldwide occasions of the twentieth century — the Great Depression and World War II.
- Between 1951 and 1980, nearly forty-eight autonomous country states were created in Africa as a result of numerous successful patriot developments. The changing financial and social conditions made a more positive connection to African political developments. More specifically, the strengths of urbanization and industrialization paved the way for introduction to Western training, and conversion to Christianity gave wide access to patriotism.
- The development of autonomy in Africa also brought an end to the majority of the customary, aristocratic leaderships that had originated before the

NOTES

NOTES

colonial period. Officially undermined by the shipper white-collar class, the minister and frontier-instructed elites, only a few conventional African monarchies remained.

- The political and social position of South Africa varied enormously from the African mainland, where European colonial populace was constrained due to the environment and geology. The South African economy had been industrialized since the late nineteenth century, owing to the effect of the revelations of precious stones and gold. The mineral abuse prompted British radical venture into the inner parts of South Africa, where it was met with resistance from Africans and Boers, the relative 'white' ranchers from Dutch, and racially blended wilderness trade and cultivating social orders at the Cape.
- The problems of Latin Americans were completely different from that of the Asian and African colonies. Thus, the procedures of decolonization and development of national freedom within Latin America deserve a special mention. The Latin Americans accomplished an alternate battle against neocolonialism and military-upheld dictatorial governments in the years following the Second World War.
- Latin American economies, like different parts of the worldwide economies, were drawn into world markets in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, extending creation of specific items and misusing assets to meet the requests of a 'universal business'.
- The responses of nationalism in the Arab world were characterized by ambivalence and uncertainty. In the early twentieth century, Arab nationalism was still in its infancy, and before the commencement of the First World War, the people of the Arab world, including its intellectuals and notables class members, did not seek the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire.
- Nationalist encounters and related activity in East Asia were the result of domination and oppression by the Western powers and Japanese dominion in the nineteenth and twentieth century respectively. Western colonialism only flared up Japanese patriotism in the mid-nineteenth century, while Japanese dominion in China during the course of World War II offered ascent to Chinese progressive or mass patriotism.
- Modern Japanese nationalistic fervour was the result of the 1868 Meiji Restoration, an 'insurgency from above' headed by upper class people who changed the Japanese political, monetary as well as social landscape. Notwithstanding people who believed in the Samurai tradition and contradicted the ouster of the old powers, popularity for the new Meiji government, led by Emperor Meiji, grew manifold from different classes in the Japanese society.
- At the end of the First World War, which Japan authoritatively joined as an associate of Britain, Japanese women protested against the rising cost of rice in mid-1918. The wages had reduced to keep pace with the inflationary blast of the post-Bellum period, increasing the value of rice which was the

main dietary staple. It led to causing hardships for urban specialists, and in addition, for poor ranchers and occupants in the farmland as well.

- Japanese nationalism can be studied vis-à-vis the Chinese nationalism. When the Chinese protested against the Japanese interests in the Dragon country, a counter attitude emerged in the Japanese army. Moreover, friction between Japan and China arose over several issues. The official Japanese policy hardened against China, and Japan launched a series of attacks on the Chinese frontiers. Thus, in 1931, the attack on Pearl Harbour took place, leading the conquest and occupation of South-East Asia in the Second World War.
- Chinese patriotism developed in two stages — before and after World War II. Nationalism in China turned into a progressive compel that overthrew the customary social traditions and developed the model of mass patriotism manufactured in the wake of the Sino-Japanese War (1937-45). The May Fourth Movement indicated the scholarly rebellion against customary society and government issues, conceived by the Chinese Communist Party (CCP).
- With the triumph of the communists in 1949, the establishment of the People's Republic of China (PRC) was formally put into place. The objective of the new government was the building of a communist society under the leadership of Mao Zedong, who took over as administrator of the CCP. The premier of the country at that time was Zhou Enlai and the most important ally of the Chinese was the Soviet Union. The PRC and the Soviets began a bargain of cooperation and support in 1951 and the two socialist titans established ties between them after the World War.
- As in China, other socialist social orders created their own nationalistic development. After the demise of Stalin in 1953, specialists in East Germany rose up against their comrade pioneers. The Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev's discourse in 1956, which condemned Stalin, unleashed unforeseen levels of restriction to the Soviet power. In 1956, the hardest test to the Soviet alliance occurred with the Hungarian Revolt, which started in solidarity with a strike by the Polish mechanical labourers. It soon developed into an expansive scale uprising against the Soviets.
- In the post-Bellum world, several countries battled for social and financial equity inside the fringes of the equitable country state, which, in this case, was the United States. Inconsistencies in the local financial conditions pulled in immigrants and led to further division between the rich and the poor. Regardless of the annulment of subjugation and ban on racialism, African-Americans continued to struggle for monetary value, social equity and complete political support in the 1960s.
- Nationalistic movements in Asia and Africa were aspired by union, freedom and independence. Countries that were held as colonies for centuries were seeking their own identities and wanted to write their own destinies. They wanted to be modern states, held together by feelings of nationalism. After the First World War, there was a rapid escalation of nationalist sentiments,

NOTES

NOTES

activities and expectations across a broad range of social classes, political organizations and military formations across the Russian empire, the Middle East and Central Europe.

- The nationalism of Asia and Africa provided an impetus for creation of modern nation-states. Self-determination and national freedom were their main goals, yet, as these nations ventured into a risk-laden transition in an unfamiliar landscape as well as an exciting and treacherous new terrain, they were confronted with several challenges. They had to repair the ethno-cultural divisions, a factor that caused greater rifts in the new states.

4.8 KEY TERMS

- **Insurgency:** It is a rebellion against a constituted authority when those taking part in the rebellion are not recognized as belligerents.
- **Hispanics:** They are Spanish-speaking people living in the US, especially of Latin American descent.
- **Apartheid:** It is a policy or system of segregation or discrimination on grounds of race.
- **Military junta:** It is a *military* group controlling a government after taking control of it by force.
- **Shogun:** A Shogun was a hereditary military governor in Japan during the shogunate period from 1192 to 1867. In this period, the shoguns were the de facto rulers of the country, though officially they were appointed by the Emperor.
- **Daimyo:** They were one of the great lords who were vassals of the shogun in feudal Japan.
- **Dowager:** A *dowager* is a widow who holds a title or property derived from her deceased husband.

