



IAS 100

A Civil Services Chronicle Initiative

WORLD HISTORY (PART-I)



Add : D-108, Sec-2, Noida (U.P.), Pin - 201 301
Email id : helpdesk@campus100.in
Call : 09582948810, 09953007628, 0120-2440265

CONTENTS

Chapter 1 : Renaissance	5-7
Chapter 2 : American Revolution.....	8-14
Chapter 3 : French Revolution	15-24
Chapter 4 : Industrialisation	25-34
Chapter 5 : Nationalism and British Democratic Politics	35-48
Chapter 6 : Unification of Italy and Germany.....	49-57
Chapter 7 : Imperialism and colonialism	58-69
Chapter 8 : World War - I	70-76
Chapter 9 : Russian Revolution	77-81
Chapter 10 : World between Two World Wars	82-86
Chapter 11 : World War - II	87-94



The Enlightenment represents the clime of the intellectual revolution in philosophy. It began in England about 1680 and quickly spread to most countries of northern Europe. It was not without influence in America. But the supreme manifestation of the Enlightenment was, however, in France. The period of its real importance was the eighteenth century. Few other movements in history have had such great effects in moulding men's thoughts on shaping the course of their actions as the Enlightenment.

The Philosophy of enlightenment was built around a number of significant concepts than. Firstly, reason is the only infallible guide to wisdom. All knowledge has its roots in sense perception, but the impressions of our senses are but the raw materials of truth, which has to be refined in the crucible of reason before it can have value in explaining the world or in showing the way to improvement of life. Secondly, the universe is a machine governed by inflexible laws which man cannot override. The order of nature is absolutely uniform and not subject in any way to miracles or to any other form of divine intervention. Thirdly, the best structure of society is the one which is the simplest and most natural. The life of the noble savage is preferable to that of a civilized man with its outworn conventions which serve to perpetuate the tyranny of priests and rulers. Every artificial thing was to be removed from religion government and economic institutions which should be reduced to a form consistent with reason and natural liberty. Fourthly, there is no such thing as original sin. Men are not inherently deprived. Only the scheming priests and depots who are eager for making war drive them to acts of cruelty and meanness. If men are allowed to follow freely the guidance of reason and their own instincts, the infinite perfectibility of human nature, and therefore of the society itself, would be easily realised.

Though the inspiration for the Enlightenment has come partly from the nationalism of

Descartes, Spinoza and Holbes, the real founders of the movement were Sir Issac Newton and Jon Locke. It is true that Newton was not a philosopher in the ordinary sense of the term. But his work has a great significance for the history of thought. He brought the whole world of nature under a precise mechanical interpretation. This was his greatest achievement. His theory of gravitation was held to be valid not only on this earth but throughout the vast expanse of the solar system. From this it was an easy step to the conclusion that every event in nature is governed by universal laws which can be formulated as precisely as mathematical principles. While the discovery of these laws is the business of science, it is the duty of man to allow them to operate unhindered. The old medieval idea of a universe guided by benevolent purpose now gave place to the idea that man lived in a world in which procession of events was automatic. Newton's philosophy did not reject the idea of a God, but it deprived him of his power to guide the star in their courses or to order the seen to remain stationary.

Locke's influence was quite different from that of Newton. He was the originator of a new theory of knowledge which served as the cornerstone of the Enlightenment. He maintained that man's knowledge originates from sense perception. This is known as the theory of sensationalism. He was the first modern philosopher to develop it in systematic form, though Hobbes had already asserted it earlier than Locke. He asserted that the human mind at birth is a blank tablet, containing nothing inscribed on it. The (human mind) does not even contain the idea of God or any notions of right and wrong. Anything gets registered in the mind of the new-born child only after the child begins to have experiences, to perceive the external world with its senses.

The simple ideas which result directly from sense perception are merely foundations of knowledge. Man, however, cannot live

intelligently on the basis of the simple ideas. These simple ideas must therefore be integrated and fused into complete ideas. This is the function of reason or understanding. Reason has the power to combine, coordinate, and organise the impressions received from the senses.

It will thus be seen that sensation and reason are both indispensable, one for furnishing the mind with the raw materials of knowledge and the other for working them into a meaningful form. It was this combination of sensationalism and rationalism which became one of the basic elements in the philosophy of the Enlightenment. Locke is also known for his defence of the religious toleration and for his liberal political theory.

The Enlightenment blossomed fourth in its fullest glory in France during the eighteenth century under the leadership of Voltaire and other critics of the established order. Voltaire's first philosophic work was "Letters on the English" which he wrote in Britain where he lived for three years, acquiring a deep admiration for British institutions. In this work, he popularised the ideas of Newton and Locke. Most of his later writings the Philosophical Dictionary, *Candide*, his histories and many of his essays were also concerned with exposition of the doctrine that the world is governed by natural laws and that reason and concrete experience are the only dependable guides for man to follow. Voltaire is best known as a champion of individual freedom. He considered all restrictions upon liberty of speech and opinion as barbarous. He hated most the tyranny of organised religion. He condemned the monstrous cruelty of the church in torturing and burning intelligent men who were bold enough to question its dogmas. His slogan was 'crush the infamous thing' with reference to the whole system of persecuting and privileged orthodoxy. He was almost unsparing in his attacks on political tyranny, especially when it resulted in the massacre of thousands to glut the ambitions of the despots.

Two other philosophers, David Hume, a Scotsman and Rousseau, a Frenchman, are commonly given a place in the Enlightenment even though neither of them was in full agreement with the majority of his contemporaries. The former is known for his skepticism. He taught that the mind is a mere bundle of impressions, derived exclusively from

the senses and tied together by habits of association, i.e. we learn from experience to associate warmth with fire. If we had never actually experienced the sensation of warmth, no reasoning faculty in our minds would enable us to draw the conclusion that fire produces heat. But constant repetition of the fact that when we see a flame we generally experience warmth leads to the habit of associating the two in our minds. Impressions and associations are all that there is to knowing. Since every idea in the mind is nothing but a copy of a sense impression, it follows that one can know nothing of final causes, the nature of substance, or the origin of the universe. We cannot be sure of any of the conclusions of reason except those which can be verified by actual experience. All others are likely to be the products of feelings and desires, of animal urges and fears. But denying the competence of reason, Hume placed himself almost wholly outside the main intellectual trend of the Enlightenment. Hence it is said that he helped to prepare its death.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau:

Rousseau repudiated many of the basic assumptions which emerged from Newton and Locke. He maintained that reason cannot be depended upon as the infallible guide to conduct and truth. Though reason has its uses, it is not the full answer. In the really vital problems of life it is much safer to depend on feelings, to follow our instincts and emotions. Since these are ways of nature, they are more conducive to happiness than the artificial lucubration of the intellect. To Rousseau, the thinking man is a depraved animal. Notwithstanding his contempt for reason, he was in other ways completely in agreement with the viewpoint of the Enlightenment.

In his *Discourse on the Arts and Sciences* he contrasted the freedom and innocence of primitive men with the tyranny and wickedness of the civilized society. He even went to the extent of insisting that the progress of learning is destructive of human happiness. Like all other reformers he shared the impatience of the Enlightenment with every sort of restriction upon individual freedom. But he was much more concerned about the liberty and equality of the masses than other reformers of his time. He considered the origin of private property as the primary source of misery in human society.

Rousseau is commonly considered the father of romanticism as he was the first significant writer to uphold the validity of conclusions dictated by emotion and sentiment. His slogan 'back to nature' provided the foundation for a veritable cult dedicated to the pursuit of the simple life. His influence, however, was not confined only to the founding of romanticism and the encouragement of sentimental devotion to nature. His dogmas of equality and popular sovereignty became the rallying cries of revolutionaries and of thousands of more moderate opponents of the existing regime. It is no exaggeration to say that it was his political philosophy which provided the real inspiration for the modern ideal of the rule of the majority.

Immanuel Kant:

Immanuel Kant devoted most of his time in teaching and matured his philosophic ideas very slowly. For a long time he spoke scornfully of the meta physicians as those who dwelt on the high towers of abstruse cogitation, "where there is a great deal of wind". He finished his first great work the critique of Pure Reason, when he was on the other side of fifty. He owed a great deal to the minds of the Enlightenment. They contributed to his political ideas. Kant believed in the natural rights of men and or defended the separation of powers as a necessary protection for the liberty of the citizens.

However, in the field of general philosophy Kant departed widely from the rationalism of the eighteenth century.

He gave the greatest importance to the concept of moral will and freedom. In this he drew upon Rousseau and asserted that if a person is allowed to act according to his morals he will attain freedom. He laid stress on moral nature and did not consider material progress as progress at all. Kant did not subordinate individual to state nor did he approve of state control over individuals. Like other individualists he considered state a necessary evil. State is all powerful and whatever freedom the individual surrenders to the state he gets it back in the form of assurance from the state to protect his freedom from any outside agency. This enlarges the sphere of his freedom.

Kant is criticized for advocating and justifying the existence of an absolute monarchy on the other. He gave too much importance to moral freedom and inspite of his idealism leaned towards individualism. However this gave birth to liberalism and aroused a desire among the people to form representative institutions. They also awakened the spirit of nationalism and national integration.

Rousseau:

The slogans of equality, liberty and fraternity during the French Revolution were inspired by his ideas. His ideas left an indelible effect upon the French Revolution. Napoleon has truly stated that "If Rousseau had not taken birth, the emergence of French Revolution would have been impossible.



American Revolution and American Constitution:

After the seventeenth century France, Holland and England began to expand their trading activities and to establish colonies in America. The USA was subjugated by Great Britain during the early 18th century but the subjugation could not last long because of two significant ideals – freedom and equality- which emerged strongly in the 18th century in Europe and in America. The occurrence of some events and the emergence of certain thoughts between 1775 and 1783 gave birth to a new nation.

The history of the American war of Independence is a record of severe struggle for its redemption from the sovereignty of England. That glorious struggle was launched by the American colonies to regain their freedom against the desire of England and to oppose its stringent colonial policy. It is true that the immediate cause of the American Revolution lays in the imposition of undue taxes upon the colonists, but there were several other causes also. On the one side, the Americans were not prepared to bear with their subjugation under the British sovereignty and on the other after 1763 the British government formulated and followed such policies, as could reinforce their control over the American Colonies better than it was earlier.

People migrated from Europe to American colonies to get rid of the war of genocide going on constantly in Europe. The poor were sold to the rich and the governing class to be as slaves in war. In order to avoid such a grievous fate, people thought it better to migrate to the American colonies. Most European immigrants left their countries with an intention to earn profit in American Colonies. The immigration was strengthened by the people's desire to escape political tortures and to get religious freedom. People thought that in the American colonies they would be able to worship God freely and get redemption from the European religious and

communal persecution and suppression and there would be neither the pressure of the church nor the governing classes.

Position of America before the revolution:

In all there were 13 English colonies from Maine in the north to Georgia in the south. Between 1713 and 1763 numerous English, Scot, German and French immigrants settled in these colonies. The prices of all the American products like wood, leather, tobacco, sugar, copper and fish increased rapidly in England and Europe, which made the Americans richer. The continuous prosperity which lasted 50 years enhanced the status of Americans in the world. Some American journals like the Gazette, The New York Reporter became popular in Europe and their demand increased there. Many famous universities like Princeton, Yale, Dart-Mouth, Brown etc. had already been established before the revolution. The colonial culture was a hybrid culture. There were two reasons that contributed to the emergence of a hybrid culture in the American colonies. Firstly, the People who had settled in these Colonies came from different regions of Europe and belonged to various sects and these Colonies had different forms of government and distinct laws. Secondly, they had various sources of livelihood. Therefore, there emerged a special culture which contained the strands of various elements. The people faced identical problems and had to seek a joint solution. In this way, they patched up their differences gradually for the sake of their existence and developed a specific culture which proved to be very significant although it resembled the European culture.

Causes of the American Revolution:

The American struggle for freedom was a conflict of economic interests primarily between Great Britain and her Colonies. But from many angles, it was a revolt against the social and political system of that time which had lost its

significance for America. In other words economic, political, social and religious forces worked together in American revolution. The American Colonies rose in rebellion in order to retain their liberty, freedom and autonomy. It is noteworthy that the colonists lived in diversity and most people did not have causes of complaint against England; even then certain circumstances bound them in unity.

One of the main causes of American revolution was the clash in ideas and principles held dear by the native of England and the American colonists. Colonists did not intend to snap political connection from their motherland but they were not prepared to see the colonies exploited for profit only. They wanted equality and autonomous rule for themselves. The middle class hated the privileges and luxuries enjoyed by the colonial rulers. This class desired the establishment of economic, social and political democracy in the colonies. Being an awakened class, the middle class was full of excessive discontent and frustration. England had been following mercantilism, an ideology which had emerged in the economic field since the later half of the 16th century. When the colonies grew in size and importance, the British government felt keen on establishing control over them. Firstly, Britain appointed governors to rule them and the salary was to be borne by the colonial exchequer. Secondly, the British merchants were interested in deriving benefits from a policy which Britain was to adopt arbitrarily and implement it in her colonies in America. This policy was called mercantilist policy. Under the mercantilism policies, England imposed many restrictions on production in American colonies.

World History – American Revolution-2

The colonists were made to sell their goods only to the English Merchants and to buy foreign goods after paying duty at an English port. Furthermore, the colonists were not to compete with the English manufacturers. Opposition to these mercantilist regulations were widespread and some of the merchants in the colonies maintained their trade contacts with the enemies of Britain.

While a new spirit was developing in America, the British still stuck to the old mercantilist theory. They also did not recognise

that the power of the British Parliament could be subjected to limitations. Further they did not share the American restrictions by some kind of fundamental law.

The Seven Years War (1756-63) gave Great Britain a much larger American empire. It also placed her under a heavy war debt. The long war strained her resources to such an extent that her government started imposing heavy duties on the manufactured goods. Since experience during the war had shown that the colonies were very reluctant to cooperate with each other for mutual protection and to pay any additional taxes, it seemed necessary for the British government to resort to compulsion. The successive British government since 1763 were of the view that they were not acting illegally by imposing additional taxes. But they were seeking to hold the colonies in their traditional position of subordination just at the time when the most vigorous elements in the colonial population were beginning to feel that they were entitled to equality. In view of the fundamental differences between the British and American conception of the nature of the empire and powers of British Parliament, it appeared unlikely that conflicts could be avoided permanently.

When the French lost Canada to Britain after Seven Years War, the colonies no longer feared of a French attack. It was this situation which gave the colonist courage and self-confidence. But the British government under King George-III, was not prepared to give them a large measure of independence. King George-III forced the cabinet to secure parliamentary sanction for imposing new taxes on the colonists. The royal officials in the colonies were ordered to enforce the mercantilist trade regulations. It gave customs officials writs of assistance or general search warrants empowering them to search ships and warehouses for smuggled goods. This aroused stout opposition. It was argued that the writs of assistance violated the fundamental rights of citizens and were therefore illegal. This argument reflected the American conviction that the powers of the British government were limited by fundamental laws.

The British government by means of a Royal Proclamation made in 1763, ordered settlers not to move beyond the traditional border on the western side lest they provoke the Red Indians.

It stopped the colonists from marching towards the West and they considered the British government to be their enemy.

In 1763, the British government decided to maintain an army in North America in order to guard against possible Red Indian raids and French attempts at reconquest. The British government led by George Greenville felt that since it was needed for the defence of the colonies, a part of the cost should be borne by the colonies.

Greenville proposed four regulations which affected the colonies. Two important regulations were Sugar Act (Molasses Act 1764) and Stamp Act (1765). The other two were Currency Act and Quartering Act.

Through the Sugar Act, duty was imposed on molasses imported by the colonists. Customs officials were ordered to show more energy and strictness in collecting duties. British ships were instructed to seize smugglers and an admiralty court was set up to try smuggling cases. Duties were also imposed upon some other colonial imports. It was to compel the colonists to contribute towards meeting the expenses of British troops stationed in the colonies. This was followed by the Stamp Act.

The Stamp Act declared that stamp duties were to be paid on newspapers and legal commercial documents. This was the first time that the British government had levied a direct tax on the colonies. The American felt that the Stamp Act would drain the colonies of money and make their debts to the British merchants more intolerable. They believed that taxation without representation was tyranny. They accepted trade regulations by the British Parliament as legitimate, but felt that British Parliament's imposition of direct taxes was contrary to fundamental law and natural rights. The opposition took the form not only of resolutions by colonial assemblies and of a collective protest drafted by a Congress of delegates from nine colonies, but also of violent popular demonstrations. The colonists also devised the instrument of general agreement to stop importing British goods. British merchants suffered heavy losses and urged the British government to give way. By this time Greenville was succeeded by Marquess of Rockingham. Rockingham repealed the Stamp Act, lowered

the molasses duty and passed a Declaratory Act, which affirmed the principle of the supremacy of the British parliament over the colonies.

Rockingham was replaced by William Pitt and, Townshend became the Finance Minister. He levied customs duties on five goods (Tea, lead, paper, coin-metal and paints) which were imported by America from England. He explained that by levying import duties which were in the nature of indirect taxes, he was only complying with the viewpoint of the colonists. John Dickinson, a conservative Pennsylvania lawyer, while accepting the right of British Parliament to regulate trade, denied that it could levy taxes, direct or indirect.

Riots against the British law broke out at several places. Besides raising a storm of protest the merchants of Boston, Philadelphia and New York resorted to the boycott of the British goods. The condition in Boston city was very deplorable. The regiment of British regulars stationed in Boston to prevent smuggling fired their guns on a protesting mob, in which four or five persons were killed. This came to be known as Boston massacre.

The new taxes could not be collected. The British traders were overwhelmed with fear and on their insistence Lord North, who took place of Townshend after his death, repealed all duties, except on tea.

After these successful agitations it was quite clear to popular leaders like Sam Adams who led Boston Mob, that none of the basic issues had been settled. In 1772 Adams set up throughout Massachusetts a network of committees of correspondence to organise resistance to British authority. This idea was copied by Jefferson in Virginia and by similar leaders in other colonies. As a result a real inter-colonial political organisation began to take place.

The British government made yet another mistake in 1773 which proved to be very costly. In 1773, Parliament passed the Tea Act, granting the financially troubled British East India Company an exclusive monopoly on tea exported to the American colonies. This Act agitated colonists even further: although the new monopoly meant cheaper tea, many Americans believed that Britain was trying to dupe them into accepting the hated tax.

The Boston Tea Party:

In response to the unpopular Act, tea agents in many American cities resigned or cancelled orders, and merchants refused consignments. In Boston, however, Governor Thomas Hutchinson resolved to uphold the law and ordered that three ships arriving in Boston Harbour be allowed to deposit their cargoes and that appropriate payment be made for the goods. This policy prompted about sixty men, including some members of the Sons of Liberty, to board the ships on the night (disguised as Native Americans) and dump the tea chests into the water. The event became known as the Boston Tea Party.

The dumping of the tea in the harbour was the most destructive act that the colonists had taken against Britain thus far. The previous rioting and looting of British officials' houses over the Stamp Act had been minor compared to the thousands of pounds in damages to the ships and tea. Governor Hutchinson, angered by the colonists' disregard for authority and disrespect for property, left for England. The "tea party" was a bold and daring step forward on the road to outright revolution.

The Intolerable Acts

The Tea Party had mixed results: some Americans hailed the Bostonians as heroes, while others condemned them as radicals. Parliament, very displeased, passed the Coercive Acts in 1774 in a punitive effort to restore order. Colonists quickly renamed these Acts the Intolerable Acts.

Numbered among these Intolerable Acts was the Boston Port Bill, which closed Boston Harbour to all ships until Bostonians had repaid the British East India Company for damages. The Acts also restricted public assemblies and suspended many civil liberties. Strict new provisions were also made for housing British troops in American homes, reviving the indignation created by the earlier Quartering Act, which had been allowed to expire in 1770.

The Quebec Act:

At the same time the Coercive Acts were put into effect, Parliament also passed the Quebec Act. This Act granted more freedoms to Canadian Catholics and extended Quebec's territorial claims to meet the western frontier of the American colonies.

The First Continental Congress:

In response to the Intolerable Acts, delegates from twelve of the thirteen colonies (Georgia chose not to attend) met at the First Continental Congress in Philadelphia in the autumn of 1774 to discuss a course of action. The delegates were all fairly prominent men in colonial political life but held different philosophical beliefs. Samuel Adams, John Adams, Patrick Henry, and George Washington were among the more famous men who attended. Although rebellion against the Crown was at this point still far from certain, leaders believed grievances had to be redressed to Parliament and King George III. The delegates met for nearly two months and concluded with a written Declaration of Rights and requests to Parliament, George III, and the British people to repeal the Coercive Acts so that harmony could be restored. The First Continental Congress marked an important turning point in colonial relations with Britain. Although some delegates still hoped for reconciliation, the decisions they made laid the foundations for a revolt. Even though American colonial leaders had petitioned Parliament and King George III to repeal taxes in the past, never had they boldly denounced them until this point, when they claimed that Britain's actions had violated their natural rights and the principles of the English Constitution. This appeal to natural rights above the King or God was groundbreaking because it justified and even legalized colonial opposition to the Crown.