4.9 ANSWERS TO ‘CHECK YOUR PROGRESS’

1. The two stages of the Chinese upheaval in East Asia were as follows:
 - A nationalistic unrest that denoted the end of the customary government (1911).
 - A social insurgency, or the Chinese Civil War, (1949) which supplanted a nationalistic military with a Chinese Marxist government that was committed to the Russian model of development as well as the formation of a communist society.
2. Burma was liberated from the British control in 1948. After freedom, the Burmese patriot pioneers were embroiled in battles within their state with the military. In 1989, the name of the nation was formally changed to Myanmar.

3. The famous leader of the Viet Minh movement in Vietnam was Ho Chi Minh.
4. The South African economy had been industrialized since the late nineteenth century, owing to the effect of the revelations of precious stones and gold. The mineral abuse prompted British radical venture into the inner parts of South Africa, where it was met with resistance from Africans and Boers, the relative 'white' ranchers from Dutch, and racially blended wilderness trade and cultivating social orders at the Cape. This clash led to the Anglo-Boer War in South Africa.
5. The Cuban progressive development objectives were nationalistic — power, financial development and social self-governance.
6. The expression 'Banana Republic' portrays the reliance of Central American national economies on solitary merchandise, for example bananas, which permitted multinational enterprises like the United Fruit Company to influence the political lives of the people as well the economies of small nations.
7. The Argentinean republicanism (1890-1930) was brought to an end after the coalition of military officers and aristocratic people seized force (September 1930).
8. The two themes that intersect the growth of modern nationalism in Japan until the end of the Second World War are as follows:
 - The growth of imperialism, culminating in a wartime empire of vast extent
 - The victory of ultra-nationalism over liberalism in domestic politics between the two world wars
9. The May Fourth Movement in China indicated the scholarly rebellion against customary society and government issues, conceived by the Chinese Communist Party (CCP).
10. The policy of 'Great Leap Forward' was founded by Mao Zedong.
11. The Hungarian Revolt occurred in the year 1956.
12. The Civil Rights Movement was triggered in America by the activities of Rosa Parks, an African American woman, who had defied a city law in Montgomery, Alabama, by declining to surrender her seat on a city transport to a white man.
13. The Bracero system came to an end in the year 1964.

NOTES

4.10 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. Briefly discuss the Marxist model of progressive change.
2. How was autonomy attained by the people of Africa?
3. Why was the battle for freedom in South Africa prolonged?

4. Write a short note on the revolutions in Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador.
5. Briefly explain the nationalist movement in Japan.

NOTES

Long-Answer Questions

1. Write a detailed note on the accomplishments of Ho Chi Minh in Vietnam.
2. Discuss the freedom struggles of the countries in Southeast Asia.
3. Elucidate the struggle for freedom and subsequent rise of nationalism in Africa.
4. Explain the freedom struggle and problems of insurgency in Latin America.
5. 'The responses of nationalism in the Arab world were characterized by ambivalence and uncertainty.' Critically comment on this statement.
6. How did the patriotism develop in China? Explain the Cultural Revolution in China.
7. Describe the nationalistic development in Europe and the United States.

4.11 FURTHER READING

Kedourie, Elie. *Nationalism in Asia and Africa*. Oxon: Frank Cass and Company Limited, 1970.

Christie, Clive J. *Southeast Asia in the Twentieth Century: A Reader*. London: IB Tauris and Co. Ltd., 1998.

Okoth, Assa. *A History of Africa: African Nationalism and the De-colonisation Process*. Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers Limited, 2006.

Walshe, Peter. *The Rise of African Nationalism in South Africa: The African National Congress 1912-1952*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1970.

UNIT 5 NATION-BUILDING IN ASIA AND AFRICA

NOTES

Structure

- 5.0 Introduction
- 5.1 Unit Objectives
- 5.2 Post-Freedom Processes: Nation-Building and National Integration
- 5.3 Nation-Building in India
- 5.4 Summary
- 5.5 Key Terms
- 5.6 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 5.7 Questions and Exercises
- 5.8 Further Reading

5.0 INTRODUCTION

As discussed in the last unit, the nationalist movements in Asia and Africa were complex occurrences, at once comprising of issues of citizenships, rights, power as well as politics. Once the movements achieved one of its ends—that is, the freedom of many colonies of Asia and Africa—these countries had newer struggles to meet. Nation building and integration of different communities into a 'nation' was one of those. These challenges had to be met amid issues such as socio-economic development, rights of minorities, as well as developing ways to deal with the upsurges that continued to challenge the existence of new nations.

Within such complexities, nationalism no longer remained an ideology or the state of mind. It no longer had only an emotional appeal for the masses but had great impact on the character of specific nationalisms. Nationalism was indeed rooted in history and it was from history that a new nationalism had to be constructed in the new-born nations to accomplish a society based on shared history and culture. This is referred to as nation-building. It is a dynamic process where the national aspirations go beyond those of a single community; wherein the socio-political-cultural identity is sought in national ideals and institutions and where the nation-in-the-being becomes the function of a social and political movement. A sense of patriotism or allegiance to a nation is important to nation-building and thus it requires going beyond or transcending the primordial feelings towards one's own community, caste, religion, language, state, etc. The task is to reach a stage where there is a national consensus on institutions and where social conflicts are both articulated and resolved through these institutions.

However, when the nation is in the process of becoming, such a period is often characterized with internal conflicts and social strife. These are clashes over resources, values and interests, over integration, exclusion and inclusion, discrimination as well as oppression. These conflicts have the tendency to de-

NOTES

stabilize a nation, yet they form the very being from which a new nation is finally galvanized. In fact, a modern state had been recognized to have the greater powers to form a 'nation', i.e. attain independence from foreign domination and become a sovereign, secular and a democratic state. In this unit, we shall learn of the problems of nation-building in different states of Asia and Africa even as they tried to develop socially and economically as well as preserve their unity and integrity.

5.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Examine the process of nation building and national integration
- Discuss the process of nation building in Africa and Asia
- Analyse the problems of national integration
- Describe continued nationalist upsurges within the newly-formed states

5.2 POST-FREEDOM PROCESSES: NATION-BUILDING AND NATIONAL INTEGRATION

After the conclusion of the Second World War, the colonies held by the British, Dutch and French empires yearned for freedom and were engulfed in nationalist struggles. The countries under foreign domination were reverberating on the beats of anti-colonialism and their leaders merged the ideology of nationalism with freedom that generated unprecedented revolts in various states of South Asia. All major world powers around the time came under the attack from their colonies except the United States of America which had granted freedom to its colony—the Philippines—immediately after the conclusion of the Second World War. This was not the case with other countries, who wanted to maintain the hold over their colonies. A major highlight of this period was thus the nationalist struggles and freedom to major countries in Asia and Africa, followed by the problems of national integration which they faced in the course of socio-economic development post independence.

While some states granted freedom to their colonies, others were not so eager. This was so in the case of India, where the British passed on the reigns of the country to its people only after a prolonged struggle. Nonetheless, countries where freedom was easily granted and those which had to go through a period of long conflict faced the outbreak of violent civil strife which was reflective of communal and ethnic antagonisms in these decolonized states. This was the dilemma of many new nations, where on one hand they were fighting for freedom from foreign domination while on other, they were battling ethnic forces within their nation-states. Communalism, which has a special connotation in the Indian context, became a recurrent problem. Riots between people of different religions dominated the Indian society even before independence on August 15, 1947. Even at that time, the idea of two different states of India and Pakistan was unforeseen. After Partition, riots

continued in great numbers and led to the killings of millions of Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs who managed to cross the newly drawn borders alive.

New countries like India, and even Pakistan, thus faced insurmountable odds. For instance, Pakistan, which was formed as an ideal Islamic state by the Muslim League, was beset with religious and linguistic antagonisms in both the wings— West and East Pakistan. Divided into two parts, thousand miles apart, constitutional government soon collapsed into a dictatorship. In 1971, the tension that beset the two wings broke out into a total military conflagration referred to as the Bangladesh war of liberation.

A year after Indian independence, the British Labour government granted freedom to its colonies like Ceylon, Malaya and Burma. The Dutch East Indies declared its independence at the end of the Second World War. The Dutch had resisted the independence movement for four years till it finally granted independence to its colony. In 1949, the Republic of Indonesia was recognized as an independent nation with a population of one hundred and twenty-five million. With the surrender of Japan in the Second World War in 1945, the Vietnamese nationalists, under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh declared the birth of 'independent' and 'democratic' Republic of Vietnam. The French imperialists, who sought to redeem their lost position, were violently opposed by the nationalists in Vietnam. In 1954, the French government admitted defeat in this struggle and ceded the northern part of Vietnam to the communist control. Africa was the last of the continents to rise against European imperialism and the history of Africa since the end of the Second World War has been the story of European domination.

Since Britain and France had the maximum number of colonies in Africa, they were the European countries which were most affected by these nationalist struggle. After the conclusion of the Second World War, France faced unrest and protests from within the North African empire. Predominantly Muslim, the population was greatly affected by Arab nationalism which was raging in the Middle East. Finally succumbing to the pressure, France granted independence to Morocco and Tunisia in 1956. In Algeria, the situation was much more complex, as the country comprised a significant number of French settlers, numbering about a million, they feared a backlash by the native Algerians once the French withdrew and Algeria was granted independence. Attempts by the French government to withhold independence resulted in open revolts in Algeria led by the Algerian nationalists. Though France recalled her legendary nationalist leader de Gaulle back to power, France was forced to grant Algerian independence in 1962. Most of the other French colonies in Africa were also granted their independence by then. British experiences in Africa over her colonies were also similar to that of France. The native population, under the influence of the spirit of nationalism, was rebellious against British rule. One of the most persistent sources of irritation was the native terror bands that endangered British life and property in Africa. One such band was the Mau Mau in Kenya. In 1957, Great Britain granted independence to the Gold Coast colony which was named the Republic of Ghana. The birth of Ghana was the first step in the decolonization of Africa. By 1965, all of British African Empire had been decolonized. The decision of the allies to free Libya from Italian

NOTES

NOTES

control was realized in 1951. In 1960, Italy granted independence to Somalia in East Africa. Belgium also granted freedom to its colony Congo. With Portugal granting freedom to her colonies in 1975, most of the colonial empires in Africa were decolonized. For most of Africa, the curtains came down on European colonial domination, a process that started in the fifteenth century.

The conflicts faced with the realization of freedom in mind were nothing compared to what the nations had to face after independence. Decolonization in most cases did not bring peace and prosperity. In most colonies in Asia and Africa, the arbitrary drawing of borders by imperial officers and representatives created insurmountable problems for people and only added to the existing crises. Besides ethnic tensions, most of the former colonies that had gained independence were faced with these challenges: economic development with distributive justice; egalitarian social transformation; democratization of politics and institutions; secularization of polity, education, and civic activities; and national integration.

With these challenges confronting the new states, it was evident that the roots of most of them lay in the politics and policies of the former colonies, the politics of the anti-colonial movements and also the strategies adopted by leaders of various national movements during their anti-colonial struggle. Scholars have argued that these strategies proved to be counterproductive, especially in meeting the challenge of national integration, once the anti-colonial struggles came to an end. Most colonial states were constructed out of lands inhabited by diverse communities, whether ethnic, linguistic and religious. The presence of multiple communities within states constructed by the colonial forces only contributed to making the post-colonial situation more complicated as each of these communities began to assert their autonomy with the withdrawal of the colonial power. Ethnic conflicts became common and outweighed all other forms of political confrontation after freedom in many former colonies of the western world. Why these conflicts increased found a lot of deliberation in the academia. Authors fell back to nationalist thinking, and postulated a universal desire for cultural rootedness and thus ethnic conflicts in different countries. Western scholarship also viewed the new states as being unable to manage their heterogeneity in terms of ethnic or cultural diversity to be able to function as normal nation-states.

This debate had its roots in colonial history. One of the major developments of the colonial rule was its attempt at evolving a great degree of political integration and homogeneity within the colonial states, irrespective of the diversities that preexisted the colonial arrival. It was thus argued that the weakening of the colonial rule, especially the moment of its withdrawal, was also the moment of an ethnic implosion. Asserting one's ethnicity was this seen as a response to the excessive attempts of the colonial state to impose the modern project characterized by the imposition of homogeneity from above and attempt to shape the communities and their resources around the realization of global capitalism. It was often accompanied by attempts to shape a world culture based on modern technology, pervasive information and communications network and a universalizing education system.

Another thesis on the pervasive nature of ethno-nationalist wars has argued that new countries have a basic violent character, since they have recently experienced

extreme forms of nationalist violence in the form of freedom struggles, for instance in India, Pakistan and in tribal regions of Africa. This argument has risked reproducing the mutual stereotyping between those factions within a nation-state that are at war. Such arguments were followed by a more analysed thesis that revealed how violence was patterned and assisted by politics and politicians who desired to achieve power in a newly built nation-state.