The Battle of Lexington and Concord:

By 1775, colonial resentment toward Britain had become a desire for rebellion. Many cities and towns organized volunteer militias of "minutemen"—named for their alleged ability to prepare for combat at the drop of a hat—who began to drill openly in public common areas. On April 19, 1775, a British Commander dispatched troops to seize an arsenal of colonial militia weapons stored in Concord, Massachusetts. Militiamen from nearby Lexington intercepted them and opened fire. Eight Americans died as the British sliced through them and moved on to Concord. The British arrived in Concord only to be ambushed by the Concord militia. The "shot heard round the world"—or the first shot of many that defeated the British troops at Concord—sent a ripple throughout the colonies, Europe, and the rest of the world. The British retreated to Boston after

more than 270 soldiers in their unit were killed, compared to fewer than 100 Americans. The conflict became known as the Battle of Lexington and Concord. The minutemen's victory encouraged patriots to redouble their efforts and at the same time convinced King George III to commit military forces to crushing the rebellion. Almost immediately, thousands of colonialists set up camp around Boston, laying siege to the British position. The battle initiated a chain of events, starting with the militia siege of Boston and the Second Continental Congress, that kicked the Revolutionary War into high gear.

The Second Continental Congress:

The Second Continental Congress was convened a few weeks after the Battle of Lexington and Concord to decide just how to handle the situation. Delegates from all thirteen colonies gathered once again in Philadelphia and discussed options. The desire to avoid a war was still strong, and in July 1775, delegate John Dickinson from Pennsylvania penned the Olive Branch Petition to be sent to Britain. All the delegates signed the petition, which professed loyalty to King George III and beseeched him to call off the troops in Boston so that peace between the colonies and Britain could be restored. George III eventually rejected the petition.

Despite their issuance of the Olive Branch Petition, the delegates nevertheless believed that the colonies should be put in a state of defence against any future possible British action. After much debate, they also selected George Washington to command the American army surrounding Boston, renaming it the Continental Army. Washington was a highly respected Virginian plantation owner, and his leadership would further unite the northern and southern colonies in the Revolution.

The delegates' hopes for acknowledgment and reconciliation failed in June 1775, when the Battle of Bunker Hill was fought outside Boston. Although the British ultimately emerged victorious, they suffered over 1,000 casualties, prompting British officials to take the colonial unrest far more seriously than they had previously. The engagement led King George III to declare officially that the colonies were in a state of rebellion. Any hope of reconciliation

and a return to the pre-1763 status quo had vanished.

On July 4, 1776, America severed its relations with England and the representatives who gathered in Philadelphia declared independence of the 13 colonies and approved the Declaration of Independence. The main purpose of the Declaration of Independence was to reveal the fact that the public is empowered to change a government that deprives it of their natural rights. It was emphasized in the Declaration of Independence that public is the source of power and was fully empowered to elect the government of its choice. It was also stated that hence forward the Americans were free to take authoritative decisions independently in all the matters of war, peace, truce and business which are the rights of an independent state.

The Battle of Saratoga:

After numerous battles, the turning point in the war came in 1777 at the Battle of Saratoga in upstate New York. When American forces won, their victory encouraged France to pledge its support for the United States in the Franco-American Alliance of 1778. A year later, Spain followed suit and also entered the war against Britain. Spain, hoping to see Britain driven out of North America, had tacitly supported the Americans by providing them with munitions and supplies since the beginning of the war. Their entry as combatants took pressure off the Americans, as Britain was forced to divert troops to fight the Spanish elsewhere. Finally, Holland entered the war against Britain in 1780. Though the war went on for several years, American popular support for it, especially after France and Spain entered the fray, remained high. The motivation for rebellion remained strong at all levels of society, not merely among American military and political leaders. French and Spanish assistance certainly helped the Americans, but without the grassroots support of average Americans, the rebellion would have quickly collapsed.

Fortified by the Franco-American Alliance, the Americans maintained an impasse with the British until 1781, when the Americans laid siege to a large encampment of British forces under Lord Cornwallis at Yorktown, Virginia.

Scattered battles persisted until 1783, but the British, weary of the stalemate, decided to negotiate peace.

The Peace of Paris:

The war came to an official close in September 1783, when Britain, the United States, France, and Spain negotiated the Peace of Paris. The treaty granted vast tracts of western lands to the Americans and recognized the United States as a new and independent country. The last British forces departed New York in November 1783, leaving the American government in full control of the new nation.

Constitution of America:

To address the problems with the Articles of Confederation, delegates from five states met at the Annapolis Convention in Maryland in 1786. However, they could not agree on how these issues should be resolved. Finally, a new convention was proposed for the following year with the express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation.

In 1787, delegates from twelve of the thirteen states (minus Rhode Island) met at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia. Most of the attendees were not die-hard revolutionaries (Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Samuel Adams, and Patrick Henry were all absent). Nevertheless, most did have experience writing their own State Constitutions. Though all fifty-five delegates involved in the proceedings were wealthy property owners, most were aware that they were serving a republic that comprised all social classes. George Washington was unanimously chosen as the Chairman of the convention.

It quickly became clear to the Philadelphia delegates that the Articles should be scrapped and replaced with an entirely new constitution to create a stronger national government. Though this about-face was a violation of Congress's mandate to revise the Articles only, most delegates believed there was no other way to restore order in the Union.

The delegates began drafting a new Constitution to create a republican government. They decided on a government consisting of three branches: Legislative (Congress), Executive (the President), and Judicial (headed by the Supreme

Court). Delegates believed this separation of powers into three different branches would ensure that the United States would not become another monarchy.

The Virginia and New Jersey Plans:

The structure of the new legislative branch was the subject of a heated debate, as delegates from Virginia and New Jersey both submitted proposals. The Virginia Plan called for a bicameral (two-house) legislature in which the number of representatives each state had would depend on the state's population. The larger, more populous states supported this proposal because it would give them more power. Hence, the Virginia plan came to be known as the "large state plan."

The New Jersey Plan proposed a unicameral (one-house) legislature in which all states had the same number of representatives regardless of population. This "small state plan" was, not surprisingly, the favourite of smaller states, which stood to gain power from it.

Eventually, the delegates settled on what came to be called the Great Compromise: a new Congress with two houses—an upper Senate, in which each state would be represented by two senators, and a lower House of Representatives, in which the number of delegates would be apportioned based on state population. Senators would be appointed by state legislatures every six years; representatives in the House would be elected directly by the people every two years.

The President:

The delegates had an easier time outlining presidential powers. Although some delegates had extreme opinions—Alexander Hamilton proposed a constitutional monarchy headed by an American King—most agreed that a new executive or president was needed to give the country a strong leadership that it had lacked under the Articles.

Article II of the Constitution thus outlined the powers of a new executive outside the control of Congress. The president would be elected via the Electoral College for a term of four years, would be commander-in-chief of the U.S. military, could appoint judges, and could veto legislation passed by Congress.

The Judiciary:

The judiciary branch of the new government would be headed by a Supreme Court, which would be headed by a chief justice. The structure of the rest of the federal court system, however, was not formalized until the Judiciary Act of 1789.

Checks and Balances:

Many delegates felt that separation of powers was not enough to prevent one branch of government from dominating, so they also created a system of checks and balances to balance power even further. Under this system, each branch of government had the ability to check the powers of the others.

The President, for example, was given the power to appoint Supreme Court justices, cabinet members, and foreign ambassadors—but only with the approval of the Senate. On the other hand, the president was granted the right to veto all Congressional legislation.

Congress was given its own veto power over the president—a two-thirds majority vote could override any presidential veto. Congress also was charged with the responsibility to confirm presidential appointees—but also the power to block them. And finally, Congress had the ability to impeach and remove the president for treason, bribery, and other “high

crimes and misdemeanors.” The Supreme Court was given the sweeping power of judicial review—the authority to declare an act of Congress unconstitutional and thereby strike it down.

Fear of Pure Democracy:

The delegates also feared pure democracy and considered it to be the placement of the government directly in the hands of the “rabble.” Many elements of the Constitution were thus engineered to ensure that only the “best men” would run the country.

Under the original Constitution, senators were to be appointed by state legislatures or governors, not elected by the people—in fact, this rule did not change until the Seventeenth Amendment (1913) established direct elections for senators. Although representatives in the House were elected directly by the people, their terms were set at only two years, compared to senators’ six years. In addition, even though new legislation could be introduced only in the House, the Senate had to approve and ratify any Bills before they could become law.

These checks on pure democracy were not confined to the legislative branch. The Electoral College was implemented to ensure that the uneducated masses didn’t elect someone “unfit” for the presidency. Life terms for Supreme Court justices were also instituted as a safeguard against mob rule.



The French Revolution broke out in 1789 as a result of the interaction of varied factors political, economic, social and intellectual. One among the political factors leading to the Revolution was the absolution of the king. All administrative functions were centralized in the hands of the king who was not answerable to anyone except God. The king's word was the law of the land. At one time absolutism was quite popular in France as it had helped the nation to become supreme in Europe besides promoting the well-being of the people. Louis XV, who became king in 1715, was neither great nor enlightened. He wasted his time and energy in pursuit of idle personal pleasures and allowed the administration to be conducted by the mistresses. His successor Louis XVI, who happened to rule France on the eve of the Revolution, though well-meaning, kind and just, lacked the very qualities which could have saved the country from the prevailing situation. Years of feudal oppression and fiscal mismanagement contributed to a French society that was ripe for revolt.

Causes of The Revolution:

The following reasons are commonly adduced: (1) the increasingly prosperous elite of wealthy commoners—merchants, manufacturers, and professionals, often called the bourgeoisie—produced by the 18th century's economic growth resented its exclusion from political power and positions of honour; (2) the peasants were acutely aware of their situation and were less and less willing to support the anachronistic and burdensome feudal system; (3) the philosophers, who advocated social and political reform, had been read more widely in France than anywhere else; (4) French participation in the American Revolution had driven the government to the brink of bankruptcy.

Long years of war had drained the financial resources of France. A number of ill-advised financial manoeuvres in the late 1700s worsened

the financial situation of the already cash-strapped French government. France's prolonged involvement in the Seven Years' War of 1756–1763 drained the treasury, as did the country's participation in the American Revolution of 1775–1783. Under Louis XVI, France helped the thirteen American colonies to gain their independence from the common enemy, Britain. Aggravating the situation was the fact that the government had a sizable army and navy to maintain, which was an expenditure of particular importance during those volatile times. Moreover, in the typical indulgent fashion that so irked the common folk, mammoth costs associated with the upkeep of King Louis XVI's extravagant palace at Versailles and the frivolous spending of the queen, Marie-Antoinette, did little to relieve the growing debt. These decades of fiscal irresponsibility were one of the primary factors that led to the French Revolution. Leaders who gave the state credit, now began to charge 10 per cent interest on loans. So the French government was obliged to spend an increasing percentage of its budget on interest payments alone. To meet its regular expenses, such as the cost of maintaining an army, the court, running government offices or universities, the state was forced to increase taxes. Yet even this measure would not have sufficed. French society in the eighteenth century was divided into three estates, and only members of the third estate paid taxes. The society of estates was part of the feudal system that dated back to the middle ages. The term Old Regime is usually used to describe the society and institutions of France before 1789. Peasants made up about 90 per cent of the population. However, only a small number of them owned the land they cultivated. About 60 per cent of the land was owned by nobles, the Church and other richer members of the third estate. The members of the first two estates, that is, the clergy and the nobility, enjoyed certain privileges by birth. The most important of these was exemption from paying taxes to the state. The nobles further enjoyed feudal privileges. These

included feudal dues, which they extracted from the peasants. Peasants were obliged to render services to the lord, to work in his house and fields, to serve in the army or to participate in building roads. The Church too extracted its share of taxes called tithes from the peasants, and finally, all members of the third estate had to pay taxes to the state. These included a direct tax, called *taille*, and a number of indirect taxes which were levied on articles of everyday consumption like salt or tobacco. The burden of financing activities of the state through taxes was borne by the third estate alone.

Noting a downward economic spiral in the late 1700s, King Louis XVI brought in a number of financial advisors to review the weakened French treasury. Each advisor reached the same conclusion—that France needed a radical change in the way it taxed the public—and each advisor was, in turn, kicked out. Finally, in the early 1780s, France realized that it had to address the problem, and fast. First, Louis XVI appointed Charles de Calonne, Controller General of finances in 1783. Then, in 1786, the French government, worried about unrest should it try to raise taxes on the peasants, yet reluctant to ask the nobles for money, approached various European banks in search of a loan. By that point, however, most of Europe knew the depth of France's financial woes, so the country found itself with no credibility. Calonne finally convinced Louis XVI to gather the nobility together for a conference, during which Calonne and the king could fully explain the tenuous situation facing France. This gathering, dubbed the Assembly of Notables, turned out to be a virtual who's who of people who didn't want to pay any taxes. After giving his presentation, Calonne urged the notables either to agree to the new taxes or to forfeit their exemption to the current ones. Unsurprisingly, the notables refused both plans and turned against Calonne, questioning the validity of his work. He was dismissed shortly thereafter, leaving France's economic prospects even grimmer than before.

The eighteenth century witnessed the emergence of social groups, termed the middle class, who earned their wealth through an expanding overseas trade and from the manufacture of goods such as woollen and silk textiles that were either exported or bought by

the richer members of society. In addition to merchants and manufacturers, the third estate included professions such as lawyers or administrative officials. Although many accounts of the French Revolution focus on the French peasantry's grievances—rising food prices, disadvantageous feudal contracts, and general mistreatment at the hands of the aristocracy—these factors actually played a limited role in inciting the Revolution. For all of the hardships that they endured, it wasn't the peasants who jump-started the Revolution. Rather, it was the wealthy commoners—the bourgeoisie—who objected most vocally to the subpar treatment they were receiving. The bourgeoisie were generally hardworking, educated men who were well versed in the enlightened thought of the time. Although many of the wealthier members of the bourgeoisie had more money than some of the French nobles, they lacked elite titles and thus were subjected to the same treatment and taxation as even the poorest peasants. It was the bourgeoisie that would really act as a catalyst for the Revolution, and once they started to act, the peasants were soon to follow. All of these were educated and believed that no group in society should be privileged by birth. Rather, a person's social position must depend on his merit. These ideas envisaging a society based on freedom and equal laws and opportunities for all, were put forward by philosophers such as John Locke and Jean Jacques Rousseau. In his *Two Treatises of Government*, Locke sought to refute the doctrine of the divine and absolute right of the monarch. In *The Spirit of the Laws*, Montesquieu proposed a division of power within the government between the legislative, the executive and the judiciary. This model of government was put into force in the USA, after the thirteen colonies declared their independence from Britain. The American constitution and its guarantee of individual rights was an important example for political thinkers in France. Another great writer was Voltaire, who employed his sharp tongue and sarcastic pen in a tirade against the existing order in general and against Christianity in particular. His writings became the gospel of the French Revolution. In his writings he advocated "enlightened despotism" and created a thundering sensation throughout France.

The most prominent among the French philosophers was Rousseau. In his "Social Contract" which became the Bible of the French Revolution he says, "Man is born free but he is everywhere in chains". He denounced the existing government as illegitimate and promulgated the theory of popular sovereignty and popularized the notion of liberty, equality and fraternity. Rousseau carried the idea forward, proposing a form of government based on a social contract between people and their representatives. Montesquieu had only denounced the autocracy of the crown, while Voltaire had vehemently criticized the clergy and exposed the social evils. But Rousseau did something constructive for the regeneration of the society. His "Social Contract" also instilled in the people a strong desire to raise the banner of the revolt against the established monarchy.

The Influence of the American War of Independence on France: When the people of America rose in revolt against the English rule and fought the War of Independence, it was France which rushed to the help of the Americans with men and money. It resulted in a great blow to the finances of France. Though France became bankrupt, the French people became rich in their thoughts and were convinced that the melancholic state of affairs of the France could be made good by a revolution. The success of a revolution and the American War of Independence opened their eyes and their thoughts and actions found a happy blend there. According to Webster, "The War of American Independence became an eye-opener for the nations of Europe and in particular gave leaders to the French Revolution".

COURSE OF THE REVOLUTION:

The Estates-General, 1789: In the wake of Calonne's dismissal, Louis XVI brought back Swiss banker Jacques Necker, who had previously served a ten-year stint as Director General of Finance. After assessing the situation, Necker insisted that Louis XVI call together the Estates-General, a French congress that originated in the medieval period and consisted of three estates. The First Estate was the clergy, the Second Estate the nobility, and the Third Estate effectively the rest of French society.

On May 5, 1789, Louis XVI convened the Estates-General. Almost immediately, it became

apparent that this archaic arrangement—the group had last been assembled in 1614—would not sit well with its present members. Although Louis XVI granted the Third Estate greater numerical representation, the Parliament of Paris stepped in and invoked an old rule mandating that each estate receive one vote, regardless of size. As a result, though the Third Estate was vastly larger than the clergy and nobility, each estate had the same representation—one vote. Inevitably, the Third Estate's vote was to be overridden by the combined votes of the clergy and nobility. The members of the third estate demanded that voting now be conducted by the assembly as a whole, where each member would have one vote. This was one of the democratic principles put forward by philosophers like Rousseau in his book 'The Social Contract'. When the king rejected this proposal, members of the third estate walked out of the assembly in protest.

The fact that the Estates-General hadn't been summoned in nearly 200 years probably says a thing or two about its effectiveness. The First and Second Estates—clergy and nobility, respectively—were too closely related in many matters. Both were linked intrinsically to the royalty and shared many similar privileges. As a result, their votes often went the same way, automatically neutralizing any effort by the Third Estate.

Additionally, in a country as secularized as France at the time, giving the church a full third of the vote was ill-advised: although France's citizens would ultimately have their revenge, at the time the church's voting power just fostered more animosity. There were numerous philosophers in France speaking out against religion and the mindless following that it supposedly demanded, and many resented being forced to follow the decisions of the church on a national scale.

Although the reconvening of the Estates-General presented France's aristocracy and clergy with a perfect opportunity to appease the Third Estate and maintain control, they focused only on maintaining the dominance of their respective estates rather than address the important issues that plagued the country. When the Estates-General convened, the Third Estate wasn't seeking a revolution—just a bit of liberty and a more equitable tax burden. The entire Revolution might have been avoided had the first two estates

simply acquiesced to some of the Third Estate's moderate proposals. Instead, they fell back on tradition and their posh lifestyles and lit the revolutionary flame.

The Tennis Court Oath:

Three days after splitting from the Estates-General, the delegates from the Third Estate (now the National Assembly) found themselves locked out of the usual meeting hall and convened on a nearby tennis court instead. There, all but one of the members took the Tennis Court Oath, which stated simply that the group would remain indissoluble until it had succeeded in creating a new national constitution.

Upon hearing of the National Assembly's formation, King Louis XVI held a general gathering in which the government attempted to intimidate the Third Estate into submission. The assembly, however, had grown too strong, and the king was forced to recognize the group. Parisians had received word of the upheaval, and revolutionary energy coursed through the city. Inspired by the National Assembly, commoners rioted in protest of rising prices. Fearing violence, the king had troops surround his palace at Versailles.

The Bastille:

Blaming him for the failure of the Estates-General, Louis XVI once again dismissed Director General of Finance Jacques Necker. Necker was a very popular figure, and when word of the dismissal reached the public, hostilities spiked yet again. In light of the rising tension, a scramble for arms broke out, and on July 13, 1789, revolutionaries raided the Paris town hall in pursuit of arms. The next day, upon realizing that it contained a large armoury, citizens on the side of the National Assembly stormed the Bastille, a medieval fortress and prison in Paris.

Although the weapons were useful, the storming of the Bastille was more symbolic than it was necessary for the revolutionary cause. The revolutionaries faced little immediate threat and had such intimidating numbers that they were capable of non-violent coercion. By storming one of Paris's most notorious state prisons and hoarding weapons, however, the revolutionaries gained a symbolic victory over the Old Regime and conveyed the message that they were not to be trifled with.