Nation building is also closely linked to constructing a national identity. Even for the colonialists, identity construction was an important task. However, their identity construction project was linked to the 'white man's burden', i.e., of universalization of identity. The project of modernity entails, as Professor Rajni Kothari stated, 'a new mode of homogenizing and of straight jacketing the whole world.' There is no denying that the onset of colonial rule had successfully ensured the integration of the communities of Asia and Africa to the global capitalist system. Along with this integration, non-European societies of the colonies also became susceptible to the modern project of universalization. Universalization project had three major dimensions. The first, as Professor Rajni Kothari points out was 'a conscious effort to project a particular into a universal, expecting the rest of the world to accept the world view and organizing principles of that particular. Second, it is the effort to universalize secular and temporal spaces. Third, the modernist perspective on universalization and homogenization is colonizing, necessarily rejecting all other universals and castigating them as a historical and anachronistic or at best historical antecedents to this more 'scientific' and 'rational' and hence superior universal. It is a mode of homogenization that takes upon itself the task of fragmenting and splintering all other social and ethnic cohesions, undermining all other unities and imposing its global will and power on all others. It is the first claim to universality that leaves no one out of its domain. Every other entity or belief system is by definition illegitimate. There is only one legitimate structure of power, morality and truth. All others are invalid.' As a result of this universalist project, colonies came under the influence of the western cultural-intellectual values which were projected to them as universally valid and superior to her own traditions.

NOTES

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS - I

1. When was the Republic of Indonesia recognized as an independent nation?
2. What is referred to as the first step towards the decolonization of Africa?
3. According to Professor Rajni Kothari, what are the three major dimensions of the universalization project?

The post-colonial state went on an almost similar path in the process of nation building and identity construction. It attempted to subjugate the immensely rich and diverse human experience of communities within the colonies in the process of creating a homogenous, national identity. Thus, assertions of ethnicity became the method by which this diversity could be protected and the

NOTES

homogenization project could be resisted. Ethnicity, in this sense was a method by which the 'other' could assert their worth in a world where the modern European nations sought to bring all 'others' under their control and colonize and homogenize them and undermine their life and lived experience. This is one of the major links between the extension of modern European nationalism through the colonialism project and the emergence and expansion of ethnic movements across the non-European world.

Asserting ethnicity thus was not just about colonial experience and of its ideological context, but also in the historical processes that constructed it. A.K. Thakur in his 'Interwoven or Partitioned: Relooking the Societies of Arunachal Pradesh' has argued that 'the practitioners of ethnicity and identity have produced large literature after 1970s and the interaction of context and theory are largely visible in these accounts. The beginning and continuance of communal and linguistic divisions in postcolonial states, the emergence of new and remembered nationalisms in Eastern Europe after 1989, the reassertion of regional/national identities in Western Europe, the increased significance of religious identities as in the Balkans and the Islamic world, the impact of immigration on Western Europe and North America, have all brought old certainties into question.' Moreover, these developments were able to challenge the theory of modernization, according to which the older, traditional, customary identities and loyalties were believed to disintegrate under the impact of an increasingly powerful and global modernity of which the nation-state was a major agent.

From the early 1980s onwards, French social and critical theory, particularly that of Foucault, together with Edward Said's *Orientalism*, had a major impact on a range of disciplines: on literary theory and anthropology, and especially on the emerging disciplines of cultural studies and postcolonial studies, but also on sociology, political science and history. The emphasis placed by Foucault on the role of powerful interested elites in structuring the idea of nation, and the enthusiasm of Said's followers for unmasking the 'discourse of colonialism' deflected attention from nation-state towards alternative, subaltern, diasporic identities, such as the working class, women, immigrants etc. More recently, scholars have sought to dismantle the entire paradigm and the grand narratives it sustained. Those developments are the product of the interplay between shifts in social and critical theory, often mediated through closely related disciplines, and changes in the wider political, social and cultural context.

A major division of views that underlies much recent discussion of collective identities, particularly ethnicity and also nationality, is that between primordialism and constructivism (also known as circumstantialism or instrumentalism). Primordialists believe that identities are deeply rooted in history and are based on descent, language and culture. Early writers operating within racist assumptions were primordialists by definition. More recent primordialists, for example Clifford Geertz and Edward Shils, have argued that ethnic attachments are so rooted in perceived common descent, and in shared language, territory, custom and religion as to have 'an ineffable, and at times overpowering coerciveness in and of themselves'.

Constructivists, by contrast, argue that modern nations are products of Enlightenment and revolutions of the late eighteenth century, and that ethnic identities, including other features of recent social life, were ‘constructed’ by a series of intellectual and social and political ends. In recent discussions on ethnicity in the academia, constructivist views have been dominant. Some, for example Adrian Hastings and Anthony Smith, have pressed for a modified primordialism, particularly by insisting on the deep historical roots of identities of various sorts.

Hans Kohn, discussed in detail in the first unit, had distinguished between ‘western’ nationalism, which is argued to have emerged in England and France during 1600-1800, from ‘Eastern’ nationalism. The ideas have been put forth in his book *The Idea of Nationalism* (1945). In the case of western nationalism, nations are identified with masses and political institutions and movements. They thus serve to provide a cultural justification for an already existing political structure. In the case of eastern states, nationalism as an ideology is used to defend the creation of modern nation states in those parts of the world which are not fully developed, whether economically and politically. Therefore, in such nations, political boundaries can be redrawn in conformation with the larger ethnographic demands, i.e. in justification of the intervention of other nation-states in the political processes. The distinction between western and eastern nationalisms serves dual purposes: descriptive and normative. It is helpful in classifying nationalisms found in post-colonial states as well as explains their viability or dangerous forms. In the academia, while the Western nationalism is considered authentic, liberal, democratic, and good, the Eastern is stereotyped as alien, ethnic and racist.

A recent division has been identified between civic and ethnic nationalism (see for example Liah Greenfeld, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*, 1992). In civic nationalism, nationality is equated with citizenship. Therefore, its definitions are primarily within the political or legal frameworks. Civic nationalism is also concerned with a sense of commitment towards rights and duties of a nation. It is thus voluntarily embraced and can be taken or given up any time. It can also be interpreted within the civic nationality framework that certain individuals can be without a nationality at any given time.

Ethnic nationality has its basis in the biological necessity. It goes beyond individual choice. It is inherited and runs in families from generations. Therefore, it is argued that a person is born into a certain nationality, which in turn determines their interests and a sense of belongingness to a certain nation. Liberal and western observers have adopted this distinction since it has allowed them to differentiate between ‘the idea of a freely chosen, politically decent nationalism (such as one might find in the civic pride of Americans), and the nationalism that celebrates inherited cultural identity (of the type that is found in, and causes conflict within, many East European and other countries).’ Nationalism has also been identified in terms of modern religion or of civil or civic religion. Therefore, in contemporary scholarly works, one finds association of nationalism with religions like Islam and Judaism.

NOTES

NOTES

Religious pluralism, identified and asserted in the form of ethnic mobilizations, became a regular feature in the modern historical approaches. In the nineteenth century, ethnicity in Europe became the foundation for emergent nationalisms as a struggle to emerge out of heterogeneous imperial states. But the ethnic assertion of the twentieth century were pitted against existing nation states as they attempted to replicate earlier models of homogenous European nation states on multi ethnic geo-political spaces. They were a revolt against the centralizing tendencies of the new states which sought to promote a national culture gathered around a national centre. These assertions were on most occasions the expressions of new nationalities and attempts to carve out a nation state from larger nation states. At times they were also assertions to assert the existence of plurality against attempts to hegemonize national spaces. These processes have been fraught with many problems as assertions against these tendencies have surfaced in different parts of the new states that came to life with decolonization. India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka have been a witness to ethnic conflicts almost immediately after their independence.

In the present times, ethnic assertions have both positive and negative connotations. It is important to know here that ethnicity refers to the feeling of a shared culture, history, language, geographical area and socio-political institutions. In historical debates, ethnicity has commonly formed the basis for nationalistic assertions. Assertions on the basis of ethnicity are not unique to Africa and have taken place in countries like the former Soviet Union, former Yugoslavia, Northern Ireland, Quebec, Kurdistan, Sri Lanka and East Timor. A section of scholars has argued that ethnicity is also constructed and given coloured connotations as has happened in the case of Africa, where tribal assertions are seen as uncivilized. In other words the so-called tribe or ethnicity which offered a basis for self-identification of groups is treated as a hindrance to the development of the nation state. These are (i) a community of people with physical space and emotional attachment to this space no matter where they find themselves; (ii) a common language and myth of common descent; and (iii) common culture.'

The current state of ethnic assertion has to be comprehended in the context of the colonial period, its politics and its philosophy. It is thus important to not only explore the role of the policy of divide and rule of the colonizers but also look at the colonial educational policies which in turn raised community elites and assertion of communal interests. The colonial recognition to caste groups needs to also be contextualized to explore the role it played in the construction of challenges and crisis of the post colonial states. The arbitrary construction of boundaries for different states during independence was also a source of many problems, as well shall read in the next sub-section. Integrating the interests of the national minorities was also an important challenge. The minority question was not unique to decolonization. E.H. Carr has shown in his work '*Europe between the Two World Wars*' that one of the most chronic crises faced by post war Europe was the minority question which emerged as a consequence of majoritarian nationalism. But in terms of scale and magnitude, one of the more negative carryover from colonial politics into the post colonial period were the notions of 'majority' and 'minority'. This idea, both as an idea and a legal denominator,

has been one of the most significant banes of plural societies. Rajni Kothari has pointed out: 'Majoritarianism has emerged as the creed of some paranoid individuals who then try to poison the minds of an entire community who happen to be diverse and differentiated (castes, occupational groups, linguistic groups, even groups having diverse religious symbols and community-based Godheads), but who are asked to stand together as one large and numerous mass and face the threat from the 'minorities'.'

On the other hand, the minorities whose identity is a construction of the result of majoritarianism also try to build their identity but based on the feeling of alienation and otherness. This 'minoritism' is constructed as a binary or a counter product to the majority community. Kothari has pointed: 'The paranoia of the majority is matched by the paranoia of the minorities, pushed to the wall by the growing assent on numbers in a 'democracy' and feeling discriminated against and pushed around, there develops that curious psychic state called the minority complex.'

The emergence of fear and insecurity contributes to the gradual alienation of minority communities from the nation-state of which they are a part and also from within the nation which is constantly dwelling on policies to integrate them. The Hindus, Muslims, or the Malays or the Sinhalese or even the people living in the North Eastern part of India have been diverse despite all national attempts to understand them as monolithic umbrella communities. However, this diversity has at times led to conflict. As Kothari has argued: 'Such a paranoia of the minorities, in another chain reaction, reinforces the paranoia of the majority, now generating a strange tendency of adopting the style and stance of the insecure minorities.'

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS - II

4. How was the process of nation building and identity construction characterized in the post-colonial state?
5. What do primordialists believe with respect to identities?
6. What is the purpose of the distinction between western and eastern nationalism?

5.3 NATION-BUILDING IN INDIA

In the context of India, the crises that started the new state after independence were countless. It was perhaps the outcome of what Sajal Nag has identified as the 'dilemma arising from the Eurocentric nature of the nationalistic discourse and its applicability'. This refers to the blind application of the European national discourse, without contextualizing the issues central to the native concerns. As per argument of one section of scholars, the new state identified its challenges, goals and development policies keeping in mind the concern of the rising middle

NOTES

NOTES

and upper classes, especially those that belonged to the majority community. This gave rise to increasing sense of alienation from the state within the minority communities, leading to the rise of communalism which took various forms in terms of linguistic, ethnic and religious communalism. Linguistic plurality was one of the challenges that independent India had to meet. The rise of the movement to promote Urdu in the colonial United Province gave rise to the movement to promote Hindi. Linguistic communalism gradually combined with religious communalism to give communal forces an added strength. On one hand, while there was a movement to save Urdu, the cause of Hindi came to be championed by the Hindu fundamentalist leaders in colonial India. Therefore, the colonial past of the country weighed heavily in the shaping of her post-colonial destiny.

The roots of post-colonial ethnic revival and minority question cannot be understood outside their colonial contexts. As the colonial power achieved a considerable success in achieving a certain degree of political and administrative unity, nationalist movements came to organize themselves on ethno-linguistic lines to crush the colonial powers. The context of linguistic reorganization of provinces could be an important case in point. The principle of linguistic reorganization could be witnessed in the Government of India Dispatch of August 25, 1911, which formed the basis of separation of Bihar from Bengal. In 1916, the Congress also tried through the Lucknow Pact to achieve a working relationship with the Muslim League and also seeking to organize its provincial units on ethno-linguistic lines. In 1916, the issue of reconstitution of the Madras province and the formation of Telugu-speaking districts into a separate province came to the fore of Congress deliberations at its Lucknow session. It finally got the recognition in the All India Congress Committee meeting in April 1917. By 1920, the principle had gained legitimacy in the Congress circles.