Lafayette and the National Guard:

As the assembly secured control over the capital, it seemed as if peace might still prevail: the previous governmental council was exiled, and Necker was reinstated. Assembly members assumed top government positions in Paris, and even the king himself traveled to Paris in revolutionary garb to voice his support. To bolster the defence of the assembly, the Marquis de Lafayette, a noble, assembled a collection of citizens into the French National Guard. Although some blood had already been shed, the Revolution seemed to be subsiding and safely in the hands of the people. Though few deaths among the nobility were reported, the National Assembly, which was meeting in Versailles at the time, feared that the raging rural peasants would destroy all that the assembly had worked hard to attain. In an effort to quell the destruction, the assembly issued the August Decrees, which nullified many of the feudal obligations that the peasants had to their landlords. For the time being, the countryside calmed down.

The Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen:

Just three weeks later, on August 26, 1789, the assembly issued the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen, a document that guaranteed due process in judicial matters and established sovereignty among the French people. Influenced by the thoughts of the era's greatest minds, the themes found in the declaration made one thing resoundingly clear: every person was a Frenchman—and equal. Not surprisingly, the French people embraced the declaration, while the king and many nobles did not. It effectively ended the ancient régime and ensured equality for the bourgeoisie. Although subsequent French constitutions that the Revolution produced would be overturned and generally ignored, the themes of the Declaration of Rights of Man and of the Citizen would remain with the French citizenry in perpetuity. The document The Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen stated that:

1. Men are born and remain free and equal in rights.
2. The aim of every political association is the preservation of the natural and inalienable rights of man; these are liberty, property, security and resistance to oppression.

3. The source of all sovereignty resides in the nation; no group or individual may exercise authority that does not come from the people.
4. Liberty consists of the power to do whatever is not injurious to others.
5. The law has the right to forbid only actions that are injurious to society.
6. Law is the expression of the general will. All citizens have the right to participate in its formation, personally or through their representatives. All citizens are equal before it.
7. No man may be accused, arrested or detained, except in cases determined by the law.
8. Every citizen may speak, write and print freely; he must take responsibility for the abuse of such liberty in cases determined by the law.
9. For the maintenance of the public force and for the expenses of administration a common tax is indispensable; it must be assessed equally on all citizens in proportion to their means.
10. Since property is a sacred and inviolable right, no one may be deprived of it, unless a legally established public necessity requires it. In that case a just compensation must be given in advance.

The Food Crisis:

Despite the assembly's gains, little had been done to solve the growing food crisis in France. Shouldering the burden of feeding their families, it was the French women who took up arms on October 5, 1789. They first stormed the city hall in Paris, amassing a sizable army and gathering arms. Numbering several thousands, the mob marched to Versailles, followed by the National Guard, which accompanied the women to protect them. Overwhelmed by the mob, King Louis XVI, effectively forced to take responsibility for the situation, immediately sanctioned the August Decrees and the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen. The next day, having little choice, the royal family accompanied the crowd back to Paris. To ensure that he was aware of the woes of the city and its citizens, the king and his family were "imprisoned" in the Tuileries Palace in the city.

Though they focused on the king as figurehead, most of the revolutionaries were more against the nobles than the king. Everyday people in France had limited interaction with royalty and instead placed blame for the country's problems on the shoulders of local nobility. A common phrase in France at the time was, "If only the king knew," as though he were ignorant of the woes of the people. It was partly owing to this perspective that the assembly attempted to establish a constitutional monarchy alongside the king, rather than simply oust him and rule the nation itself.

The Assembly's Tenuous Control:

Despite the National Assembly's progress, weaknesses were already being exposed within France, and the Great Fear and the women's march on Versailles demonstrated that perhaps the assembly didn't have as much control as it liked to think. The revolution that the assembly was overseeing in Paris was run almost exclusively by the bourgeoisie, who were far more educated and intelligent than the citizens out in the country. Although the August Decrees helped assuage the peasant's anger, their dissatisfaction would become a recurring problem. The differing priorities that were already apparent foreshadowed future rifts.

Louis XVI's Flight:

Although King Louis XVI maintained a supportive front towards the Revolution, he remained in contact with the rulers of Austria, Prussia, and Sweden, asking for their help in restoring his family to power. In late June 1791, Louis XVI and his family attempted to escape to the Austrian border, where they were supposed to meet the Austrian army and arrange an attack on the revolutionaries. However, the runaway party was caught just before reaching the border and brought back to Tuileries in Paris.

This escape attempt considerably weakened the king's position and lowered his regard in the eyes of the French people. Beforehand, although he had little real power remaining, he at least still had the faith of his country. The king's attempt to run away, however, made it clear to skeptics that he was a reluctant associate at best and would turn his back on the constitution and its system of limited monarchy at any moment.

The more radical revolutionaries, who had never wanted a constitutional monarchy, trusted the king even less after his attempted escape. The more moderate revolutionaries, who once were staunch proponents of the constitutional monarchy, found themselves hard-pressed to defend a situation in which a monarch was abandoning his responsibilities. Therefore, although Louis XVI constitutionally retained some power after being returned to Paris, it was clear that his days were numbered.

The Declaration of Pillnitz:

In response to Louis XVI's capture and forced return to Paris, Prussia and Austria issued the Declaration of Pillnitz on August 27, 1791, warning the French against harming the king and demanding that the monarchy be restored. The declaration also implied that Prussia and Austria would intervene militarily in France if any harm came to the king.

Prussia and Austria's initial concern was simply for Louis XVI's well-being, but soon the countries began to worry that the French people's revolutionary sentiment would infect their own citizens. The Declaration of Pillnitz was issued to force the French Revolutionaries to think twice about their actions and, if nothing else, make them aware that other countries were watching the Revolution closely.

The Constitution of 1791:

In September 1791, the National Assembly released its much-anticipated Constitution of 1791, which created a constitutional monarchy, or limited monarchy, for France. This move allowed King Louis XVI to maintain control of the country, even though he and his ministers would have to answer to new legislature, which the new constitution dubbed the Legislative Assembly. The constitution also succeeded in eliminating the nobility as a legal order and struck down monopolies and guilds. It established a poll tax and barred servants from voting, ensuring that control of the country stayed firmly in the hands of the middle class.

The Jacobins and Girondins:

Divisions quickly formed within the new Legislative Assembly, which coalesced into two main camps. On one side were the Jacobins, a group of radical liberals—consisting mainly of

deputies, leading thinkers, and generally progressive society members—who wanted to drive the Revolution forward aggressively. The Jacobins found Louis's actions contemptible and wanted to forgo the constitutional monarchy and declare France a republic.

Disagreeing with the Jacobins' opinions were many of the more moderate members of the Legislative Assembly, who deemed a constitutional monarchy essential. The most notable of these moderates was Jacques-Pierre Brissot. His followers were thus labeled Brissotins, although they became more commonly known as Girondins.

Meanwhile, in cities throughout France, a group called the sans-culottes began to wield significant and unpredictable influence. The group's name—literally, “without culottes,” the knee breeches that the privileged wore—indicated their disdain for the upper classes. The sans-culottes consisted mainly of urban laborers, peasants, and other French poor who disdained the nobility and wanted to see an end to privilege. Over the summer of 1792, the sans-culottes became increasingly violent and difficult to control.

War against Austria and Prussia:

A number of French counter revolutionaries nobles, ecclesiastics, and some bourgeois—abandoned the struggle in their own country and emigrated. Many formed armed groups close to the northeastern frontier of France and sought help from the rulers of Europe. The rulers were at first indifferent to the Revolution but began to worry when the National Constituent Assembly proclaimed a revolutionary principle of international law—namely, that a people had the right of self-determination. In accordance with this principle, the Papal territory of Avignon was reunited with France on September 13, 1791. By early 1792 both radicals, eager to spread the principles of the Revolution, and the king, hopeful that war would either strengthen his authority or allow foreign armies to rescue him, supported an aggressive policy. France declared war against Austria on April 20, 1792.

In the first phase of the war (April–September 1792), France suffered defeats; Prussia joined the war in July, and an Austro-Prussian army crossed the frontier and advanced rapidly toward Paris.

Believing that they had been betrayed by the king and the aristocrats, the Paris revolutionaries rose on August 10, 1792, occupied Tuileries Palace, where Louis XVI was living, and imprisoned the royal family in the Temple. At the beginning of September, the Parisian crowd broke into the prisons and massacred the nobles and clergy held there. Meanwhile, volunteers were pouring into the army as the Revolution had awakened French nationalism. In a final effort the French forces checked the Prussians on September 20, 1792, at Valmy. On the same day, a new assembly, the National Convention, met. The next day it proclaimed the abolition of the monarchy and the establishment of the republic.

In the second phase of the war (September 1792–April 1793), the revolutionaries got the better of the enemy. Belgium, the Rhineland, Savoy, and the county of Nice were occupied by French armies. Meanwhile, the National Convention was divided between the Girondins, who wanted to organize a bourgeois republic in France and to spread the Revolution over the whole of Europe, and the Montagnards (“Mountain Men”), who, with Robespierre, wanted to give the lower classes a greater share in political and economic power. Despite efforts made by the Girondins, Louis XVI was judged by the Convention, condemned to death for treason, and executed on January 21, 1793; the queen, Marie-Antoinette, was guillotined nine months later.

In the weeks after the execution of the king, the internal and external wars in France continued to grow. Prussian and Austrian forces pushed into the French countryside, and one noted French general even defected to the opposition. Unable to assemble an army out of the disgruntled and protesting peasants, the Girondin-led National Convention started to panic. In an effort to restore peace and order, the convention created the Committee of Public Safety on April 6, 1793, to maintain order within France and protect the country from external threats.

The Jacobin's Coup:

The Committee of Public Safety followed a moderate course after its creation but proved weak and ineffective. After a few fruitless months under the committee, the sans-culottes finally

reached their boiling point. They stormed the National Convention and accused the Girondins of representing the aristocracy. Seeing an opportunity, Maximilien Robespierre, the leader of the Jacobins, harnessed the fury of the sans-culottes to take control of the convention, banish the Girondins, and install the Jacobins in power.

Once again, the sans-culottes proved to be a formidable force in effecting change during the Revolution. Already upset about the composition of the National Convention—which remained dominated by middle- and upper-class bourgeoisie and was influenced by big thinkers of the time—they became even more angry upon learning that many of the Girondin leaders expected them to bolster the failing war effort. Sieyès had originally rallied the Third Estate by reminding them that they numbered many and that their numbers gave them strength. This message clearly stuck with the sans-culottes throughout the Revolution, and they took advantage of their strength at every possible opportunity.

The Reign of Terror:

In the autumn of 1793, Robespierre and the Jacobins focused on addressing economic and political threats within France. What began as a proactive approach to reclaiming the nation quickly turned bloody as the government instituted its infamous campaign against internal opposition known as the Reign of Terror.

Beginning in September, Robespierre, under the auspices of the Committee of Public Safety, began pointing an accusing finger at anyone whose beliefs seemed to be counter revolutionary citizens who had committed no crime but merely had social or political agendas that varied too much from Robespierre's. The committee targeted even those who shared many Jacobin views but were perceived as just slightly too radical or conservative. A rash of executions ensued in Paris and soon spread to smaller towns and rural areas.

During the nine-month period that followed, anywhere from 15,000 to 50,000 French citizens were beheaded at the guillotine. Even longtime associates of Robespierre such as Georges Danton, who had helped orchestrate the Jacobin rise to power, fell victim to the paranoia. When Danton wavered in his conviction, questioned Robespierre's increasingly rash actions, and tried

to arrange a truce between France and the warring countries. Robespierre pursued his policies so relentlessly that even his supporters began to demand moderation. Finally, he was convicted by a court in July 1794, arrested and on the next day sent to the guillotine.

The Constitution of 1795 and the Directory:

The fall of the Jacobin government allowed the wealthier middle classes to seize power. On August 22, 1795, the convention was finally able to ratify a new constitution, the Constitution of 1795, which ushered in a period of governmental restructuring. The new legislature would consist of two houses: an upper house, called the Council of Ancients, consisting of 250 members, and a lower house, called the Council of Five Hundred, consisting of 500 members. Fearing influence from the left, the convention decreed that two-thirds of the members of the first new legislature had to have already served on the National Convention between 1792 and 1795.

The new constitution also stipulated that the executive body of the new government would be a group of five officers called the Directory. Although the Directory would have no legislative power, it would have the authority to appoint people to fill the other positions within the government, which was a source of considerable power in itself. Annual elections would be held to keep the new government in check.

The dilemma facing the new Directory was a daunting one essentially, it had to rid the scene of Jacobin influence while at the same time prevent royalists from taking advantage of the disarray and reclaiming the throne. The two-thirds rule was implemented for this reason, as an attempt to keep the same composition like that of the original, moderate-run National Convention. In theory, the new government closely resembled that of the United States, with its checks-and-balances system. As it turned out, however, the new government's priorities became its downfall: rather than address the deteriorating economic situation in the country, the legislature instead focused on keeping progressive members out. Ultimately, paranoia and attempts at overprotection weakened the group.

Meanwhile, the Committee of Public Safety's war effort was realizing unimaginable success. French armies, especially those led by young General Napoleon Bonaparte, were making

progress in nearly every direction. Napoleon's forces drove through Italy and reached as far as Egypt before facing a deflating defeat. In the face of this rout, and having received word of political upheavals in France, Napoleon returned to Paris. He arrived in time to lead a coup against the Directory in 1799, eventually stepping up and naming himself "first consul"—effectively, the leader of France. With Napoleon at the helm, the Revolution ended, and France entered a fifteen-year period of military rule.

Significance of the French Revolution in the World History:

French revolution influenced not only the French public but left an indelible impression on Europe and the entire world. Before and during the revolution, certain ideas were put forward which later became the foundation of modern thought and practice. The first republic of France lasted a few years only and may indicate that the revolution was a fiasco. Although France retrieved monarchy, it sustained good objectives of the revolution. Feudal prerogatives could not flourish again and the Church could not revive its bygone glory. Government was run efficaciously and the condition of farmers improved considerably. Jurisdiction of the law increased. Taxation was made more rational.

The French Revolution originated a new concept in the matter of state, propagated new ideology in respect of politics and society and presented a fresh, novel outlook towards life. The Revolution claimed that nationality did not mean the subjection to one ruler but to a sharing of same, blood, language and tradition. The idea of nationalism had a profound effect on Europe and, later on the world. Nearly every revolution in the 19th and 20th century was caused by nationalistic ambitions. Its effect can be also seen on the Indian struggle for independence. The declaration of the Rights of Man, a statement of the people's rights issued by the French revolutionary government in 1789, laid down the democratic principle that any government should be "for the people" and "by the people". It also emphasized the principle of the popular sovereignty, and that ultimately the people had the right to create a government or to remove it if it does not work for the welfare of the people. The revolution acquainted the people with their rights and they had come to know about their individual freedom. The Revolution established

the principle that a country should be led by men of ability and not necessarily by men of the noble birth and this had enabled Napoleon to rise from obscurity to the position of the Emperor of France.

It can be said that French Revolution has played a remarkable role in the making of the modern age in Europe and other countries of the world and familiarised the common people with the spirit of liberty, equality and democracy. It started a number of movements where people demanded not only political freedom but also right to property and freedom of expression. They also demanded franchise. The revolution aroused the spirit of political, social and economic equality. Women claimed equal rights with men. The Revolution awakened the spirit of nationalism, which paved the way for the unification of Italy and Germany. It also popularized the concept of democracy. Absolute monarchy was replaced by constitutional monarchy in many countries. It fortified the concept of fraternity and separated religion from politics. It stood for secularism and condemned religious fanaticism. The ideas of liberty and democratic rights were the most important legacy of the French Revolution. These spread from France to the rest of Europe during the nineteenth century, where feudal systems were abolished. Colonial peoples reworked the idea of freedom from bondage into their movements to create a sovereign nation state. Tipu Sultan and Ram Mohan Roy were greatly influenced from the ideas coming from revolutionary France. The impact of ideas of nationalism, democracy, equality, etc., which arose from the French Revolution can be seen on the Indian struggle for independence and on Indian Constitution.

Napoleon Era (1799-1815):

Napoleon was born in the island of Corsica in 1769. His family had received French nobility status when France made Corsica a province in that year, and Napoleon was sent to France in 1777 to study at the Royal Military School in Brienne. In 1784, Napoleon spent a year studying at the Ecole Militaire in Paris, graduating as a Second Lieutenant of artillery. Sent to Valence on a peacetime mission, Napoleon whiled away the hours there educating himself in history and geography.

During the tumultuous years of the French Revolution, Napoleon fought well for the

Republic, helping to defeat the British at Toulon. For his services there, he was made a Brigadier General. After the Directory came to power, Napoleon married Josephine de Beauharnais and gained command of the French army in Italy, where, after defeating the Austrians in 1797, he negotiated the Treaty of Campo Formio. This victory boosted Napoleon to widespread popularity when he returned to France. Eager to get rid of this potential challenger, the Directory agreed to let Napoleon take an army on an Egyptian campaign to capture Egypt and hamper British shipping to India. Napoleon's campaign in Egypt did not go as planned, and when he heard that the Directory was losing power, he abandoned his army and rapidly returned to Paris to take advantage of the situation, becoming the first of three consuls in the new government proclaimed in 1799.

As First Consul, Napoleon began a programme to consolidate his power. He ended the current rift between France and the Church by instituting the Concordat of 1801. France was then involved in several wars. In 1802, Napoleon signed the Peace of Amiens, a temporary peace with the British. In order to be able to concentrate solely on his European affairs, he sold France's Louisiana territory to the U.S. in 1803. In 1804, he set the foundation for much of Europe's legal system by establishing the Napoleonic Code. In 1804, Napoleon did away with the Consulate and crowned himself Emperor in an extravagant coronation ceremony.

In 1805, Napoleon was planning an invasion of England when the Russian and Austrian armies began marching towards France. Napoleon's forces defeated them at Austerlitz, but not before the British fleet had destroyed Napoleon's navy at Trafalgar. At this time, Napoleon expanded his Empire by creating the Confederation of the Rhine in Germany and the Grand Duchy of Warsaw in Poland. By now, Napoleon controlled almost all of Western Europe with the exception of Spain. He decided to try and destroy the economy of his major enemy, Britain, by instituting the Continental System, under which all European ports would refuse to accept British shipments. He failed in this task, and in trying to force Spain to comply touched off the Peninsular War. Russia and Prussia, however, did cooperate with Napoleon for a few years under the Treaty of Tilsit (1807).

Czar Alexander I withdrew Russia from the Continental System. In 1812, Napoleon's Grand Army entered Russia in order to punish Alexander, but the ravages of the deadly Russian winter decimated his army. Meanwhile, affairs in France began to look unstable. Napoleon rushed back to Paris and raised a new army, only to be defeated by a coalition of European forces at Leipzig in 1814.

Napoleon was then exiled to the isle of Elba, where he plotted his return. With the great powers of Europe deep in negotiations over how to redivide the continent, Napoleon escaped from Elba, sneaked into France, and raised a new army in the period known as the Hundred Days. In June 1815, the armies of Wellington and Blucher defeated Napoleon at Waterloo. Napoleon was again exiled, this time to distant Saint Helena in the South Atlantic, where he died in 1821.

Impact of Napoleon on Europe:

Napoleon saw his role as a modernizer of Europe. Within the wide swathe of territory that came under his control, Napoleon set about introducing many of the reforms that he had already introduced in France. Through a return to monarchy Napoleon had, no doubt, destroyed democracy in France, but in the administrative field he had incorporated revolutionary principles in order to make the whole system more rational and efficient. The Civil Code of 1804 – usually known as the Napoleonic Code – did away with all privileges based on birth, established equality before the law and secured the right to property. This Code was exported to the regions under French control. In the Dutch Republic, in

Switzerland, in Italy and Germany, Napoleon simplified administrative divisions, abolished the feudal system and freed peasants from serfdom and manorial dues. In the towns too, guild restrictions were removed. Transport and communication systems were improved. Peasants, artisans, workers and new businessmen enjoyed a new-found freedom. He introduced many laws such as the protection of private property and a uniform system of weights and measures provided by the decimal system. Businessmen and small-scale producers of goods, in particular, began to realize that uniform laws, standardized weights and measures, and a common national currency would facilitate the movement and exchange of goods and capital from one region to another. Initially, many saw Napoleon as a liberator who would bring freedom for the people. However, in the areas conquered, the reactions of the local populations to French rule were mixed. Initially, in many places such as Holland and Switzerland, as well as in certain cities like Brussels, Mainz, Milan and Warsaw, the French armies were welcomed as harbingers of liberty. But the initial enthusiasm soon turned to hostility, as it became clear that the new administrative arrangements did not go hand in hand with political freedom. Increased taxation, censorship, forced conscription into the French armies required to conquer the rest of Europe, all seemed to outweigh the advantages of the administrative changes. Soon the Napoleonic armies came to be viewed everywhere as an invading force. Many of his measures that carried the revolutionary ideas of liberty and modern laws to other parts of Europe had an impact on people long after Napoleon had left.



INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

The Industrial Revolution was a transformation of human life circumstances that occurred in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (roughly 1760 to 1840) in Britain, the United States, and Western Europe due in large measure to advances in the technologies of industry. The Industrial Revolution was characterized by a complex interplay of changes in technology, society, medicine, economy, education, and culture in which multiple technological innovations replaced human labour with mechanical work, replaced sources like wood with mineral sources like coal and iron, freed mechanical power from being tied to a fixed running water source, and supported the injection of capitalist practices, methods, and principles into what had been an agrarian society.

The Industrial Revolution marked a major turning point in human history, comparable to the invention of farming or the rise of the first city-states—almost every aspect of daily life and human society was, eventually, in some way altered. As with most examples of change in complex systems, the transformation referenced by “Industrial Revolution” was really a whole system effect wrought through multiple causes, of which the technological advances are only the most apparent.

Industrial Revolution started in the United Kingdom in the early seventeenth century. The Act of Union uniting England and Scotland ushered in a sustained period of internal peace and an internal free market without internal trade barriers. Britain had a reliable and fast developing banking sector, a straight forward legal framework for setting up joint stock companies, a modern legal framework and system to enforce the rule of law, a developing transportation system. In the latter half of the 1700s the manual labour based economy of the

Kingdom of Great Britain began to be replaced by one dominated by industry and the manufacture of machinery. It started with the mechanization of the textile industries, the development of iron-making techniques and the increased use of refined coal. Once started, it spread. Trade expansion was enabled by the introduction of canals, improved roads and railways. The introduction of steam power (fueled primarily by coal) and powered machinery (mainly in textile manufacturing) underpinned the dramatic increases in production capacity. The development of all-metal machine tools in the first two decades of the nineteenth century facilitated the manufacture of more production machines for manufacturing in other industries. The effects spread throughout Western Europe and North America during the nineteenth century, eventually affecting most of the world. The impact of this change on society was enormous.

Industrial Revolution, its emergence in England was primarily the result of the many reasons. A few are briefly enumerated here. A major increase in population; An agricultural revolution, which was linked to population growth and the application of new techniques and machinery in cultivation; the application of new techniques of production in the cotton and iron and steel industries; the gradual abandonment of cottage industry and a focus of production in factories, where it could be more rigorously supervised.

Character of British society also is stated to have stimulated the rise of entrepreneurship. The pursuit of wealth in trade and manufacture or in the professions led to the accumulation of fortunes which gave individuals rank and status. Utter rejection of such fortune as “tainted” was not a feature of English society, as it was in Europe. Nobles themselves invested in activities which linked their estates to manufacturing.

In both France and Germany, the construction of railways in the mid-nineteenth century was crucial to the growth of industrial capital. The development of industrial capitalism in other countries (Russia, and Hungary for instance) in the late nineteenth century was primarily the result of capital investments from the established industrial nations. However, towards the end of nineteenth century, increasing importance of markets in colonies and underdeveloped regions of the world cannot be denied for all these nations.

Agricultural Revolution and Industrial Revolution

“Agricultural revolution”, which grew out of the commercial agriculture of the seventeenth and early eighteenth century was a major factor responsible for the development of industrial capitalism in England, and the “industrial revolution”. In English agriculture, cultivation was by and large market oriented by this time. It was also specialized according to the convenience of soil, climate, location and product. e.g. Clay soil of the Midlands was ideal for wheat production. Commercial production was primarily on the farms of the large tenants of greater and lesser landowners. These proprietors were not concerned with the productivity of their land as much as the rent it yielded, and they instituted major improvements in order to assure themselves of high rents.

Transfer of capital from agriculture to industry was a major requirement of the rise of industrial capitalism in the country. Equally important for the rise of industrial capitalism was the improvement in agricultural productivity and the ample availability of food for seasonal and perennial industrial labour. Such improvement was initially the result of reorganization of cultivation; but from the end of the eighteenth century, improvement was also the result of the application of industrial technology for cultivation.

Many technology innovations were introduced into like crop rotation of root crops and legumes (beetroot, clover, sainfoin etc.), which reinvigorated the soil, and allowed farmers to forgo the necessity of leaving it uncultivated (fallow) to avoid soil exhaustion. Mixing marls (soil which was a mixture of carbonate of lime

and clay) were used in sandy soil, as a fertilizer. Strips and commons were consolidated to introduce improvements and increase productivity to preserve income levels. This also led to release of sizable sections of rural population for industrial labour. Besides, Enclosures by Acts of Parliament were undertaken in large number from around 1759. Under-drainage, which was necessary for cultivation of heavy clay land, was begun extensively in the 1820s.

Technical Innovations

The most famous inventions were as follows. For the textile industry, most significant were Kay's Flying Shuttle (1733), which increased the pace of weaving, Arkwright's Spinning Jenny (1769), and later more innovations revolutionized spinning, i.e. Crompton's “mule” of 1779 Arkwright's water frame of 1785 and (for weaving), Cartwright's Power Loom of 1785. In the coal and iron industry, the development of coke by Abraham Darby (1709) and the use of “pudding” and hammering by Cort.

The innovations, on the other hand, in the case of coke, altered the quality of coal, while other innovations permitted the quick removal of impurities. The application of steam power to production through the Newcomen Engine (1705-06) and, more significantly, James Watt's engines, allowed the running of large wooden and metal machines. The innovations led to economies in various aspects of production. Such innovation also gave the entrepreneur greater flexibility.

Crucial for the iron industry was the process which allowed the production of steel, a more tensile and malleable product than iron. This was the consequence of Henry Bessemer's innovation of 1856 whereby air blasts at the bottom of masses of molten metal reduced the carbon content of iron, producing steel: a process which was perfected further by Sir William Siemens and Pierre Martin (1866) in the open hearth process.

Demand, Market and Govt. Support

The increase in demand and labour that a growing population supplied were crucial to the development of industrial capitalism; and substantial growth in population undoubtedly took place over the century, from 5.83 million in England and Wales in 1701 to 9.16 millions in 1801.

In this course of affairs, although, at home, demand from the poorer classes undoubtedly led to increase in agricultural production and the transport industries which were linked to it, it was middle class demand that merits attention. There was a long history to this development, but it created a market for substantial rather than fine goods, in other words, those suitable for machine production. A rise in income before 1740 and a combination of rise of middle classes and growth of overseas market after 1740 gave a substantial scope to the market for industrial capitalism.

Large centers of production were controlled by the government. Government orders for munitions were of importance to the iron industry, wool and textile industries. The Navigation Act (initially passed in 1660), and related legislation, were important to the shipbuilding industry, since they required that trade with the colonies and carriage of goods from Asia, Africa and America could only be done on English ships. Government followed a protectionist policy of considerable scope (general import duties rising from 10% in 1698 to 15% in 1704 to 20% in 1747, 25% in 1759, 30% in 1779 and 35% in 1782. Most celebrated was the duty on corn imports, established by the Corn Law (initially passed in 1670) by a sliding scale, which varied from 25% of the home price to a minor charge when that price was particularly high.

After the period of spirited growth described above, industrial capitalism in Britain was consolidated in the mid nineteenth century, partly through participation in international construction of railways. Other emerging Industrial nations increasingly placed British production under severe competition after the 1870s, which is described as the beginnings of the Great Depression. This "depression" affected both agriculture and industry: the former as a result of the arrival of cheap grain from North America on British markets from the 1870s, and the latter because of competition from new industrializing nations.

Railways to Colonial Markets

The gradual development of steam-engine drawn railway lines in England after the first Darlington-Stockton rail was built (1825), substantially affected the iron and coal industries in Britain, which provided rolling stock, rail etc.

The railways contributed to "economies of scale", because, for a variety of industries, they cut down the time taken for transport. If cotton had been crucial to the economy of industrial capitalism to the 1840s, it was coal and iron which led thereafter.

Much of the industrial expansion of this period was the consequence of the large amounts of capital generated during the early phase of the industrial revolution. Such capital inevitably flowed to railways, given their considerable attractions (the Stockton Darlington generated 15% interest on investment in 1839-41, and the Liverpool-Manchester, a 10% dividend in 1830). From the 1860, with increasing competition from European economies and the economy of the United States, the international position of British industrial capitalism declined. The consequence was the resort to underdeveloped and colonial markets which became increasingly important to the country by the end of the nineteenth century.

Modern Industrial Society and New Classes

Capital accumulation in the countryside and erosion of common communal rights led to significant class formation within the peasantry in most areas of Europe. All over Europe, the development of capitalism and modern class society meant the breakup of peasant societies, and the differentiation of the peasantry into classes ranging from the peasant petty bourgeoisie to the rural proletariat. More than anywhere else in Europe, the peasantry in Russia became responsive to political appeals and played a significant role in the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of the socialist regime. With the development of capitalism in Europe that rural conflicts became subsumed into the fundamental dichotomy of Capital and Labour, even as peasant agriculture remained alive and the landlords remained privileged strata of European societies.

This entire process of social restructuring that ensured a smooth and profitable integration of the landed aristocracy into the capitalist economy and bourgeois society was helped along by the political victory of the land-owning gentry, for example, in the 'Glorious Revolution' after the English Civil War, followed by the land enclosures of the 18th century. Only from the 1880's that we can seriously speak of the

declining wealth or political influence of the landed gentry in England. Landlordism actually vanished in Russia with the destruction of capitalism itself.

The second half of the nineteenth century can be characterized as the age of the bourgeoisie in Western Europe, although in the eastern parts the bourgeoisie having attained its own identity and wealth, was yet to exert its hegemony. Throughout Western Europe the wealthiest and the most influential section of the bourgeoisie were now bankers, factory owners and mine owners, i.e. capitalists particularly after the 1850's. The merchants lost their eminence as their class gained hegemony. Commercial bourgeoisie invested in urban property and land, participated as actors on the political stage.

The virtues of the capitalist ethos-individualism, thrift, hard work, competition, use of money power, family, were values basically promoted by middle class, and came to dominate industrial society as a whole. The bourgeoisie also included the professional salaried component that grew with the growth of bureaucracies, the sectors of health and medicine, law and order, education, publishing, printing and mass media, and culture as an industry, with a new system of patronage linked to mass production.

This entire bourgeoisie shared a critical distance from the landed aristocracy and the monarchies in their countries as they grew in strength and significance, and despite the clear differentiation among themselves were united in their opposition to privilege and despotism. Social democracy and the women's movement, which questioned the status quo, were born as a result of these.

Numbers increased rapidly with the expansion of services of various kinds under capitalism: Retailing, marketing, distribution, banking and finance. This led to emergence of lower middle class. The lower middle class, though highly stratified, can be divided into two main groups – the classic petty bourgeoisie of shopkeepers and small businessmen, and the new white-collar salaried occupations, mostly clerks but also commercial travellers, schoolteachers, and certain shop assistants.

They stood for the broad features of the capitalist economy, strongly defended the right to private property and their goals were to aspire

to bourgeois status and climb higher in the social ladder. They did not agitate to overthrow the bourgeois social order or to challenge the right to private property, even as they suffered the consequences of increasing concentration of production and trade, and lost out badly in the ensuring competition. In the labour market too their situation was precarious.

Industrialization may have reduced the barriers between the landed classes and the wealthy middle classes, but it sharpened the differences between the middle class and the labour class. This is one of the reasons for their emerging as a political and social class despite their varied composition. The city and social life reflected the strong division of the rich and poor. They had different spaces in the city to live in, and the amenities and the facilities were quite different.

The industrial revolution destroyed the traditional world of the new factory worker. The new worker was now entirely dependent on a cash wage, subjected to a totally different work rhythm dictated by the factory discipline and the machine. Working conditions were terrible. The new industrial working class bore the brunt of the early industrial growth. Long hours of work (15-16 hours, later 12 hours), unending grind and terrible behaviour by the supervisors often led to series of spontaneous worker riots.

Political Consciousness and Class Consciousness

Class experiences gave rise to class-consciousness on the part of the different sections of society, which was expressed through differing political affiliations. The bourgeoisie expressed its political consciousness initially through representing the general demands of society against privilege and despotism. Increasingly it began to give specific form and content to its class interests through promoting economic policies opposed to agriculture and landed aristocracy and through gaining dominance in the representative institutions. Although ideologically it stood by liberalism, in practice it supported and initiated centrist and right wing parties as well to counter the working class pressure.

The working people were the first to challenge the capitalist order. Theirs is a story that began with food riots and machine breaking and

evolved into varied forms of organized protests that assumed great political significance.

In Europe, with the emergence of capitalism, landlords and the peasantry were integrated with the economy in different ways. At the same time, in some countries the dominance of landed interests continued to shape the society and economy. This dominance of landed interest did not allow the emerging bourgeoisie to attain an independent identity or hegemony. Elsewhere, the newly emerging classes had to struggle politically to attain a new consciousness.

Impact over social and economic systems

Industrial revolution is synonymous with certain technological and economic changes, with important social consequences and social origins. It denotes the extensive application of water, steam (and later electrical) power in production systems; the focus of production in the factory and its formidable mechanization; major changes in the character and exploitation of “home” and “foreign” markets, and the near disappearance of subsistence agriculture.

Industrial society cannot survive without universal literacy. Education which was a cottage industry in the agrarian world, must now become full-fledged, impersonal and organized modern industry to turn out neat, uniform human product out of the raw material of an uprooted anonymous mass population.

An industrial society is one in which work is not manual but semantic. Modern economy does not just need a worker; it needs a skilled worker. It is mobile society; it is an egalitarian society; and it is a society with a shared high-culture and not exclusive as it was in the agrarian world.

A peasant's son need not be a peasant; what occupational position he occupies will depend, not on his heredity or community's status, but on his own competence and training.

Land inevitably attracted investment and loans, but industry, with its few guarantees was a different matter. Until mid-eighteenth century, entrepreneurs lent to themselves within the same trade, or drew on the funds that merchants made available to them. They could also call for loans on goldsmiths and others who dealt in precious metals. With a pickup of commercial activity in agriculture and industry, such

“bankers” were joined by various country banks which were set up during periods of expanding trade after mid-century. They were also backed by London banks in times of difficulty. A network existed, therefore, for redistributing resources at the time that manufacturing industry increasingly came to require it.

Industry was increasingly rationalized. Here, rationalization implied the subordination of production to calculation—a development which had been less important earlier, since hired labour and technology were rarely concentrated in one place, where the influence of the capitalist could exert itself effectively. Among the consequences of such change were economies of scale, where, as production increased, each unit of manufacture became cheaper in terms of costs of production. A diminution of dependence on natural forces (climate, cardinality) followed from the integration of markets

Major changes in ecological balance resulted from the scale of demand and production: well known here is the deforestation of large sections of the United States and Russia, and the destruction of wild herds in the United States. An important feature was also the rigorous subordination of economic activity to the troughs and booms of the trade cycle, whose nature varied in accordance with alterations in investment and consumption.

‘Gradualist’ argument which stressed continuities with earlier demographic regime and slow growth of industrial productivity has been criticized for not taking into account the substantial contributions of female and child labour and for not taking a connected regional picture of emerging industrialization.

The peculiar importance of youth labour in the industrial revolution are highlighted in several instances of textile and other machinery being designed and build to suit the child worker. The spinning jenny was a celebrated case; the original country jenny had a horizontal wheel requiring a posture most comfortable for children aged nine to twelve. Indeed, for a time, in the very early phases of mechanization and factory organization in the woollen and silk industries as well as in cotton, it was generally believed that child labour was integral to textile machine design.

Bureaucratization can be said to encompass the processes both of the centralization and expansion and of the professionalization of all institutions. Bureaucratization has been a result & cause of and similar to industrialization. Generating and exploiting material resources took the form of industrialization; doing the same with human resources took the form of social mobilization. Entirely new institutions and professions were required for these activities; and the emergence of professional bureaucracies takes place against this background. The first of these were the direct servants of the state, the civil servants and the armed forces. Bureaucratization was accompanied by a campaign against "corruption" and in the cause of "efficiency."

Geographical Spread of IR United States

As in Britain, the United States originally used water power to run its factories, with the consequence that industrialization was essentially limited to New England and the rest of the Northeastern United States, where fast-moving rivers were located. However, the raw materials (cotton) came from the Southern United States. It was not until after the American Civil War in the 1860s that steam-powered manufacturing overtook water-powered manufacturing, allowing the industry to spread across the entire nation.

Samuel Slater (1768–1835) is popularly known as the founder of the American cotton industry. As a boy apprentice in Derbyshire, England, he learned of the new techniques in the textile industry and defied laws against the emigration of skilled workers by leaving for New York in 1789, hoping to make money with his knowledge. Slater started Slater's mill at Pawtucket, Rhode Island, in 1793, and went on to own thirteen textile mills.

While on a trip to England in 1810, Newburyport, Massachusetts merchant Francis Cabot Lowell was allowed to tour the British textile factories, but not take notes. Realizing the War of 1812 had ruined his import business but that a market for domestic finished cloth was emerging in America, he memorized the design of textile machines, and on his return to the United States, he set up the Boston Manufacturing Company. Lowell and his partners built America's first cotton-to-cloth textile mill at Waltham, Massachusetts. After his

death in 1817, his associates built America's first planned factory town, which they named after him. This enterprise was capitalized in a public stock offering, one of the first such uses of it in the United States. Lowell, Massachusetts, utilizing 5.6 miles of canals and ten thousand horsepower delivered by the Merrimack River, is considered the "Cradle of the American Industrial Revolution." The short-lived, utopia-like Lowell System was formed, as a direct response to the poor working conditions in Britain. However, by 1850, especially following the Irish Potato Famine, the system was replaced by poor immigrant labour.

Continental Europe

The Industrial Revolution on Continental Europe came later than in Great Britain. In many industries, this involved the application of technology developed by Britain in new places. Often the technology was purchased from Britain, or British engineers and entrepreneurs in search of new opportunities abroad. By 1809, part of the Ruhr Valley in Westphalia were being called "Miniature England" because of its similarities to the industrial areas of England. The German, Russian, and Belgian governments did all they could to sponsor the new industries by the provisions of state funding.

In some cases (such as iron), the different availability of resources locally meant that only some aspects of the British technology were adopted.

Japan

In 1871, a group of Japanese politicians known as the Iwakura Mission toured Europe and the U.S. to learn western ways. The result was a deliberate, state led industrialization policy to prevent Japan from falling behind. The Bank of Japan, founded in 1877, used taxes to fund model steel and textile factories. Education was expanded and Japanese students were sent to study in the west.

A brief discussion of how IR spread to France and Germany is important to understand and internalize the overall history of industrialization. Major improvements in cultivation were introduced in many regions of France especially in the north east, i.e. French Flanders (where innovation in agriculture in Holland and Belgium had initially made their way to England and

were now quickly disseminated). Knowledge of “improving methods” which were prevalent in England and elsewhere came to be known through publications such as Duhamel du Monceau’s 6-volume introduction to improving agriculture, through cheap literature and by word-of-mouth. Partly as a result of the application of “improving” techniques, substantial increase in agricultural production was registered during 1725-1789.

Since much cultivation on peasant land was still based on the three-field rotation in an open field, improvements were difficult to initiate on smaller holdings and strips. Hence, on the standard and smaller peasant holdings, where the open field was less known, land was increasingly insufficient to provide the requirements of a growing family. Although commercialization in agriculture was substantial, and major surpluses of grain were available for growing urban population, large fluctuations and disparities in income levels were a feature of the French countryside, as was dire poverty in certain quarters.

A rapidly-growing internal market for manufactured goods, though, was not a feature of initial manufacturing development; for this was prevented by major problems of trade within the country, and the problems of industrial organization and capital availability. The country was far from uniform in its administration, and could not strictly be treated as a well integrated market by traders and producers. Industry was curbed by guild restrictions. Country banks were not available in the country. Unlike England, the practice of trade and manufacture attracted social disapproval among the French elite, among whom status by privilege, either through venal offices (i.e. official positions which could be bought), or through titles of nobility.

A considerable portion of the political and social reconstruction of France during the 1789-1815 periods had major economic repercussions, and affected the position of industrial capitalism within the country. These include the attack on privilege and the consequent changes in land tenure, and the abolition of guild structures; and equally important, the impact of war and expansion of trade and production.

The sudden influx of cheap goods from England after the end of the Napoleonic Wars

immediately led to decline in demand for many items of French manufacture on the Continent, and confronted producers with the possibility of bankruptcy. It was almost natural, therefore, that the government of the country’s Restoration rulers (Louis XVIII and Charles X), turned to a continuation of Napoleonic and pre-Revolutionary policies to “protect” national industry.

Demands for free trade coincided with the industrial growth of the 1830s and 1840s. But still much production focused in small units, which explains the popularity of protection until 1848; and that production was dependent on less productive water power. Beyond international circumstances, much of the increase in production in France was the consequence of the interventionism of the Bonapartist state under the Second Empire. Here government encouragement of growth, prompted by Napoleon III’s Saint Simonian principles, was evident in the official assistance to the creation of the Credit Foncier (a national mortgage bank) and the Credit Mobilier (a joint-stock bank).

Following the defeat of France in the Franco-Prussian War (1870-71), a general impression prevailed for several decades that the country experienced a decline. However, the impression always bore reference to comparisons with Germany and the United States.

France showed substantial headway in research and development in the fields of chemicals production and the electrical industries. e.g. Solvay process for soda, dyestuff research, electrical and telegraph and telephone manufacturing research are some areas where France showed considerable growth. In general, the loss of Alsace and Lorraine in 1871 (to Germany) was less significant for French industrial capitalism than may initially appear.

In Germany, many circumstances hindered economic growth of a more substantial nature. Availability of labour was poor for much of the eighteenth century in certain areas – the consequences of heavy mortality during the wars of the time (the War of the Austrian Succession and the Seven Years’ War). The territory of the German states, moreover, did not provide manufacturers with a well-integrated market, since each state had its tolls and duties, and

transit required the payment of these.

Other problems of significance were: quality, for instance, of the coal and iron deposits in the region. In the East of the region, labour mobility was severely restricted by the prevalence of serfdom. Capital supply was, unlike Britain and like France, limited to the wealth of powerful traders and manufacturers, and could not call on a wider network of availability of capital

Such problems became of decreasing significance with the Serf Emancipation in the 1800s, the creation of the Zollverein (the Prussia-centered customs' union) in the 1830s, the dismantling of paternalist conventions in 1848-49, and the creation of joint-stock banks on French model in the 1850s. Together, these developments lay the foundation of the industrial boom of the middle decades of the nineteenth century, and, following the formation of the German empire, industrial capital systematically developed on this basis.

The character of capitalism in the region was decisively influenced by official measures that were taken in the area during the period 1789-1815. In the first case, the industrial settlements of the Rhineland underwent the dismantling of the guilds, and the abolition of their privileges – which improved the status of competitors in a number of industries and gave greater scope to innovation. The Continental system increased demand for the products of this region. The impact of serf emancipation, though, in Prussia was limited but decisive and ubiquitous.

Crucial also to economic growth after 1815 was the gradual development of large regional markets in the 1820s, before the formation of the Prussia centered Zollverein (Customs Union) in 1834. Within such a system of trade agreements, the development of railways in the German states acted as a major stimulus to production and innovation in the enclaves of iron and coal production in Silesia and in the Rhineland. Railway lines allowed the extension of a home market which was reasonably well-knot around the internal river system based around the Rhine, the Elbe and the Oder, all of which had canal networks working off them.

In total it can be said that the France and German industrial capitalism was constrained by a peasantry tied to land on the one hand

(fragmented holdings held by customary rights in France and serfdom in Germany) and the dominance of big landed institution, on the other. As a consequence of the above, the state played a crucial role in (a) creating uniform legislative measures, (b) financing of industry and (c) creating a common market. In France, however, an important role was played by the period of French revolution when the attack on privilege loosened the tight grip of nobility and the guilds.

The growth of industrial capitalism in Russia struggled with the country's persistent backwardness. In the process a major role was played by the state which tried to mobilize a labour force by 'emancipation of serfs,' took policy initiatives like bringing in foreign capital for investment and took major initiative in setting up centres of industry. Insufficient growth in the agricultural sector tended to reinforce backwardness.

Models of development

W.W. Rostow, in his discussion of the stages of economic growth argues that growth follows five stages:

- Traditional society, where innovation occurs in both industry and agriculture, but there is a limit on "the level of attainable output per head".
- Societies "in a process of transition" in "the period when the pre-conditions for take-off are developed", where transition might be the result of circumstances where "the insights of modern science began to be translated into new production functions" in agriculture and industry. An "intrusion" thus created would lead to the path towards modernity.
- The stage of take-off which is "the interval when old blocks and resistances to steady growth are finally overcome", where "enclaves of modern activity" expand and dominate society, and where "growth becomes the normal condition". Here investment of the Gross National Product of GNP must increase from about 5% upto 10% on average, and it must be marked by large reinvestment in industries and large scale changes in agriculture.

It is a stage to be seen in Britain in the twenty years after 1783; in France and the USA in the decades before 1860; in Germany in the 1850-1875; period; and in Russia and Canada in the twenty-five years before 1914. The cardinal elements and periodicity of this perspective are not easily justified. Many of Rostow's preconditions for take-off are themselves, for instance, features of take-off itself: in the case of the French economy, no significant period of take-off is discernible.

- The drive to maturity, when an economy become fully part of an international economy, the significance of established leading sectors decline and investment stands at 10-20% of GNP.
- The stage of high mass consumption, where greater resources are devoted to social welfare, and where the focus of the economy shifts from leading sectors to durable consumer goods.

Alexander Gerschenkron, on the other hand, in his discussion of backwardness in historical perspective, argues that stress on "preconditions" or "take-off" is unwarranted, since these hardly exist in any consistent way in industrialization. He feels that "the development of a backward country tend to differ fundamentally from that of an advanced country".

Gerschenkron proposes that the nature of the industrialization process in a backward country shows differences when compared with advanced countries in the rate of industrial growth and, in its organization and nature of production. These consequences are the result of the application of "institutional instruments" for which no counterpart exists in established industrial nations. The intellectual climate of industrialization is substantially different. "The extent to which these attributes of backwardness occurred in individual instances appears to have varied directly with the degree of backwardness and the natural industrial potentialities of the countries concerned".

Novel banking networks and the intervention of the state are the "institutional instruments" that Gerschenkron isolates as crucial to industrialization in "backward" states of Europe. Hence in France, a new form of banking emerged during the reign of Napoleon III, which changed the direction of established wealth and established

a model of banking which thereafter became widely established on the continent. This model was developed in new directions in Germany. In Russia, on the other hand, the state was inspired by military interests to establish a firm path towards industrialization. Different paths followed by different countries for industrialization drives home the point that there can be no one-stop solution for the general underdevelopment in developing countries of world. Every nation has to fine tune its strategy keeping in mind its specific concerns.

Ideological Criticisms

Path towards capitalist 'Industrial revolution' was not accepted unanimously but an ideological and intellectual criticism of earlier growth models was vigorously pursued. Criticism pursued mercantilists who were concerned with the methods the state might use to promote prosperity, through regulation of foreign trade; criticism was also leveled against physiocrats who were mainly concerned with general improvements in the productivity of the land. A proper integration of the various forces which were crucial to capitalism (population, entrepreneurship, demand, rent, profit, state policy etc.) were achieved by Adam Smith (1723-1790), David Ricardo (1772-1823) and Thomas Robert Malthus. Smith, in his *Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* established a critique of mercantilism and physiocracy. He supported the principle of laissez faire. Smith accepted the occurrence of social disparities when individuals pursued their own ends; but he was optimistic that overall prosperity would ensure, and that a degree of "harmony" with the onset of 'perfect' competition in prosperity would exist in social relations.

Objections were raised by others thinkers against the capitalist industrialization. Ricardo was convinced that steady increase in rent, which would follow more production and a growing population, might be the foundation of economic crises. Malthus, on the other hand, saw a rising population, which was the necessary consequence of growth, as the ultimate brake on prosperity. "Utilitarian" views, associated with Jeremy Bentham that some role for government was still to be found in the pursuit of prosperity were further strengthened in face of such criticisms. These were aimed primarily to ensure the "greatest happiness of the greatest number",

which might, in various circumstances, be threatened by the greed of the minority.

Smith's optimism regarding the ability of classes to arrive at a harmonious pursuit of prosperity, despite disparities of income, was challenged by Socialist writers. Sismonde de Sismondi (1773-1842), saw production increasing rapidly within capitalist development, but also foresaw a growth of inequalities, which could not be resolved, except through state intervention. Proudhon (1809-1868), considered that the injustices which were linked to inequalities must be ameliorated by "mutualism" or the activities of voluntary associations which would perform the regulatory functions of an interventionist state. Karl Marx (1818-1883) attempted to isolate the course that inequality would run, and argued that capitalism itself would collapse eventually.

A revolution in human life

To speak of the Industrial Revolution is to identify only the most immediately obvious aspects of a total social revolution that occurred during the period called the Industrial Revolution.

The short-term effects were in many cases drastic as traditional family-centered agrarian lifestyles with all family members playing a role were torn asunder by long hours of tedious factory work required of men, women, and children if the family were to earn enough to survive. These new work patterns, over time, fostered the emergence of laws, regulations, inspectors, and labour unions to protect factory workers from exploitation by the factory owners. Aided by these protections, families became more stable and factory workers in the cities became

the source of an emergent middle class occupying such positions as managers or independent entrepreneurs or government employees.

Over the long term, the Industrial Revolution marked a period in which the living standard of the people in the affected countries rose tremendously as did the power of the human species to use technology for exploiting nature to human purpose and the image of the human being as the rightful dominating owner of the natural world. The resulting destructive consumption of the natural world has grown to such dimensions that in recent decades equally powerful counter currents calling for sustainable development and responsible stewardship of nature have arisen.

While the Industrial Revolution contributed to a great increase in the GDP per capita of the participating countries, the spread of that greater wealth to large numbers of people in general occurred only after one or two generations during which the wealth was disproportionately concentrated in the hands of a relatively few. Still, it enabled the ordinary to enjoy a standard of living far better than that of their forebears. Traditional agrarian societies had generally been more stable and progressed at a much slower rate before the advent of the Industrial Revolution and the emergence of the modern capitalist economy. In countries affected directly by it, the Industrial Revolution dramatically altered social relations, creating a modern, urban society with a large middle class. In most cases, the GDP has increased rapidly in those capitalist countries that follow a track of industrial development, in a sense recapitulating the Industrial Revolution.



NATIONALISM AND BRITISH DEMOCRATIC POLITICS

Nationalism is an ideology and belief that the people of a single territory should have a common culture, and with it, a sovereign state. Nationalism is a modern phenomenon, dating from the eighteenth century; when it combines with the modern state in that territory, the product is known as the nation-state. The creation of the nation-state system thus witnessed the development of nation-states out of existing states (France and Britain) or through the unification of a number of smaller ones (Germany and Italy).

At the same time, the process entailed the break-up of existing territorial states into a number of national units. The prime examples of this process were the Russian, Habsburg, and Ottoman empires. Hence their pattern of formation went through three phases; the first of scholars propagating the idea of a single nation by promoting its language, folklore, and history; the second of journalism disseminating the idea of the nation through popular publications in the national language; and the third of political movements espousing these doctrines to work for the nation-state. When international diplomacy and war combined with these factors, as especially during and after the First World War, a number of such nation-states established themselves.

Until the French revolutionary wars, states engaged in war and diplomacy; thereafter it was nations, or more strictly, nation-states. Nationalism has clearly emerged as the most dominant political force during the course of the last two centuries. Modern man does not simply think; he thinks as French or German or as an Indian. One of the most prominent features of modern state is nationalism. Nationalism has become one of most important instruments of mobilization and effectively it leads to self-

mobilization. For nearly 150 years between the Congress of Vienna in 1815 and the end of the Second World War in 1945, nationalism was the lone promoter of nation-states.

Although it is possible to trace the idea of the nation to the earliest times and certainly to the 16th century – as in the case of the German word Volk for people – there is considerable unanimity among historians that nationalism is a modern concept. Despite other disagreements, scholars like Benedict Anderson, Ernest Gellner and Eric Hobsbawm agree that nationalism is a phenomenon which emerged in the eighteenth century in Western Europe and then spread during the 19th and 20th centuries to other parts of the world.

Proto-Nationalism Before 1789

Several 19th Century Observers believed that elements of nationalism emerged in the medieval period – a sense of ethnic or linguistic or national identity. This can be called a form of patriotism or of protonationalism. The 19th century French historian and politician Guizot believed that the Hundred Years War between England and France (1337-1453) – provoked by the claim of the king of England to the throne of France – brought together the nobility, burghers and peasantry in a common desire to defeat the foreigners who had attacked and plundered France. Though modern historians regard this as a period of crises marked by war, plague and famine; it did create a sense of patriotism. The four different nationalities which created a modern state in 1648 managed to create a distinct Swiss national consciousness only by 1848 after the victory of the liberals and the drafting of a new federal Constitution.

The 19th century is regarded as a century of nationalism – a period in which the idea of the nation state based on Britain and France was generalized and perceived as the universal principle for modern societies. It is the considered

view of historians that nationalism in the modern sense emerged with the growth of industrial capitalism or print capitalism and was then sustained by a variety of factors – by notions of community based on language, ethnicity or religion or by the rivalry and competition among states and imagined communities.

The big change in the attitude towards nationality and nationalism came about in the late 19th century with the growth of mass political movements in the era of democratic politics. After 1880 the debate about the national question becomes important with the need to mobilize voters for different political parties and to gain adherents for new ideologies whether among socialists or minor linguistic and national groupings. In the later stage of mass politics and national movements, the state played an active role. Colonel Pilsudski, the liberator of Poland, in fact observed, “It is the state which makes the nation and not the nation the state”. Whatever view one takes of the relations between nation and state, it was electoral democracy which undermined the liberal theory of the nation.

The exercise of power in modern European states was different from any form that preceded it. It was marked especially by the absolute power of the modern state, and the correspondingly enormous mobilization of the population over which these states exercised their powers. Nationalism was the driver of this type of mobilization.

Defining the Un-Definable

The earliest attempt to define a nation was made in 1882 by Ernest Renan, a French scholar. He defined nation, as a “human collectively brought together by will, consciousness and collective memory” (and also common forgetfulness, or a collective amnesia). He called the nation as an exercise in everyday plebiscite. The strength of Renan’s definition lay in providing a voluntaristic (as against naturalistic) component to the understanding of nation. He forcefully rejected the notion that nations were created by natural boundaries like mountains, rivers and oceans. He emphasized the role of human will and memory in the making of a nation.

According to Renan, human collectivity or grouping can will itself to form a nation. The process of the creation of a nation is not defendant upon any natural or objective criteria

and a nation, in order to be, is not obliged to fulfil any of the objection conditions.

Stalin offered a much sharper and comprehensive understanding of nations. According to him, ‘A nation is a historically constituted, stable community of people,’ formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture.’ If Renan’s definition-net was too wide catching nations as well as many non-nations, Stalin’s definition tended to be a bit narrow, leaving out significant nations.

Though Renan offered an ‘idealist’ definition of the nation as against the ‘materialist’ analysis of Stalin, both authors believed that there was nothing eternal or everlasting about nations. Nations had a beginning and they would also have an end.

Within the Marxist tradition, the definition of the nation has evolved from the writings of Marx and Engels, through Lenin and Stalin, to those of Hobsbawm. Broadly speaking, within this tradition the nation is regarded as a historically evolved phenomenon which emerges only with decline of feudalism and the rise of capitalism. Tribes, clans and peoples existed prior to the emergence of capitalism but it was because of new economic relations produced by the emergence of the capitalist mode of production that nations were created. Nationalism was regarded as an ideological construct which enabled the bourgeoisie to identify its interests as a class with the interests of the whole society.

Hobsbawm also emphasizes that nations and nationalist aspirations have to be examined in “the context of a particular stage of technological and economic development.” Though essentially constructed from above, nationalism cannot be understood unless it is also analyzed from below” in terms of the assumptions, hopes, needs, longings and interests of ordinary people which are not necessarily national and still less nationalist”.

Friedrich List in ‘The National System of Political Economy’ stated that, “a large population and an extensive territory endowed with manifold national resources, are essential requirements of the normal nationality. It is this tacit liberal assumption of a certain size of states

which Hobsbawm calls the “threshold principle” of nationality which the liberal bourgeoisie broadly endorsed from about 1830-1880. It is this threshold principle of nationality which is shared by figures as far apart as John Stuart Mill, Friedrich Engels and Mazzini. It is this principle which explains why Mazzini, the apostle of nationalism, did not support the cause of Irish independence. The principle of national self-determination in the period of Mill and Mazzini was therefore substantially different from that in the period of the American President, Woodrow Wilson.

The modern concept of the nation emerged during the Age of Revolution, the American Revolution of 1776 and the French Revolution of 1789. In America political discourse did not emphasize the unitary aspect of nationalism - the Americans were concerned with the inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, with the proper relation between the American union and the states and with development of a liberal capitalist society. By contrast, in France the nation was conceived as “one and indivisible”. The idea of the nation was inextricably linked up with mass participation, citizenship and collective sovereignty of the people or of a given nationality.

Hobsbawm draws a distinction between the revolutionary democratic and the nationalist conception of the nation. In the revolutionary democratic view of the nation the sovereign citizen people within a state constituted a nation in relation to others whereas in the nationalist view the “prior existence” of some distinguishing features of a community, setting it apart from others, was necessary to constitute a nation.

Hans Kohn, argues that “nationalities are products of the living forces of history and therefore always fluctuating never rigid.” Nationalities are not identical with clans, tribes or folk-groups nor are they the simple outcome of common descent or common habitat. Kohn argues: “Ethnographic groups like these existed throughout history, from earliest times on, yet they do not form nationalities; they are nothing but ‘ethnographic material’, out of which under certain circumstances a nationality might arise. Even if a nationality arises, it may disappear again, absorbed into a larger or new nationality”.

Kohn argued that “both the idea and the form of nationalism were developed before the age of nationalism”. The idea of nationalism is traceable to the ancient Hebrews and Greeks. The idea of the chosen people, the consciousness of national history and national mechanism were three traits of nationalism which emerged with the ancient Jews. But he acknowledges that, despite their “fierce nationalist ideology”, the Greeks lacked “political nationalism” and there was only a brief period of patriotism during the Persian Wars.

According to Ernest Gellner, nations are best understood in the spirit of nationalism. Contrary to popular belief it is not nations that lead to nationalism. But, nations are created by nationalism. The three components-will (Renan), culture (Stalin) and ideology (Gellner)- complete definition of nation.

Emergence of Nationalism

The present day congruence of nation and state (emergence of nation-state) is a product of specific development in human history. Arrival of the industrial era increased this division of labour manifold, thereby ensuring a long life for the state. State, under conditions of industrial economy, was no longer an option; it became a necessity.

According to Ernest Gellner: ‘nationalism is political principle that holds that national and political units should be congruent.’ For this coming to state and nation, there are clearly three preconditions-there should be a state; there should be a nation; and finally, they should be nationalism to tell the other two that they are meant for each other and cannot live without each other.

The citizens of the agrarian world lived in laterally insulated cultural groupings. It was an agglomeration of communities of common people. They lived in stable cultural formations, not particularly informed about the presence of other groups. Written word was rarely available to them. They lived their culture without ever articulating it. They could not write and to understand what was written, they relied upon the clergy or the Ulema or Brahmin.

Compared to agrarian society an industrial society was a society based on perpetual growth-both economic and cognitive. The industrial

society showed a tremendous commitment to continuous change and growth. It was a literate society. Literacy in the agrarian world was confined to the exclusive high-culture, in other words to the king, priest and the scholar. However, the reality was that universal suffrage did not come to West Europe till 1870 and in East Europe till 1919. Thus it was mainly the educated, urbane middle class who pursued the ideology of nationalism and liberalism and built movements around them.

The role of social status does not completely diminish in the industrial society, but it loses the eminence that it enjoyed in the agrarian world. A marriage of culture and polity is the only precondition to man's dignified survival in such a world of dissolving identities.

His national identity becomes important to him and only a state representative of his nation can ensure the preservation of this identity. This is nationalism. And this is why modern man is a nationalist. Modern state needs not only trained men but also committed and loyal men. They must follow the instructions of the state in which they live, and of no other subdivision within the territory. Only nationalism can ensure this.

Different Routes taken by Nationalism

Anthony Smith has attempted a division of a world into different types of routes that nationalism takes in its journey towards creation of nation-states. The creation of nation-states has taken two routes; Gradualist and nationalist. The gradualist route is generally conflict free and contest free and is one where the initiative was taken by the state to create conditions for the spread of nationalism.

Nation-states were thus formed either by direct state sponsored patriotism or were the result of colonization (Australia and Canada: they did not have to fight for independence) or provincialism where cultures/states just ceded from the imperial power, were granted independence and were on their way towards becoming nation-states. One feature of the gradualist route is that it was marked by the absence of conflict, violence, contesting claims over national hood or any national movement. The other, nationalist route is characterized by rupture, conflict, violence and earth-moving.