‘Thus the twenty provincial committees were reorganized to make them linguistically and culturally more homogenous,’ P. Sitaramayya has argued. The colonial experience had brought some key conflicts to the fore. However, post independence, these priorities underwent rapid changes. Although India began its post-colonial journey with the objective of asserting its nationhood, it had to make several adjustments in response to the roadblocks encountered by it. Thus while asserting the necessity for national integration, it evolved ideals like unity-in-diversity, nation-in-the-making and multi-cultural, multi-ethnic state, captured in the opening lines of the Constitution, ‘India, that is Bharat, is a union of state’.

The priorities of anti-colonial mobilization of the colonial period gave way to post-colonial adjustments for national integration. Gunnar Myrdal, a well-known exponent of Asian Studies, has pointed out that ‘in India there has been lively and increased discussion of the need for ‘emotional integration’’. State reorganization in the pre- and post-independence period has been a major contributor to the rise of ethnic and cultural assertions in India. Commenting on the situation, Paul Brass wrote in his work ‘Politics of India since Independence,’ ‘The British gave official preference to the Bengali language in the East rather than to Assamese and Oriya and to Urdu in the North rather than Hindi. They provided separate electorates and other political concessions to Muslims and Sikhs. They allowed migration of

plains people into Tribal areas in central India but forbade it in some parts of the North East. They patronized the non-Brahmin movement in South India when Brahmins were leading the Indian National Congress there.’

Integration was an important part of nation building. After independence, the new government, along with various state governments, sought to balance the social hierarchy of the country and give recognition to the downtrodden groups. Recognizing their local dialects was one of the ways to integrate them within the nation. Therefore, while Hindi was adopted as the official language of the country and of the northern states, Assamese was adopted as the official language of Assam against the wishes of a large Bengali speaking minority and many Tribal groups. Separate electorates for Muslims and Sikhs were done away with, but reservation of legislative seats and administrative and educational places for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes were retained or introduced. Under the leadership of Jawaharlal Nehru, the central government pursued pluralist policies while dealing with the different language and culture movements. Therefore, the state recognized especially ‘the large language groups among whom major mobilizations developed for the creation of separate linguistic states’

National integration is crucial for any nation with socio-cultural, religious, linguistic and geographical diversities. Moreover, it is concerned with the protection of the nation at different levels. National integration is primarily integration of minds and a sense of belonging to that work for the socio-cultural, economic, political welfare of the state, its protection, and contributes to nation-building. It is a cooperation and not an assimilation of individual and societal identities. At the national level, integration means to be one with the nation, to work for its welfare, prosperity and development. In a democratic framework, it is respect for different opinions and ideas. It is an equal opportunity to participate in the nation-building efforts.

For instance, India is a country of diverse people, languages, cultures, and religions. Since time immemorial, these varied people, languages and cultures have lived together harmoniously. Though the diversities appear to be of continental dimensions, they reflect shades of a significant common cultural heritage and ethos. However, the forces of modernization are bringing about rapid changes in the social structure. Not only are people becoming more aware of their social, cultural and religious heritage, but due to economic forces their mobility is also increasing. Language plays an important role in the social, economic and educational development of a nation. It has a special role for a multilingual and multiethnic country like India. Multilingualism is also the most important characteristic of the Indian society. The classical Indian literature, chronicles of Chinese or Western travellers and the contemporary grassroots reality, reflect multilingualism in Indian society operating at individual and societal levels.

The linguistic situation in India became even more critical after the death of PM Nehru when the country started to witness several linguistic, ethnic and regional movements, which in turn accelerated inter-community conflicts and violence. Since the conception of the Constitution, the question of official language continued to be a major issue of political and public debate. There were two

NOTES

NOTES

challenges to meet as far as the linguistic integration of the people of the country was concerned. The first required deliberation upon the use of English as the official language for governance purposes. The second was concerned with building a relationship among major regional languages of the country and ensure their representation across linguistic boundaries. This led to demands for reorganization of states on linguistic lines which became a prolonged process and opened a floodgate of similar demands across the country. It became a much more divisive issue in India politics than the controversy that arose over the question of official language.

The first step in this regard followed a major movement in the Telugu-speaking areas of the Madras Province, leading to the appointment of the First States Reorganization Commission which submitted its report in 1955. This was followed by the reorganization of other Indian provinces in 1950s and 1960s. The pressures generated by mass agitations, popular protests and rebellion within and outside the Congress party compelled the central government led by Nehru to announce the 'establishment of Andhra Province in March 1953'. However, this gave way to the counter movement to carve a separate province of Telengana. Widespread agitations in the 1960s and 1970s, similar ones revived in the first decade of the twenty-first century, led to the formation of the Telengana state last year. This was followed with the reorganization of Bombay in 1960. Gujarat and Maharashtra were carved as Gujarati and Marathi speaking population and sought separate provinces for themselves. Punjab too emerged as the new centre of agitations around the same time. In 1966, the state was reorganized to form three units—Punjab, Haryana and Himachal Pradesh. Similar protests were seen in the north-east parts of the country. Nag has pointed out, 'On January 26, 1950, the north-east comprised the state of Assam and the union territories of Manipur and Tripura. The entire region consisted of about 217 scheduled tribe groups besides the plainsmen. The number of language groups inhabiting the region can be imagined from this. In view of the secessionist demand from some Naga quarters countered by a demand for a separate state from some other quarter, a state of Nagaland comprising most of the Naga areas of the region was carved out in 1963. In the rest of the areas, the Assamese language groups retained its hegemony which was slowly beginning to be challenged by the emerging middle classes of different tribal groups. It was fuelled by the consistent neglect of the non-Assamese regions of the state in terms of development and the attempts at forcible 'Assamesization.' The Language Policy of the Assam government (1960) was the final straw. The Hill people resented imposition of the Assamese language and launched agitations for separate states. As a result the states of Meghalaya, Mizoram, Arunachal Pradesh, Tripura and Manipur were created in 1971-72, some as union territory and some as full-fledged states. However, by the mid 1980s, all the areas were granted full-fledged statehood. In spite of the difficulties involved, the principle of linguistic provinces was followed to a large extent in the creation of these states.'