Smith divides this rupture-ridden route into two sub-routes those of ethnic nationalism and territorial nationalism. The ethnic sub-route is divided into two lanes-based on renewal and secession. Renewal is based on the renewal or the revival of a declining ethnic identity like Persia in the 1890s. The secessionist lane could be further divided into three by-lanes of breakaway, Diaspora and irredentist nationalism. The breakaway group sought to sever a bond through cessation. Bangladesh that broke away from Pakistan in 1991 could also come in the same category. The Diaspora nationalism is best represented by the Jews. The irredentist nationalism normally followed a successful national movement. If the new state did not include all the members of the ethnic group, these will demand the nation. Territorial nationalism occurred when a heterogeneous population was coercively united by a colonial power.

Nationalism is a territorial ideology which is internally unifying and externally divisive. Authorities as Max Weber and Lenin have argued that nations and nationalism have to be seen "primarily in political terms in relation to statehood". Nationalism is an ideology which links culturally and historically defined territorial communities called nations, to political statehood.

Three ways in which nationalism has shaped the modern state have been identified. In the older states like England and France the rise of nationalism was linked to the development of more democratic relationships between the state and civil society. Secondly, nationalism furthers the internal unification of culturally and economically diverse regions into a more homogenous state territory. Finally, nationalism divides one political community or nation from another and even determines the geographical boundaries of the nation in many cases.

Nationalism can support both movements of unification and separation. In Italy and Germany, nationalism and the state created a new nation state. In Scandinavia, nationalism produced the separation of Norway from Sweden.

As a result of the growth of industrialization, of the rise of the working class and socialism, and of inter-imperialist rivalries, nationalism became associated with conservative and right wing ideologies not just with the republican ideas of the French Revolution.

Factors Affecting Spread and Growth of Nationalism

The process of democratization in the first half of the 19th century was accelerated not only by revolutions but by a gradual process of socio-economic change; the growth of industries and the new social classes of the bourgeoisie and workers.

As the economy developed new social classes, of which the emergence of the working class in particular posed new problems for the 19th century modernizing state and the liberal bourgeoisie. After the 1832 Reform Act in Britain the struggle of the liberal middle class parted company with the struggles of the working classes. The inclusion of the propertied middle classes within the framework of electoral democracy was typically achieved in several European states by the mid 19th century. It was the emergence of the labour and socialist movement in the late 19th century which affected the balance of social forces. The rise of the Social Democratic Party in Germany during the late 19th century affected the position of the liberal bourgeoisie vis-à-vis the conservatives in the German politics and society. Mass participation – even the participation of a broad based socialist party – did not successfully democratize German society, though the extent of pre-World War I German conservatism has been exaggerated.

The modernization of states was accompanied by the development of a centralized administration and a large bureaucracy based on rational-legal principles. This process was accompanied by the development of a national language, of a language of administration and not merely local communication. The choice of a dialect or language as the medium of official communication led to public or state support for its propagation, especially through the school system. The growth of a professional middle class and of modern state bureaucracies were based on the growth of modern universities, law and journalism. The expansion of secondary school system and the state choice of the official or national language in schools became a source of great conflict among rival ethnic linguistic groups within multi-ethnic states like Austria-Hungary and in Eastern Europe in general. However, in earlier periods language had been less divisive because literacy levels were very low.

The modern state and its administrative innovations themselves sharpened a sense of linguistic identity among the general population. The statisticians and census data collectors from the 1860s onwards sought data on language. Hobsbawm observes, “In truth, by asking the language question, censuses for the first time forced everyone to choose not only a nationality, but a linguistic nationality”.

In older states like Britain and France a state-based patriotism itself encouraged a sense of nationalism during the course of the 19th century. The patriotism of the working classes in Europe did not deny the chasm between classes but affirmed its loyalty to the nation state. The most significant illustration of this is the manner in which the working class and socialist parties of the Second International which had repeatedly passed political resolutions condemning the idea of an imperialist war and emphasizing the international character of the struggle of the socialist parties very quickly identified with their nations and their national interest once the First World War broke out. It is evident that Socialists and Marxists had underestimated the power of nationalism and the patriotism of the working classes, even of these groups who professed socialism and identified with the social democratic parties.

The gradual extension of the franchise and the efforts of liberal states like Britain, modernizing states like Germany, or survival strategies of autocracies like Tsarist Russia to gain legitimacy and popular support, produced a form of patriotism. National pride and national identification was also encouraged by overseas expansion, by the material and psychological rewards which imperial possessions brought to countries like Britain, France, and even Holland and Spain. In Britain a sense of national identification was encouraged not only because of the “peculiarities” of the English and the glorious tradition of free born Englishmen, but also because of pride in a worldwide empire.

The aggressive nationalism of the conservative regimes in the late industrializing countries like Germany helped to rally support for the regime and to encourage nationalist sentiment throughout Europe. The speech by the German Emperor, William II, at Tangiers in Morocco in 1905, induced widespread fear in France, helped to create a sense of national unity which was able to transcend domestic conflicts in times of acute crisis.

The period from 1890 to 1914 is often called the period of armed “peace” based on the creation of rival military and diplomatic alliances, between contenders for industrial and military supremacy and for colonial possessions and profits. Nationalism in the period 1880-1914 was no longer constrained by the ‘threshold principle’ which had limited the demands for nation states earlier. Anybody of people claiming to be a nation could claim the right to national self-determination.

The reasons for the increasing readiness of real and imagined communities to make claims of nationhood and national self-determination was because of the pace of change, economic distress and large scale migration of peoples in this period. Traditional groups felt threatened by the pace of modernization. Educated middle strata with modest incomes- journalists, school teachers and petty officials were the torchbearers of linguistic nationalism. Migration produced friction and conflicts between groups unused to coexistence with different groups.

The oppressed nationalities of Eastern Europe did become independent states based on Wilson’s support for the principle of national self-determination but it is hardly possible to assert that significant numbers had dreamed of both social revolution and national independence.

Spread of nationalism

Britain can be said to be the first nation state in modern sense as we identify the term ‘Nation’ today. Britain transformed its state and its politics from the 1770s to 1830s. The Wilkes agitation of 1770s and the parliamentary reform of the 1830s are the landmarks of these developments. From 1830, transformation of the state was marked by a firm commitment to increasing intervention by the state that led to the beginnings of a welfare state and a system made to function by the state according to the rules of the market. The development of politics culminated in the outline of a pluralist liberal democracy. In this, besides all the agitation politics by different interest groups, the working class played the most important role, especially with the Chartist movement of the 1840s. While Britain went through modernization, it was remarkable for having done so without a deliberate revolution as in France.

Although the democratization of France took place gradually, and the French Revolutions of 1830 and 1848 and the Paris Commune of 1871 are part of the gradual process of democratization of French politics and society, the significance of the radicalism of the years 1792-95 cannot be denied.

Though, Napoleonic dictatorship was a retreat from the ideals of the Revolution it is equally true that his military exploits and conquests simplified the political map of Europe and spread the ideas of nationalism and democracy among the conquered people. The Congress of Vienna not only wished to contain France but also, through the Metternich system, the conservative European Powers – represented by Prussia, Austria and Russia – sought to restrict the spread of both democratic and nationalist ideas.

Metternich system

In 1815, at the Congress of Vienna, the protagonists of the old European order, inspired by the Austrian Chancellor, Count Metternich, tried to create a permanent barrier against national and liberal movements. Popularly known as the Metternich system, the origins of this system of alliances can be traced from the Holy Alliance, brought together by Tsar Alexander I, and its rival, the Quadruple Alliance, which was a British creation to counteract the Tsar. These two different systems of alliances set the stage for what came to be known as the Congress system, which in the period after 1815, envisaged a series of international congresses of the great powers to decide on European issues and problems. The power structure of European states was periodically reviewed after the Napoleonic wars by the European great powers through the mechanism known as the “Congress System”. This was a periodic conference of the leaders of the great powers in Europe to maintain the balance of power between themselves starting with the Congress of St. Petersburg in 1825. Congress of Berlin in 1878 was a high point which dealt with the consequences of the war between the Russian and Ottoman Empires.

After 1818, following the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle, there was a growing inclination towards great power intervention in the domestic politics of a country threatened by liberal

movements. e.g. in 1820, when a outbreak occurred in Naples, the Powers conceded to Metternich's demand for intervention. At the Congress of Laibach, 1821, Metternich was allowed to intervene in Naples and Piedmont to restore the absolutist regimes. This was the greatest triumph of the Metternich system.

Even though the landed aristocracy and the Church felt rejuvenated by the Restoration of the traditional dynasties, it was still impossible for the restored monarchies to ignore popular political sentiments. These "strands" were moderate constitutionalism, that would accept a monarchy in a popular guise, radical republicanism which verged on democracy, and an inchoate egalitarianism that anticipated socialist ideas of the future.

Between 1815 and 1848, the character of the opposition to the restored regimes, however, underwent a significant transformation. What in the 1820's, looked like an elitist, somewhat conspiratorial opposition without any roots in a larger society became linked by 1848, with a range of popular political movements. In the process, however, the opposition also became divided. The main elements in the opposition were the liberals who were tolerant about monarchy but were keen to see absolutism reformed into a constitutional monarchy.

Secret Society Movement

The secret society movement was a powerful European phenomenon in early 19th century. Everywhere, such secret conspiratorial formations developed partly because of the restrictions on organized politics imposed by the Restoration regimes. Radical secret groups with their initiation ceremonies, hierarchical chain of memberships, secret symbols and codes were sometimes direct offshoots of Masonic lodges.

Very often the secret societies represented the more radical sections of a fairly widespread liberal movement in Europe with the main political objective of constitutional government. In the larger European context, the secret society activities of course became a part of the nascent nationalist politics, the full implications of which were realized during the 1830's.

Turbulent 1820s and 1830s

Around the middle of the 1820s, a fresh bout of the revolutionary fever came with the failed Decembrist uprising in Russia and the relatively

successful Greek revolt. Decembrists attempted a military coup de tat in December 1825 when the death of the Czar provoked the uprising of the soldiers in St. Petersburg. The Russian artillery could easily disperse this uprising while a similar action of a few days later in the Ukraine was suppressed in the same manner. The leaders of the uprising, including Colonel Pestel were hanged and many more exiled to Siberia.

Russians succeeded in imposing the treaty of Adrianople on Turkey by which Turkey agreed to the autonomy of Serbia, the Danubian principalities and Greece. Later in 1830, by the Treaty of London, Greece's complete independence was recognized.

The result of all this was the complete collapse of the Metternich system even though Austria managed to retain its sphere of influence in Italy and the Balkans. Despite his obsession with legitimism, Metternich was unable to prevent a European combination against the Turkish Monarchy.

The July revolution in France was a brief and quick affair. The restored monarchy failed to defend itself against the popular combination of liberal parliamentarians, the Parisian mob and disgruntled soldiers. The provisional government was established and on 30 July, the king's cousin, the Duke of Orleans was asked to take over as the head of the state. In the first week of August, a crown of the French people was offered to the Duke of Orleans. In France, the 1830 revolution was completed with the establishment of a constitutional monarchy.

Radicals in Germany and Italy saw the monarchical governments as obstacles to the politics of integration; to them, their overthrow was the precondition for a unified nation-state. Radical nationalism in Italy found its greatest exponent in Guiseppe Mazzini (1805-1872).

This was also the period when smaller, mostly Slavic nationalities, of the Austrian empire in the eastern reaches of the continent – the Czeches, Slovaks, Croats, Slavs, Ukrainians and Romanians – began to assert their identities as nations by reviving their historical and folk traditions.

Age of Masses

In 1848 Europe made its cautious entry into 'the age of the masses'. Political mobilizations

began to acquire a popular following in an attempt to overcome the limitations of the politics of secret societies that had dominated the different phases of political unrest earlier in the century. Economic distress certainly contributed to this process of mobilization.

In 1845 the potato blight caused acute food shortages, followed in 1846 by worse grain crop in a several hot summer. The consequent steep rise in the prices of foodstuffs resulted in food riots in many places. Such distress was aggravated by economic recession, which produced urban unemployment.

The European revolts in 1848 began with the Swiss Civil War in which the radically inclined Protestant cantons were locked in a battle with the conservative Catholic cantons. In this battle the radical Protestant Cantons were ultimately victorious as Metternich's attempt to bail out the conservative Catholic Cantons failed. The events in Switzerland clearly demonstrated that the defenders of the established order were incapable of stopping the tide of the revolution.

Despite the revolutionary euphoria all over Europe, and a significant move towards parliamentary government, the revolution ultimately "stopped at the foot of the throne". Except in France, in most parts of the continent, monarchical government remained in place with very little changes in even their administrative structure.

From mid-1848, the revolution began to stage its retreat. In a series of dramatic confrontations, the revolutionary forces were overwhelmed. Moderate factions within the liberal movement worked out compromises with conservatives and monarchists, and together played a crucial role in suppressing the second round of revolutionary insurgency in 1849.

The European revolts in 1848 despite focusing on parliamentary government failed to change much the character of monarchical government. Even in France the revolutionary forces failed to check the rise of Louis Napoleon's dictatorship.

The process of centralization began in the sixteenth century in both Britain and France but in England the nation of national unity was more advanced and continuous while in France it

remained only political unification till the coming of French Revolution. Political debates provided the theoretical structure of the French nation-state formation was continuous and the economic integration was as much the product of state direction as of the activity of business groups and manufacturers.

The rise of the British nation-state was the result of the English union with Wales, Scotland and Ireland thereby creating a multi-national state. The initial problem of separate identities was greatly resolved by the process of capitalist development and economic growth. However, the French state had to become a vehicle of capitalist development.

Separate class identities merged in the British state though representative institutions like parliament and political parties. In France the class identities and class conflicts manifested itself in the state and determined the nature of French nation state which remained involved in social issues.

Despite the systematic efforts to suppress democracy in Europe the spread of liberal ideas could not be held back indefinitely. The revolution of 1848 which engulfed most of Europe led to an accelerated movement towards democracy and nationalism. It brought Napoleon III to power in France, hastened the unification of Germany and Italy and stirred national sentiments in the multi-national Austrian empire.

New states like Greece, Belgium and Serbia came up as a result of the revolutions of 1830 and 1848. After 1848, the Unification of Italy and that of Germany were significant political events and a total vindication of middle class nationalism.

The simplification of the political map of Europe by the reduction in the number of states within the German Empire; the quickening of the pulse of Spanish nationalism during the military campaigns of the Peninsular War; and the rise of Italian and German nationalism based on the inspiration of the French armies, the Napoleonic role in nation-state building and the contagion of revolutionary and democratic ideas helped to spread the gospel of nationalism in Europe. It appealed to the intelligentsia and the bourgeoisie which spearheaded the movement for Italian and German unification. Mass politics

in the late 19th century was to give an additional fillip to nationalism especially in Eastern Europe, a region which was relatively backward compared to the more industrialized parts of Western Europe. Tilly observed, "The European state-making process minimized the cultural variation within states and maximized the variation among states".

Gerschenkron argued in his book *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective* that in countries like Germany and Russia which began to industrialize later than Britain – the first industrial nation – the role of the state was much greater. To compensate for a late start the state played an active role in creating appropriate conditions for rapid industrialization by creating a system of tariff protection and aiding a process of cartelization of industry.

The doctrine of free trade liberal capitalism as propounded by Britain was challenged by the German economist Friedrich List to enable the German economy to develop behind protectionist walls and to catch up with Britain. The businessmen and industrialists favoured political unification because their self-interest as a class was linked with the creation of a national market for German entrepreneurs. In Italy the weakness of the bourgeoisie gave greater salience to the role of the landlords and urban professionals in the movement towards economic unification.

The study of nationalism in the small states of Eastern Europe by Miroslav Hroch yielded the notion of three phases in the development of national movements. In the first stage or phase A there was primarily an emphasis on culture, literature and folklore; in phase B pioneers of the national idea and its publicists occupied centre-stage. It was only in the third stage – phase C – that the national movements acquired mass support on any significant scale.

It was only after the growth of a sense of cultural nationalism based on a sense of language, culture and history that nationalism as an idea influenced the smaller nationalities of Eastern Europe. The break-up of the Hapsburg Empire of Austria-Hungary led to the creation of new nation states of Czechoslovakia, Romania and Yugoslavia. In most cases the nationalist idea preceded the growth of the nation-state. The democratization of polity in Europe helped the

popular mobilizations around the issues like language and empire-building which strengthened the feeling of nationalism among people. The modern states also played crucial role in giving shape to nationalist feelings and forging the nation-states. In Eastern Europe, except Russia, the cultural issues proved to be more important in giving rise to national sentiments.

Gellner and Typology of Nationalism

Gellner, writing exclusively about Europe, divided Europe into four zones travelling from west to east and formulated four different types of nationalism applicable to each zone. Gellner understood nationalism in terms of a marriage between the states and a pervasive high-culture and saw four different patterns of this marriage in the four European zones. Zone I, located on the western belt consisting of England, France, Portugal and Spain witnessed a rather smooth and easy marriage of the two, because both the ingredients (state and high-culture for the defined territory) were present prior to the arrival of nationalism.

Zone II (present day Italy and Germany), situated on the territory of the erstwhile Holy Roman Empire, was different from zone 1 in the sense that the bride (high culture for the territory) was ready (among the Italians from the days of early Renaissance and among the Germans since the days of Luther) but there was no groom (state for the exclusive territory).

Here also, as in zone I, nationalism was benign, soft and relatively conflict-free. There were no claims and counter-claims for the territory. Culturally homogeneous territories did not have to be carved out; they already existed. The high-culture also existed; it only needed to reach out to peasants and workers.

It is in zone III (territories east of Germany and west of Russian Empire, areas of present day Poland, Ukraine, Yugoslavia, Greece, Albania, Balkans etc.) that nationalism ceased to be benign and liberal and had to necessarily be nasty, violent and brutal. The horrors, generally associated with nationalism, were inevitable here as neither of the two preconditions (state and high-culture) existed in congruent fashion. Both a national state and a national culture had to be

carved out. The nationalist imperative was kept ruthlessly under check by the Tsarist Empire, the marriage of state and culture followed the disintegration without causing it in any way.

Nationalism and Indian Experience

Essence of Indian nationalism was rebellion against the state. Indian people acquired a modern state in the form of British imperialist state for the entire territory, but refused to live under it. The bulldozer of industrialization was not operative in India. The pre-existing socio religious identities were therefore not flattened out.

India experienced four different kinds of nationalism. The major Indian nationalism was territorial, anti-colonial and led to the creation of a nation-state through a national movement.

It acquired not only one but three distinct high-cultures during the colonial period. Indian National movement remained, throughout its life, linguistically and culturally remarkably plural. Since cultural unity is the hallmark of all nationalist projects, Indian national movement evolved the unique slogan of 'unity in diversity' and remained committed to both. Paradoxically the plural and non-coercive elements of the Indian national movement became its greatest strength and weakness at the same time.

The focus on cultural and linguistic plurality enabled the movement to maximized mobilization, but it also rendered Indian nationalism somewhat handicapped when confronted with a rival nationalism. The second major nationalism was a rival to Indian nationalism. This led to the creation of Pakistan. Pakistani nationalism was based on the famous two-nation theory, which implied that Indian Muslims were not a part of an Indian nation but were a nation in themselves.

Pakistani nationalism was strangely based on religious unity and territorial disunity. The east and the west wing of the new nation-state were separated from each other by over 900 miles. The new state took religious unity for granted and imposed linguistic and cultural unity without being able to achieve economic parity.

The result was the emergence of a breakaway nationalism in 1971. The fourth category is that

of aspirant nationalism- forces for Khalistan in Punjab, Azad Kashmir in the state of Jammu and Kashmir and the Tamil demand for a separate state in Sri Lanka. These may be called potential nationalisms. The experience of potential nationalism (or nationalism which are not likely to ever culminate in the formation of new nation-states) is not specific to India but is a world-wide phenomenon.

Modern State

In the 1750s, Britain's political, social and economic life was dominated by the landed aristocracy and agriculture was the basis of the economy. Government had little active role in the lives of the people. But by the 1760s Britain became the first nation which brought about significant changes in her polity, society and economy, thus beginning the process of industrialization. New shades of political ideologies developed in Britain and became modern through a liberal and democratic transformation. Britain's rising middle class and ruling aristocracy through reforms managed to restrict the working class movements within the broader framework of parliamentary politics.

Politics refers to the struggle for power. Those who have power try to maintain it while those who are out of power may resist or try to capture it. In a sense, this tussle pervades all forms of social relations and institutions. Secondly, ideological conflicts also play a significant role in the politics which centres around the state.

The rulers may seek to justify the existing system in terms of religious or secular ideals while those out of power may look forward to changes which may be radically new or reactionary in their aims. In general terms, such political impulses may be described as centrist, leftist and rightist respectively. But their content can vary according to context. And, it may be useful to view them as relative positions only.

In modern times, however, the notion of the 'left' has been associated more with egalitarian movements of/for the working classes while centrist politics has been mostly ascribed to the bourgeoisie which champion individual rights but not social equality. 'Rightist' politics has further assumed various forms in recent times ranging from different types of revivalist movements to secular dictatorships and fascist states.