The earlier analysis of the challenge to integrate multiple languages and linguistically and culturally different groups in the country is an example of only one of the roadblocks that post-colonial India had to pass to meet its ideal of nation building. Another significant problem arising out of the country's diversity was the

outbreak of communal violence in different parts of the subcontinent, culminating in riots that broke out during the Partition in 1947. While the two new states were being created, what broke out was a 'fratricidal war of unprecedented proportions. Unspeakable atrocities were perpetrated on the minorities in both India and Pakistan. In a span of a few months, nearly 500,000 people were killed and property worth thousands of millions of rupees was looted and destroyed.' Despite Partition and the mistrust created in the minds of people of different religious beliefs, the government succeeded in bringing the situation under control. Chandra has noted: 'During August-September (1947) the back of communal violence in Delhi was broken by bringing the army on the streets and ordering the police to shoot at communal mobs indulging in looting and killing. The government also succeeded in protecting the Muslim minority in the country so that in the end forty-five million Muslims chose to remain in India.' The steps taken to protect the minorities succeeded initially but could not weaken the forces of communalism in the later years. PM Nehru believed Indian communalism was a kind of fascism and despite his earnest desire, was unable to uproot it completely. In one of his correspondences, Nehru observed: 'The wave of fascism that is gripping India now is the direct outcome of hatred for the non-Muslims which the Muslim League preached amongst its followers for years. The League accepted the ideology of fascism from the Nazis of Germany. The ideas and methods of fascist organization are now gaining popularity among the Hindus also and the demand for the establishment of a Hindu State is its clear manifestation.' Therefore, nation-building in India was a process of complex institutions and actors and different ideals at different times.

The dilemma of these new nations that emerged as a product of Second World War decolonization was summed up by Nag, who pointed out in the epilogue of the 'Nationalism, Separatism and Secessionism' that 'Nations, nation-states and nationalism were part of the post Industrial Revolution European discourse which was carried to the colonies in Asia and Africa by the European colonizers along with the flag and the Bible. Such ideas were further disseminated through the mechanism of the colonial education system where the study of European civilization and their history was given precedence over indigenous civilizations. The intelligentsia produced by such a system internalized this pattern of discourse. Hence, when they led the anti-colonial struggle they strived to present themselves as equivalent to the European nations and their anti-colonial sentiment were conceptualized in terms of 'nationalism'. Interestingly, both the subject and object of mobilizations used the same definitions, parameters and the concept of nations and nationalism which were overwhelmingly European in origin, without questioning their applicability in indigenous conditions. Often when the format proved to be too narrow to accommodate indigenous diversities, they made creative innovations within the structure of the theory.'

It is argued that while the new states adopted discourses like nation-in-the-making or eternal nation, realizing them posed serious problems in multicultural countries. 'Crises multiplied and the theory often proved to be too rigid to be able to either explain the situation or provide solutions to them.' Therefore, Nehruvian India adopted the principle of 'Unity in Diversity' based on the pillars of socialist, sovereign,

NOTES

NOTES

and secular democracy. On a similar note, the country has made several attempts over the last few decades to abandon the Eurocentric approach to nation-building and adopt measures that are in tune with its diversity. As Nag has argued, 'Post-colonial introspection into the tangled nationality question was a response to the challenges which Indian polity confronted since independence. The crystallization of a plethora of sub-national and secessionist developments and linguistic rivalries had brought India on the verge of disintegration. These were not abrupt eruptions and, hence, had to be traced to the processes it underwent in the past. The claim that freedom from colonial rule automatically entitled India to nationhood also began to be debated.'

The challenges posed by several smaller nationalistic aspirations and mass mobilizations around them—like the Khalistan movement in the 1980s—forced scholars to revisit the monolithic concept of the Indian nation state and appreciate the diversity of the country. This has led to the enrichment of the question of nationalism and nation building in India. While the nationalists claimed the existence of the Indian nation after independence, the Marxist school that emerged as a counter to the nationalist assertions pointed that the colonial experience had given birth to two parallel strands of nationality consciousnesses. While one was based on a pan-Indian consciousness, the other stimulated regional cultural identity. It is as a result of this debate that there seems to be a consensus that it is difficult to sustain the nationalist claim of a one-nation-one-movement theory. Thus, rather than focusing on the Eurocentric model of the nation state, the idea that scholars are now engaging with is that of a nation-state. The idea of the civilizational state is a reaffirmation of this idea—a pragmatic response to the tendency of some of the smaller nationalities to totally reject any claims of India as a nation. It is therefore a result of such pragmatism that as multi-national states of Europe gave way, the Indian state could resist the attempts to tear the fabric of its polity. Despite the presence of secessionist movements in Kashmir, Punjab and the North-eastern regions or the arousal of sub-national upsurge in various other parts of the country like Assam and Darjeeling, the Indian state has been successful in countering all of them.

Today, the strength of the wisdom of the founding fathers of the post-colonial state is all the more vindicated as India moves into the second decade of the twenty-first century as a unified country despite its multi-ethnic and multi-national character, as most of the other states of Europe and Africa that also embarked on a similar journey at the same time are disintegrated.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS - III

7. What does integration mean at the national level?
8. What were Nehru's views on Indian communalism?

5.4 SUMMARY

- Nationalism was indeed rooted in history and it was from history that a new nationalism had to be constructed in the new-born nations to accomplish a society based on shared history and culture. This is referred to as nation-building. It is a dynamic process where the national aspirations go beyond those of a single community; wherein the socio-political-cultural identity is sought in national ideals and institutions and where the nation-in-the-being becomes the function of a social and political movement.
- When the nation is in the process of becoming, such a period is often characterized with internal conflicts and social strife. These are clashes over resources, values and interests, over integration, exclusion and inclusion, discrimination as well as oppression. These conflicts have the tendency to de-stabilize a nation, yet they form the very being from which a new nation is finally galvanized.
- While some states granted freedom to their colonies, others were not so eager. This was so in the case of India, where the British passed on the reigns of the country to its people only after a prolonged struggle. Nonetheless, countries where the freedom was easily granted and those which had to go through a period of long conflict faced the outbreak of violent civil strife which was reflective of communal and ethnic antagonisms in these decolonized states.
- The conflicts faced with the realization of freedom in mind were nothing compared to what the nations had to face after independence. Decolonization in most cases did not bring peace and prosperity. In most colonies in Asia and Africa, the arbitrary drawing of borders by imperial officers and representatives created insurmountable problems for people and only added to the existing crises.
- Nation building is also closely linked to constructing a national identity. Even for the colonialists, identity construction was an important task. However, their identity construction project was linked to the 'white man's burden', i.e., of universalization of identity. The project of modernity entails, as Professor Rajni Kothari stated, 'a new mode of homogenizing and of straight jacketing the whole world.' There is no denying that the onset of colonial rule had successfully ensured the integration of the communities of Asia and Africa to the global capitalist system.
- A major division of views that underlies much recent discussion of collective identities, particularly ethnicity and also nationality, is that between primordialism and constructivism (also known as circumstantialism or instrumentalism). Primordialists believe that identities are deeply rooted in history and are based on descent, language and culture. Constructivists, by contrast, argue that modern nations are products of Enlightenment and revolutions of the late eighteenth century, and that ethnic identities, including

NOTES

NOTES

other features of recent social life, were 'constructed' by a series of intellectual and social and political ends.

- Ethnic nationality has its basis in the biological necessity. It goes beyond individual choice. It is inherited and runs in families from generations. Therefore, it is argued that a person is born into a certain nationality, which in turn determines their interests and a sense of belongingness to a certain nation.
- The current state of ethnic assertion has to be comprehended in the context of the colonial period, its politics and its philosophy. It is thus important to not only explore the role of the policy of divide and rule of the colonizers but also look at the colonial educational policies which in turn raised community elites and assertion of communal interests.
- The roots of post-colonial ethnic revival and minority question cannot be understood outside their colonial contexts. As the colonial power achieved a considerable success in achieving a certain degree of political and administrative unity, nationalist movements came to organize themselves on ethno-linguistic lines to crush the colonial powers. The principle of linguistic reorganization could be witnessed in the Government of India Dispatch of August 25, 1911, which formed the basis of separation of Bihar from Bengal.
- Integration was an important part of nation building. After independence, the new government, along with various state governments, sought to balance the social hierarchy of the country and give recognition to the downtrodden groups. Recognizing their local dialects was one of the ways to integrate them within the nation.
- The challenges posed by several smaller nationalistic aspirations and mass mobilizations around them—like the Khalistan movement in the 1980s—forced scholars to revisit the monolithic concept of the Indian nation state and appreciate the diversity of the country. This has led to the enrichment of the question of nationalism and nation building in India. While the nationalists claimed the existence of the Indian nation after independence, the Marxist school that emerged as a counter to the nationalist assertions pointed that the colonial experience had given birth to two parallel strands of nationality consciousnesses. While one was based on a pan-Indian consciousness, the other stimulated regional cultural identity.

5.5 KEY TERMS

- **Nation-building:** It is constructing or structuring a national identity using the power of the state.
- **National identity:** A sense of a nation as a cohesive whole, as represented by distinctive traditions, culture, and language.
- **Primordialism:** Also known as perennialism is the argument which contends that nations are ancient, natural phenomena.

- **Constructivism:** A theory—based on observation and scientific study—about how people learn.
- **Multi ethnic:** Relating to or constituting several ethnic groups.
- **Geopolitical:** The study or the application of the influence of political and economic geography on the politics, national power, foreign policy, etc., of a state.
- **Multilingualism:** The use of two or more languages, either by an individual speaker or by a community of speakers.
- **Fascism:** A way of organizing a society in which a government ruled by a dictator controls the lives of the people and in which people are not allowed to disagree with the government.

NOTES

5.6 ANSWERS TO ‘CHECK YOUR PROGRESS’

1. In 1949, the Republic of Indonesia was recognized as an independent nation with a population of one hundred and twenty-five million.
2. In 1957, Great Britain granted independence to the Gold Coast colony which was named the Republic of Ghana. The birth of Ghana was the first step in the decolonization of Africa. By 1965, all of British African Empire had been decolonized.
3. Universalization project had three major dimensions. The first, as Professor Rajni Kothari points out was ‘a conscious effort to project a particular into a universal, expecting the rest of the world to accept the world view and organizing principles of that particular. Second, it is the effort to universalize secular and temporal spaces. Third, the modernist perspective on universalization and homogenization is colonizing, necessarily rejecting all other universals and castigating them as a historical and anachronistic or at best historical antecedents to this more ‘scientific’ and ‘rational’ and hence superior universal. It is a mode of homogenization that takes upon itself the task of fragmenting and splintering all other social and ethnic cohesions, undermining all other unities and imposing its global will and power on all others.
4. The process of national integration and identity construction in the post-colonial state was characterized by an attempt to subjugate the immensely rich and diverse human experience of communities within the colonies in the process of creating a homogenous, national identity.
5. Primordialists believe that identities are deeply rooted in history and are based on descent, language and culture.
6. The distinction between western and eastern nationalisms serves dual purposes: descriptive and normative. It is helpful in classifying nationalisms found in post-colonial states as well as explains their viability or dangerous forms. In the academia, while the Western nationalism is considered

NOTES

authentic, liberal, democratic, and good, the Eastern is stereotyped as alien, ethnic and racist.

7. At the national level, integration means to be one with the nation, to work for its welfare, prosperity and development. In a democratic framework, it is respect for different opinions and ideas. It is an equal opportunity to participate in the nation-building efforts.
8. PM Nehru believed Indian communalism was a kind of fascism and despite his earnest desire, was unable to uproot it completely. In one of his correspondences, Nehru observed: 'The wave of fascism that is gripping India now is the direct outcome of hatred for the non-Muslims which the Muslim League preached amongst its followers for years. The League accepted the ideology of fascism from the Nazis of Germany. The ideas and methods of fascist organization are now gaining popularity among the Hindus also and the demand for the establishment of a Hindu State is its clear manifestation.'

5.7 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. What do you understand by nation building?
2. What is the role of communalism with reference to Indian nation building?
3. What kind of challenges did newly-independent colonies have to deal with?
4. What factors contributed to the alienation of minority communities in nation state?
5. What is the basic point of division between civic and ethnic nationalism?
6. What were the repercussions of the Language Policy of the Assam government (1960)?

Long-Answer Questions

1. Assess the nature of the nationalist struggle in the African colonies.
2. Discuss the relevance of universalization of identity in the process of nation building.
3. Evaluate the role of ethnicity in nationalism. How did newly-independent colonies use the concept of ethnicity to assert their value in the world?
4. Explain primordialism and constructivism with reference to collective identities like ethnicity and nationality.
5. Examine the positive and negative connotations of ethnic assertions.
6. Analyse the role of linguistics in the context of Indian nation building.

5.8 FURTHER READING

- Waites, Bernard. (2012). *South Asia and Africa after Independence: Post-colonialism in Historical Perspective*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Phadnis, Urmila, Rajat Ganguly. (2001). *Ethnicity and Nation-building in South Asia*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Wang, Gungwu (ed.). (2005). *Nation-building: Five Southeast Asian Histories*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Smith, Anthony D. (1991). *National Identity*. Nevada: University of Nevada Press.
- Birch, Anthony H. (2012). *Nationalism and National Integration*. London: Routledge.
- Nag, Sajal. (1998). *India and North-East India: Mind, Politics and the Process of Integration, 1946-1950*. New Delhi: Daya Books.
- Ashraf, Ali. (1994). *Ethnic Identity and National Integration*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES

NOTES