Political changes that occurred from 18th century onwards can be traced to the experiences in British Polity. Reason being that Britain was one of most important originating place of most far reaching changes in economic, social and political sphere. One should note that most of modern democratic procedural instruments were invented, practiced and sharpened over a considerable period of time and today are taken as granted. A study of British polity will make one realize the importance of these procedural instruments.

Changes in British Polity

In Britain, after the revolutions of the seventeenth century, the lower house (House of Commons) managed to introduce some important checks on the monarch's political powers and acquired a crucial role in governance. For example, the crown's finances, including its right to raise fresh taxes and spend on all state departments were controlled by the House of Commons through the mandatory annual budget. Similarly, all new laws had to be passed by parliament first and only then sent for royal assent.

The Monarch who was in practice compelled to appoint his ministers largely from those who had a following in the House of Commons. This significant convention opened the path to the future development of the modern 'cabinet system' in which the council of ministers is held collectively responsible to parliament and holds office as long as it can command a majority in the House of Commons.

The Whigs and the Tories were the principal political groupings in British parliament since the Glorious Revolution of 1688. The Tories were political conservatives and firmly geared towards the ruling Anglican aristocracy while the Whigs supported the organized body of religious dissent in England as well as Scotland and were more open to middle class demands for greater political equality and freedom.

Still, the electoral base of the Commons itself was extremely limited and the landed interest dominated both the houses. Some large centres like Westminster had several thousand voters while a few ghost towns like Old Sarum had as

few as seven. Narrow social base of parliament was actually defended by most ideologues of the eighteenth century. Even reformers such as Edmund Burke had considerable contempt for the poor and feared any mass action instead of viewing it as a resource for reform efforts.

While it is apparent that representative institutions played a unique role in Britain both at the central and local levels in fixing taxes and regulating state expenditure as well as poor relief, it is also worth remembering that the dominance of the landed aristocracy at all levels. At the top, there was powerful group of some 350 families who owned huge landed estates, usually with titles of nobility.

Below this exclusive group of peers or nobles in Britain's ruling elite, came the 4000 odd families constituting the gentry. They were again owners of substantial landed estates. A few amongst them had wealth comparable to those of the lords but their title was that of a knight or a baron and the offices they generally aspired to were those of the unpaid Justices of Peace or a seat in the House of Commons. Another feature of the British aristocracy was its fairly compact character.

Parliamentary checks on the executive's right to impose new taxes, the sanctity of private property, the independent tradition of the English common law and the force of legal provisions such as Habeus Corpus along with a relatively free press guaranteed some important rights to the upper and middle classes in Britain as a time when similar liberties were unknown elsewhere. At the same time it is important to remember that these freedoms could be enjoyed in practice only by the wealthy who could take recourse to the lengthy procedures of law.

Demand for Reforms

Britain had tradition of liberal thought going back to the revolutionary decades when philosophers such as John Locke espoused a new theory of state bound to safeguard persons and property. The controversies generated centering on the freedom of press and protection against arbitrary arrest during 1760s and 1770s brought the issues of civic rights to the fore to British politics. The arrogance of George III, who ruled Britain from 1760 to 1820, the fight for liberal

rights led during his rule by leaders such as Fox and Wilkes, and the issues raised by the liberation of British colonies in America after 1776 further stoked the embers of such discontent.

The most important concern of the liberal agenda was of high taxation and waste in public expenditure. The parliament as well as the press were important fora through which the demand for the 'economical reforms' against these ills was raised. In 1779, influential sections of the gentry led by Wywill gave further support to such demands. Consequently, Conservative leaders such as Edmund Burke as well as liberals such as Pitt the Younger embarked upon a series of reforms which led to the abolition of crown patronage and the introduction of modern budgeting in Britain.

The Doctrine of 'utilitarianism', was coined by influential thinker Jeremy Bentham. According to this doctrine all laws and institutions of society were to be judged on the basis of their utility to the maximum number and not by their traditional sanctity or textual authority.

Others causes of public concern during this period were: the issues of public health and education, crime and morality, the treatment of prisoners, condition of the poor in sprawling industrial slums and the rights of dissenting religious groups. The demand for electoral and parliamentary reforms was also gaining momentum amongst sections of the middle class as well as artisans and working classes. The writings of radicals like Tom Paine and Major Cartwright acted as powerful catalysts in this respect.

The outbreak of the French Revolution in 1789 also had a positive impact on the radical movement in Britain. During this period, the British state not only used nationalist sentiment to buttress its authority but also unleashed unprecedented repression against the radicals as well as the nascent working class movement. This included the suspension of the Habeus Corpus in 1794, the introduction of anti-combination laws in 1799 as also a series of treason trials and bloody suppression of all radical organizations.

Meanwhile the working class movement was also maturing in Britain. The initial phase of industrialization was full of misery for the proletariat which worked and lived in extremely

hostile conditions for long hours on meager wages and with few rights or social security. It is hardly surprising that in the face of these brutal conditions, in several places, the workers responded by systematically breaking the machines which symbolized the new order to them. These early machine breakers have been nicknamed Luddites after their mythical leader Nedd Ludd. Socialists such as Robert Owen (1771-1858) further argued that all wealth is created through labour and therefore the laboring classes should claim the full fruit of their work. Owen himself emphasized workers' cooperative and self help rather than a direct confrontation with the state.

Most brutal state action was visible in 1819 at Peterloo Park, in Manchester, where a crowd of 60,000 had gathered to listen to Orator Hunt on Democratic reforms. It was indiscriminately fired at. Eleven persons lost their lives and more than four hundred were injured in this bloodbath. Peterloo has been remembered as the domestic Waterloo of the old guard which became panicky and passed the infamous Six Acts putting fresh restrictions on the press and political assemblies etc.

Reform Act

The passage of the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832 was one of the most crucial events in Britain's transition to modern politics as it ensured a prominent place to the rising middle classes in British polity and a stake in its stability. However, aim of the Act was to preserve the existing Constitution of Britain; not to change it. It tried to introduce some reforms in the election of the House of Commons. While providing for a redistribution of 143 seats of the lower House to accord with the new demographic pattern of industrial Britain, the Act also abolished a number of 'rotten' boroughs (parliamentary constituencies with few members) and extended the franchise marginally. The few electorates still consisted of less than six lakh men or a mere 3% of the total population of Britain then.

Thus, the Act ensured that the rule of property would continue in Britain. But, alongside the established aristocracy, it granted representation to the rising middle classes in the country's parliamentary government. This went a long way towards forging a compromise between the bourgeoisie and the landed elite,

thus enabling a peaceful transition to a modern liberal polity in Britain.

First, the very manner of its passage enhanced the significance of the House of Commons in relation to the upper House and also set an important precedent of extra parliamentary pressure on legislators. Second, the reformist agenda within parliament became extremely strong after 1832 as more radicals entered parliament from the industrial centers which had gained representation.

The emergence of modern political parties geared for electoral competition and the mobilization of public opinion also had an important bearing on politics. Liberal polity matured. e.g. resolution of corn controversy.

The Corn Laws had been passed in 1815 to ensure good returns to the landed classes of Britain on their staple produce with the help of high tariffs on cheaper grain coming from overseas. This was hurting the interest of all who had to purchase grain from the market, including the workers and the middle classes. The industrialists also viewed them as a serious burden since they compelled them to pay higher subsistence wages to workers. In 1839, the middle classes, led by Richard Cobden, founded the Anti-Corn Law League and launched a nation-wide campaign for the abolition of the hated laws. The campaign was a remarkable illustration of a political movement employing modern means of propaganda for a well defined objective to be achieved through parliamentary legislation. The abolition of the laws was actually carried out, not by a liberal, but by a pro-landlord Tory government in 1846. This again established the spirit of accommodation.

Emergence of Modern state

Britain was among the first countries to emerge as a nation-state in the early modern period. Under the Tudors and Hanoverian dynasty, it acquired political stability (cessation of wars amongst feudal factions, a strong defence against external invasions and pride regarding its 'mixed constitution'). The relative decline of widespread political violence, whether in the form of factional wars within the ruling classes, large scale popular disturbances, or brutal state suppression (or even organized crime) in the

century after the Glorious Revolution of 1688, was a significant feature of the British polity. This was accompanied by the growth of the sovereign authority of the 'King in Parliament' and the subjugation of church, lords and autonomous communities within Britain. The growth of a nationalist identity amongst its citizens (outside Ireland) was of great significance.

Various measures were also required to establish a 'free market' (another major concern of an emerging modern state). It began with a series of abolitions from the closing years of eighteenth century, of price and wage controls, of state-supported monopolies, and of subsidies and restrictions on business. It also demanded the unification of the internal market and the tariff reforms of 1786 and 1820s culminating in the abolition of the Corn Laws in 1846. The New Poor Law of 1834 played a critical role in establishing a free labour by making conditions for local welfare for the poor very strict.

The beginning of a public education system was made with the Act of 1833 when grants-in-aid and school inspection were also started. But disputes between religious groups slowed the pace of change on this major issue. Similarly, a public health policy evolved after Chadwick's energetic but controversial efforts at enforcing sanitation schemes through the Public Health Board established in 1848. The development of public utilities were assigned to local bodies by the Municipal Reform Act of 1835 but it gathered momentum only from the late nineteenth century when 'gas and water socialism' was championed by leaders like Chamberlain.

Early industrial state was slow to grant even basic workers' rights to form unions or to strike peacefully. The Anti-Combination Act against unionization was passed in 1799 and early labour movements were suppressed violently. The existing system of poor relief was also considered wasteful and scaled down by the New Poor Law of 1834. The growing misery of the proletariat and pressures from humanitarian groups and the labour movement itself forced the state to take limited ameliorative measures subsequently. The anti-combination laws were repealed in 1834. The first Factory Act was passed in 1833 only to provide some protection to children under the

pressure of the Evangelicals (one of the reforming religious groups). Further reforms came in small doses, e.g. Mines Act (1842), Ten hours working day (1847), legalization of union (1870's) and of peaceful picketing (1876).

Apart from labour, other social groups which demanded reforms were religious minorities and women. Despite the advocacy of women's rights by Mary Wollstonecraft and some liberals like John Stuart Mill, female franchise was conceded only after the First World War.

Working class and Chartist movement

There were radical movements led jointly by artisans and some middle class activists at the turn of the nineteenth century. The British state adopted repressive measures against them which culminated in the Peterloo massacre of 1819. The first attempts to link all laboring men together in general trade union and also to forge unity for a General Strike acquired momentum during the 1820s and 30s. In 1834, the Grand National confederation of Trade Unions or the GNCTU was formed to give concrete shape to a broad working class movement to demand better wages and working conditions, including a ten hour working day. Some of the members also looked forward to an Owenite millennium in which workers would enjoy the full product of their labour by organizing industries under their own cooperatives.

State also swung into action and widespread arrests were ordered against all unions. For example, the Friendly Society of Agricultural Workers was disbanded and six of its organizers convicted for seven years transportation simply on the ground of 'taking secret oaths'. These became famous as the Tolpuddle martyrs and only after a prolonged agitation by workers they were repatriated in 1839. Workers were badly hit all over Britain. Some working class leaders were beginning to question the Owenite stress on self help and cooperatives and demanding political rights for workers instead.

In 1836, the London Working Men's Association was founded by men like Lovett to demand universal suffrage. Radicals like William Morris and Smith O' Brien also called for a new awakening amongst workers.

The Chartist Movement was the most significant outcome of the growing focus on

political power which the British workers evinced in 1830s and 40s. It derives its name from the six point Charter, it presented before the parliament demanding universal manhood suffrage, secret ballot, annual parliaments, equal electoral districts, abolition of property qualification for the members of House of Commons and payment of regular salaries to them. In 1839, the first Chartist Convention met in London but despite the collection of a million signatures for its petition it was rejected outright by the parliament.

Economic recovery of the mid forties again turned the attention of most workers away from radical politics and towards wage improvement through trade union activity. The last flicker of Chartism glew again in 1848-which was the year of revolutions all over Europe. A demonstration of five lakh Chartists was called at Kennington commons in the heart of London to present a mammoth petition of six million signatures to the parliament.

Overall, in Britain, Liberal rather than revolutionary politics remained the preponderant concern of workers. The growth of the Labour Party committed to parliamentary politics at the turn of the present century further ensured this pattern. Term 'labour aristocracy' is used to refer to men whose specialized skills in the expanding industrial economy coupled with the growing benefits of Britain's large empire enabled them to maintain a comfortable standard of living. As a result, the 'labour aristocracy' put faith in 'improvement' within the Capitalist order rather than its overthrow.

Reform Act of 1867 which granted voting right for urban workers was a product not of a radical mass movement but of party politics. The urban working class was further accommodated within the liberal polity with further enactments to recognize their right to form trade unions (1870) and to go on strike (1876).

The principal factors which led to such a political resolution in the first industrial nation were: the unity displayed by its upper classes vis-à-vis workers, the economic benefits of the expanding British Empire, the relative weakness of revolutionary politics in nineteenth century Britain and the subsequent growth of welfare legislation in the country.



Italy and Germany are two important examples of how language, folk culture and common historical memories led to very strong nationalistic feelings helping to build the two people into sovereign, united and independent nations states by 1870.

Both Germany and Italy emerged as nation-states in the 19th century. Although the idea of nationalism in some form or other can be traced back in time in both cases, the actual development of nation-states took place only in the 19th century. The process of unification was different in the case of Germany from that of Italy. While in Germany the economic and political unity was achieved at a much higher level, in Italy the unification was achieved mainly at the political and cultural levels. The economic unity in Italy was much weaker in comparison. In Germany, the unity was brought about mainly from above. But in Italy, the popular mobilizations also played an important role. Apart from these factors, wars also provided the impetus which brought the people together and helped in forging the respective nations.

Increasing importance of language as a factor in the emergence of nationality conflicts in the late 19th century was of special significance in unification of Germany and Italy. Language became an issue in international politics with the dispute between the Danes and the Germans and over Schleswig-Holstein and of the Germans and French over the Rhine frontier during the 1840s. The history of German and Italian nationalism can be said to be a struggle to unite German and Italian speaking people within a single nation state. The protagonists were Prussia and Piedmont-Sardinia which forged national unity by skillful diplomacy and warfare on the one hand and pragmatic handling of popular national sentiments and occasional revolutionary upsurges.

Idea of A German Nationality

The impetus to the idea of a German Nation was provided by the French Revolution and the Simplification of the political map of Europe and of the German states by the destruction of the Holy Roman Empire by Napoleonic armies. During the early Middle-Ages various Germanic tribes and Celts and Slavs were fused by a process of conflict and assimilation into the German people. Even when the German races felt bound to each other by ties of blood – the Saxons, Franks, Bavarians and Swabians – they did not have the consciousness of being German.

The connection between Lutheranism and the rise of German nationalism was slight since their struggle was primarily against the Antichrist in Rome and not limited to national issues. The Protestant translations of the Bible into the German vernacular led to the growth of modern German but the growth of German nationalism actually took place with the rise of German Romanticism.

The Renaissance and Reformation in Germany were primarily scholarly and theological events and so these movements failed to destroy the medieval idea of World Empire or to change politics and society as in the West European countries. German nationalism like that of the Russians became preoccupied with the “soul” or “mission” of the nation since it was not rooted in social and political reality and constituted “a venture in education and propaganda rather than in policy shaping and government”. Still, one can say that Martin Luther’s rejection of the authority of the Pope and translation of the Bible into German created the basis for a national consciousness.

Political and Economic Background

At the end of the Napoleonic Wars, the political fragmentation of Germany was partially overcome by the reduction in the number of sovereign German states to thirty-eight from the

three hundred states of the Holy Roman Empire which was abolished. The German Bund was created in 1815 in order to preserve “the independence and sovereignty of the individual German states”. The concert of Europe, created after the Congress of Vienna, was a system designed by the conservative monarchies of Austria, Prussia and Russia to check to spread of democratic idea in Europe.

Very limited powers were granted to the representative institutions introduced after 1815 in the German states. While after 1848 most German states introduced democratic reforms, in Prussia the pace of reforms was slower since electoral votes were allocated equally to three groups of income-tax payers, the divisions being made on the basis of income tax revenue payments. Prussian system of representation remained in force until 1918 and constituted an important basis for the perpetuation of a backward political system.

The defeat of Austria in the Austro-Prussian War of 1866 led to the creation of the North German Confederation. The defeat of France in the Franco-German War of 1870-71 led to the creation of the Imperial German government. A national parliament elected on the basis of adult franchise – the Reichstag – and representatives of the 25 German states in the Federal Council or Bundesrat were to shape the policy of Imperial Germany. The Prussian king became the German Emperor with control over the German armed forces and the Reich Chancellor was also Prussian. However, the Imperial Reich was not a unified state like that of Britain or a centralized state like that of France. In the Federal Council or Bundesrat the Prussians controlled a plurality but not a majority of votes since concessions had to be made to Bavaria and Württemberg to entice them into the Imperial Reich.

The process of German national unification was shaped by Prussian conservatism and militarism but the process of centralization under the Imperial Reich was affected by local and centrifugal forces.

In Prussia public industrial and technical schools after 1820 encouraged industry for national political reasons. Liberal entrepreneurs linked the issue of industry for the fatherland to expectations of political unity before 1848. The engineering associations of the 1850s and 1860s

carried these ideal further. Camphausen, Siemens, Hansemann, List and Harkort were German entrepreneurs who believed that they were also part of “a national civilizing mission”.

Dahrendorf has argued that Germany developed into an industrial but not a capitalist society. The presence of a sizable Mittelstand or intermediate stratum of small producers is evidence of incomplete modernization. The German nation state, unlike the French, was not founded on the basis of liberal democratic ideas and the weakness of the German liberal bourgeoisie is largely responsible for this.

Unification

The process of German unification during the 19th century was speeded up by the creation of a national market, a network of railways and communications and a self-conscious bourgeoisie. Unification was achieved by an alliance of liberal bourgeoisie with the landowning class in which war and diplomacy played a vital role.

The German Bund or Confederation of 1815, with all its deficiencies, served as a preordained and legitimate theatre of operations till 1867 for nationalist forces in Germany. In 1815 East Prussia and Schleswig were not a part of the German Confederation while Bohemia and Moravia, predominantly Czech area, were included. The Czech liberals refused to take part in the elections to the German Assembly in 1848.

The German National Assembly in 1848 was created on the basis of the most substantial and widespread upsurge in Germany in the 19th century. Briefly the Frankfurt Parliament of 1848 indicated the possibility of a democratic and untied Germany. But it had limited success, evident by the fact that even in 1849 the National Assembly opted for a Kleindeutsches Reich or Little Germany.

Rivalry of the two major dynastic powers in Germany eventually led to the Austro-Prussian War of 1866 which ended in Austrian exclusion from the German nation. In 1863 the issue of German claims over the Duchies of Schleswig-Holstein, an important issue in 1848, were revived and once these duchies were taken from Denmark, it was not difficult to pick a quarrel with Austria over tenure. In the Austro-Prussian war although the Austrians secured a victory at Custozza they were decisively defeated at

Koniggratz. In so far as the creation of the North German Confederation in 1867 menaced the power or security of France, it has been rightly remarked that it was France rather than Austria which was defeated at Koniggratz.

In July 1863 the Austrian Emperor Francis Joseph convened a meeting of all the German Princes at Frankfurt to discuss a scheme for Federal reform, by which the reconstituted central authority was to be placed permanently in the hands of Austria and of her allies, the secondary states. Prussia's absence (which was the result of strong advice by Bismarck to King of Prussia) made the Austrian proposal unworkable.

Austria's policy of trying to overthrow the Zollverein by using the resentment of the south German secondary states against Prussia's liberal customs policy also failed to yield results. Despite political sympathies with Bavaria and Austria Saxony remained within the Zollverein. The south German secondary states were compelled to accept the Prussian customs policy since they were unwilling to join a tariff union with Austria without the north German states.

Bismarck's skill lay in securing a favourable international situation before the waged war with Austria in 1866. Also considerable statesmanship was involved in the manner of handling the small German states after Prussian victory in 1866 and in the creation of the North German Confederation in 1867. The fear of France also encouraged the small south German states to attach themselves to Prussia.

The failure to create a Southern Confederation indicated that the southern states would eventually join Bismarck's North German Confederation. The conflict with France in 1870 led to military victories which in turn led to the creation of the German Empire. The four southern states, Bavaria, Wurtemberg, Baden and Hesse joined the German Empire in 1871.

In short the whole process is summarized as follows; Under Bismarck, Prussia went to war with Austria and forced Austria to surrender some areas. He also made peace with South German states. Austria withdrew from any involvement with the German Confederation.

Prussia also went to war with France in 1869 when France tried to secure Luxembourg and Belgium and opposed Prussia's support for a

Hohenzollern candidate for the Spanish throne. This war led to a new nationalist wave sweeping through the South German states as well. This helped in the process of unification. The war ended with the treaty of Frankfurt in February 1871 by which Alsace Lorraine was ceded perpetually to Germany and France also had to pay an indemnity of 5 billion francs.

Bismarck showed a remarkable ingenuity in manipulating democratic institutions and principles for galvanizing popular support for the monarchical order in the newly established German empire after 1871. In a way this political strategy, described as Bismarckism, was the German variant of Bonapartism which throughout the imperial era remained a principal watchword of the German ruling classes.

Illiberal Shift in Late 19th Century

Towards the late 19th century there was an illiberal or right wing shift in the nature of nationalist politics. The reason for this growth in right wing orientation of nationalism was the fear of popular participation in politics, especially by the working class and the left wing or socialist parties. The liberal intelligentsia and middle class, which had championed a republican or liberal nationalism in the first half of the 19th century made a compromise with the conservative landowners and dynastic states after the defeat of the revolutions of 1848. In Italy the relation between the national movement for political unification and popular participation was so weak that Massimo d' Azeglio observed: "we have made Italy, now we have to make Italians".

It was the revolution of 1848 that revealed the weakness of the liberal bourgeoisies in Europe. In Germany and France, middle classes were willing to side with conservative Prussia or the Emperor of the French, Napoleon III, rather than accept a greater pace of change. In Germany, during the years 1870-1878 the anti-clerical element in bourgeois nationalism prepared the basis of the conflict with the Social Democratic party and movement after 1878. The new right-wing nationalism which emerged in the late 1870s was hostile to left-wing liberals as well as Social Democrats.

The weakness of liberal democratic movements in 19th century Germany certainly led to the growth of right wing nationalism and the containment of Socialist Democracy.

Successful overseas expansion was supported by the right wing to secure economic benefits which would not only benefit businessmen, and middle class colonial officials, but also the industrial working class, at least in the export industries. The German right-wing was able to forge an alliance of landowners, industrialists and middle class to hold in check the growth of the liberal middle class, workers and socialism.

An authoritarian government legitimized by popular support had to take recourse to imperial expansion as a measure aiming at domestic political stability. The man who successfully outlined the basic framework of this policy was Otto von Bismarck who became the Minister-President of Prussia in 1863 and subsequently held the position of Imperial Chancellor after the unified German state came into being in 1871.

In fact in 1863 Bismarck was summoned from his estate in East Prussia by a besieged Prussian monarchy to solve the political and constitutional crisis caused by the rift between the liberal majority in the Prussian parliament (Landtag) and the government over the extremely contentious issue of army expansion.

The confrontation first took shape in 1860 when a new law was laid before the Landtag for financial approval of the war ministry's plans of army expansion. The liberal majority saw this as a step towards the further militarization of society. They feared that the expansion of the regular army at the expense of the citizen's militia would become a weapon of repression in the hands of Prussians despotism. In such situation Bismarck, appointed as PM ruled without parliamentary approval of budget. Prussian victory in the battle of Sadowa (between Prussia and Austria in 1866) fulfilled the liberal dream of national integration under Bismarck's leadership, the Prussian liberals were even agreeable to giving retroactive sanction to Bismarck's budget less regime of the early 1860's by condoning the excesses of the great leader who was increasingly looked upon as a white revolutionary in liberal circles.

The compromise that was finally reached between Bismarck and his liberal critics determined the character of the German Empire. The governmental system was basically an extension of the Prussian system in which the privileges and power of the military aristocracy

remained insulated from popular intervention. The success of this Bismarckian strategy of rallying parliamentary support for the conservative through electoral manipulations ultimately depended on his skill 'for running internal politics on the steam power of foreign affairs. National prestige was one consideration which could turn critics into supporters. This strategy remained unchanged even after Bismarck's rule came to an end in 1890.

The inevitable consequence of this strategy was a certain kind of ultra nationalist popular mobilization along racist lines anticipating in a way the basic features of Fascist mobilization of the early twentieth century. The phenomenon of the charismatic leader which was an important feature of Bonapartism continued to inform Fascist mobilization at a later date.

In Nazi Germany, the Fuehrer (title used by Hitler) demanded complete obedience and surrender to the leader. In addition much of the racist ideologies in the Nazi movement were derived from the racial theories that the German ruling classes had earlier deployed (in the late 19th century) to bolster the extremist nationalist sentiments. Central to this racist and ultra-nationalist mentality was Social Darwinism which transferred to the human sphere the biological theories of natural selection and an equally volatile notion of, 'survival of the fittest'.

The whole argument implied that competition between different nations for achieving dominance in the world is endemic in which only the strongest will survive. The theory fitted in well with the imperial ambitions of the German state. Pan German league popularized the notion of Germanisation of Europe, particularly the continent's eastern reaches inhabited by 'inferior Slavonic people'. Civilising them was looked upon as the great mission of the Teutonic (Anglo-Saxon, Dutch, German and Scandinavian) race.

The anti-Semitic ideology, which was substantially reinforced by the activities of the Pan German league since the 1890's reached a bloody climax in Nazi Germany.

ITALY

The idea of Italy as an entity, of Italian as a noble and beautiful language and of the common

cultural roots of the Italian city and states, however, can be traced back to the Renaissance period and even earlier. Francesco Petrarca (1304-1374) turned to antiquity for inspiration and solace following the decline of the two great forces of universalism – the Holy Roman Empire and the Papacy. It was a purely literary patriotism. Rienzo's "proclamations of the sovereignty of the Roman people and of the unity of Italy", and his support for the common people against the aristocracy, also contained weak anticipations of ideas of nationalism and democracy.

The campaign for a unified literary vernacular started in Italy when it became the victim of invading armies. But the debate on language reflected the social divisions in Italy and not merely regional differences. The insistence on the linguistic cleavage between the ruling class and the common people and the assumption that Italy could have one language only for the dominant social groups reflected a profoundly elitist attitude.

In Italy poets played a major role in the development of nationalism. It was humanistic literary elite which played a role in the diffusion of the Italian language. There was no powerful state as in France which could promote the national language. The absence of a vernacular reformation as in Germany confined the Italian language to tiny elite of 2.5% who commonly used the Italian language even in 1860.

In fact the great contributions of Italian humanism also reflected a bias in favour of the elite. The great Italian humanists "spoke for and to the dominant social groups". The literary output of the humanists was rooted in a sense of the responsibilities of the upper classes. Even the Renaissance ideal of the dignity of man was linked to the domineering position of urban ruling groups in an age of triumph. Italian nationalism of the 19th century failed to overcome the cultural elitism of the Italian humanists and literary masters.

Political and Economic Background

During the first half of the 16th century, Italy faced an intermittent conflict between French, Swiss, Spanish and German soldiers for political supremacy on Italian states – Venice, Milan, Florence, Naples and the Papal states – produced

by, mid-15th century – was upset by the Italian wars of 1494-1559. While France and Spain began to move towards a sense of nationalism, the Italians had a strong sense of regional or local attachment to Milan, Florence or Genoa; but they could also swing to the other extreme to become cosmopolitans.

It was the French Revolution which provided a model for Italian nationalism. The French occupying forces in Lombardy organized an essay competition on the subject of the best form of free government for Italy. This encouraged a debate extolling the ancient glories of Italy, admiration for France and its constitution of 1795 and schemes for Italian regeneration and unification. Melchiorre Gioia won the essay competition and became one of Italy's leading economists.

The Kingdom of Italy created by Napoleon helped to foster Italian national sentiment but it also reduced it to a continental colony of France. The Napoleonic legal codes and prefectural system which was introduced in Italy helped to define the model of a unified national state. Even the Italian army, based on conscription and used for Napoleon's campaigns, revealed a sense of nationalism. It was as a reaction to French domination and Napoleon's identification with Imperial Rome that Italian writers choose to reject the Roman heritage.

The Austrians were the dominant power in Italy and the settlement after the defeat of Napoleon strengthened Austrian control. Metternich's proposal for an Italian Confederation, on the lines of the German Confederation, was opposed by both Piedmont and the Pope's advisers. In the period after 1815 the secret societies attracted the supporters of the Italian Jacobin tradition. Members of the Carbonari and other secret societies were not exclusively concerned with Italian nationalism. e.g. Carbonari of southern Italy who enjoyed the greatest public support among the 19th century revolutionary organizations were more interested in democratizing Naples than in unifying Italy.

After the failure of the revolutions of 1830-31, specially in Modena and Bologna, Italians felt increasingly the need to rely on their own endeavour and on open methods of agitation. Giuseppe Mazzini, started Young Italy and rejected the sectarian model of revolutionary

dictatorship and terror. Mazzini was a democratic nationalist who simultaneously rejected both the elitism of the moderates and the Jacobin ideal of revolutionary dictatorship.

Radicals in Italy saw the monarchical governments as obstacles to the politics of integration; to them, their overthrow was the precondition for a unified nation-state. Radical nationalism in Italy found its greatest exponent in Giuseppe Mazzini (1805-1872) who had earlier joined a branch of the Carbonari in 1827 but soon became disillusioned by their lack of clear purpose. He felt that Italy's freedom from Austrian domination depended entirely on the destruction of aristocratic privilege and clerical authority. With this objective he founded the Young Italy (*Giovine Italia*) in 1832 and envisioned a republican form of government for a united Italian state. After a failed armed uprising at Savoy in 1834 Mazzini went into exile in London.

As a radical Unitarian, Mazzini believed that all forms of federalism were mere mechanisms for perpetuating the dominance of local elites. Mazzini's nationalism was not exclusive and he believed in the eventual emergence of a United States of Europe after all nations had become free. Although he believed in a people's war of national liberation he also believed in a democratic government based on universal suffrage. Mazzini recognized the importance of support from the peasantry for his conception of people's war but Italian republicans were never able to bridge the gap between the towns and the countryside.

The Italian national movement was not based on such a strong industrial bourgeoisie as in the case of Germany. The level of economic unification in Italy prior to political unification was also on a lesser scale than in Germany, the Italian customs union being no match for the German Zollverein. Another serious economic problem was the considerable backwardness of the Italian south.

The process of national unification in Italy was based on the existence of several states which tried to preserve their autonomy and privileges in the context of Franco-Austrian rivalry. Piedmont became the Italian state which unified Italy. The king, Charles Albert until 1840, evinced no sentiments in favour of either liberalism or

patriotism. Charles Albert (1831-1840) was a conservative monarch who had no compunctions about using Austrian troops to stop revolution in Italy much like the Metternich system envisaged.

Although Piedmont was not quite the powerhouse like Prussia in an economic sense, it was politically and militarily the most active participant in the process of Italian revolution. Cavour, Mazzini and Garibaldi have been hailed in some accounts as the brain, heart and sword of unification. While Piedmont's policies had been timid before 1849, in the 1850s the more resolute policies of Count Cavour in combination with the popular movements launched by Mazzini and Garibaldi led to Italian unification. Cavour used his friendship and alliance with Napoleon III to wage successful wars for both the liberation of Italy from Austria and political unification. The territorial ambitions of Piedmont-Sardinia and the desire to preserve social stability shaped the attitude of the aristocratic Cavour. Unification was to depend primarily on the regular army and bureaucracy, not popular movements.

The financial costs of the wars of liberation had to be borne by Piedmont Sardinia which adversely affected the programme of modernization started by Cavour in the 1850s. Piedmont influence which Piedmont wielded in the unitary state which was created in 1861. Earlier, when Pope Pius IX withdrew support for a national war against Catholic Austria in April 1848 he lost the support of nationalist opinion in Italy.

After the revolution in Rome and the flight of the Pope, the Roman Republic was proclaimed. The efforts of the Pope to return succeeded in June 1849 with the help of French and Austrian forces. During the period of Italian unification, the Pope and the Catholic Church played a conservative role. After losing temporal power, the Pope forbade the faithful to participate in national politics. The opposition of the Church to the secular state – as well as socialism, anarchism and the labour movement – culminated in the merger of anticlericalism with support for parliamentary democracy.

Unification Process

Although popular mobilization played a part in unification process the elites tried to control the level of popular participation. This is what led Gramsci to characterize the Risorgimento and Italian unification as a form of passive revolution. Secret societies such as the Carbonari, Filadelfi or Young Italy were active in the 1830s and 1840s in fomenting revolutions. There was a chain of rebellions in Turin, Naples, Palermo and other areas in 1820-21 and a fresh round of rebellions during 1828-31 and the 1848-49 revolutions in Germany, the revolutionary coalitions collapsed with workers, peasants, urban poor and socialists parting company from the liberal upper and middle classes.

The revolutions of 1848-49 were popular revolutions but more municipal than national revolutions. The real problem was that the democrats failed to secure the support of the countryside. The 1848-49 revolutions failed but the heroic defense of the republics – in Rome by Mazzini and Garibaldi and in Venice by Manin – produced the legends of Italian nationalism and the Italian left.

Cavour joined the Crimean War in 1855 on behalf of Britain and France to gain their support in this future confrontation with Austria. One of Cavour's military officers predicted that out of the mud of the Crimea Italy would emerge. Although Italy did not achieve much it got an opportunity to discuss its problems in an international forum in 1856, Piedmont Cavour had consolidated his position by a connubio or alliance with Urbano Rattazzi of the centre-left in 1852.

Although the republicans were initially distrustful of Cavour and the Piedmontese they slowly recognized the pivotal importance which Piedmont would have to play in Italian unification. On the basis of the agreement with Napoleon III at Plombieres in 1858 France, came to the aid of Piedmont in the war with Austria which broke out in 1859. Italian National Society which played a key role in these plebiscites. Between 1857 and 1862 this Society published a national newspaper, drafted volunteers, orchestrated revolutions in Central Italy and then played a role in the plebiscites. This society was implicated in Garibaldi's invasion of Naples as well as Cavour's entry into the Papal States "thus

ensuring", says Coppa, "that the kingdom of 1861 would be national rather than northern."

Although Garibaldi was upset by the handing over of his home province of Nice to the French he collaborated with Cavour in the invasion of Sicily and Naples. It was the tremendous success of Garibaldi's volunteers which galvanized Cavour into uniting the whole of Italy while earlier he had concentrated on northern and central Italy. The 1859 annexations in North and Central Italy had been achieved without much collective violence, but in 1860 the transfer of power in the south was marked by enormous violence.

As far as the unification of Italy was concerned, the question of Venetia and Rome remained. Venice was incorporated in Italy after an overwhelming vote in favour of union in a plebiscite. After several failed attempts to acquire Rome – notably Garibaldi's attempt in 1867 – it was incorporated after a short war in September 1870.

Economic Unification

The Italian state after unification did try to force the pace of economic development in order to catch-up with the advanced countries. Unlike the USA and Germany and even France, the industrialization of Italy was not boosted substantially by the railways. Even the utilization of the railways was poor because North and South did not complement each other; because the main Italian export-silk-weighed very little; and because of the general backwardness of the country. The railway policy of the Italian state was excessively "forced" in terms of timing as well as the mode of financing though the railways sewed up the Italian boot they neither integrated the south with the Italian economy nor boosted overall industrial growth.

In Italy the divisions between the more industrialized north, the less developed central region and the neglected and backward south actually intensified after the Italian unification. The Italian south remained an alienated, almost colonized, region. The Italian unification, more due to military success and international diplomacy rather than people's war or mass struggles, was based on the lowest possible mobilization of the masses required for achieving independence and unification.

In Gramsci's words, the process of Italian unification was a form of passive revolution in which the Italian elite had mobilized the Italian masses only to the extent necessary to achieve the political objective of national unification and independence from Austria.

Disintegration of Empires

In the modern international relations system any a-national or dynastic state could no longer exist. The Habsburg and Ottoman states hoped to survive by obstructing, suppressing, or ignoring, nationalism. But the nation-state did not have to be the result, although so many nation-states had come into being. It could as well have been the multi-national state. Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and the Soviet Union are examples. The modern state could exist only on the basis of the promotion of nationalism; and this nationalism could equally be a single nationalism appropriate to the nation-state, or a number of nationalisms combined through imaginative federating arrangements into a multi-national state.

In principle the Ottoman and Habsburg empires could have evolved into such multi-national entities like the Czechoslovak, Yugoslav, and Soviet states. But the two empires were defeated in international war and were carved up, as happens with almost unfailing regularity throughout history. In this case, the victors used nationalism as the principle by which to slice them up as it was the most readily available and effective instrument. Yet they were not consistent, if it did not suit them, as the shifting frontiers in the Balkans, or finally the Czechoslovak and Yugoslav states demonstrate. The disintegration of the two empires was due to both nationalism and military defeat; military defeat gives most immediate reasons, and nationalism gives an idea of the form in which it happened.

The Habsburg disintegration corresponded to the Ottoman with a difference of emphasis. The primary thrust to the breakup of the Ottoman Empire was the pressure by the great powers; nationalism came a distinct second, even if used by the great powers. The Habsburg process was similar, but more spectacular. Its early losses in the nineteenth century were due to French action. It lost authority over Germany in 1806 when the Holy Roman Empire was abolished after Napoleonic victories. In 1860 the French deprived

the Habsburg of their Italian possessions by promoting the unification of Italy. In 1866, Prussia drove the Habsburgs finally out of the German leadership. On the other hand, the Habsburgs gained territories, chiefly the provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the western Balkans at the expense of the Ottoman Empire,

But, despite all the nationalist pressures in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, it was only the defeat in World War I that led to the final disintegration, with the victorious powers carving out the new nations of Czechoslovakia, Hungary minus the non-Magyars, Romania with Transylvania, and a south Slav federation called Yugoslavia, leaving the rump Austria. The process was more dramatic than the Ottoman as the Habsburg central state was more modern and effective. It could contain local nationalism and hold off international predators better. But, as usual, international rivalry was the ultimate test; and the Habsburgs went down like the Ottomans, and for much the same reasons.

Russian Empire differed from the other two Empires in terms of its more effective modernization, relatively lesser losses in wars, the demographic superiority of the Russians in relation to other nationalities, the supportive role of the Orthodox Church thereby ensuring religious loyalty of the majority of its subjects, enforced cultural and linguistic unification of the minority nationalities and the leading role of Russian nationalism. Even after the Empire broke up under the impact of the World War I, the Soviet Union, in a span of twenty years or so, was able to re-unite most of its constituent units in a single nation-state.

For this (emergence of a Supra national structure i.e. USSR), a national territory was identified on the basis of language, history, and culture, and it was made into a constituent Republic of the Soviet Union. The language of the Republic was then made the official language for local use, and Russian because the language for communication with the rest of the Soviet Union. Universal literacy campaigns were conducted with great energy such that more members of that nationality now knew how to read, write, and speak a single standardized version of their languages and could use it at all levels than ever before in history.

The full apparatus of education, from primary to post-secondary was established, so that members of the nationality could aspire to even higher levels of scholarship and culture within their own cultural space. All the national cultural institutions were created, that is, museums, theatres, publishing house, radio, and many newspapers. As much as possible, people of the local nationality were given preference in local employment; this process was known as nativization or korenizatsiia.

All these, put together, were major achievements for nationalist. But the essential conditions they had to observe in the twenties were: All citizens had to accept loyalty to the Soviet state and accept the dictatorship of the Communist Party, including its anti-religious

militancy. Security sensitive jobs were controlled by Russians, as in the intelligence and defence services.

This was followed by the decade of Stalin which forced industrialization, collectivization, mass purges, labour camps, appalling man-made famines, and the final dictatorship of a security apparatus masquerading as the Party. Now nationalism was to be permitted in the form made notorious by the slogan 'nationalist in form, socialist in content.' All the non-socialist, or rather non-party line, thinking of the nationalists was denounced. They could promote their culture and pursue their careers within their respective Republics and regions only if they followed the Party line in its details. It was a thoroughgoing imposition of uniformity and centralism.



IMPERIALISM AND COLONIALISM

The term imperialism means the practice of extending the power, control or rule by a country over the political and economic life of the areas outside its own borders. Imperialism refers to the process of capitalist development, which leads the capitalist countries to conquer and dominate pre-capitalist countries of the world. The imperialist country or Metropolis (literal meaning mother country), subordinates another country/colony for its own economic and political interests. This may be done through military or other means and particularly through colonialism. Colonialism means the practice of acquiring colonies by conquest (or other means) and making them dependent. The country which is subjugated by a metropolitan capitalist country is described as a colony, and what happens in a colony is colonialism. In other words, Colonialism is the total system of imperialist domination of a pre-capitalist country. Occupation/direct rule over a country by another country is not always an essential feature of imperialism. The essential feature is exploitation, with or without direct political control. Until recent years, most countries of Asia Africa and other parts of the world were under the control of one or another imperialist country.

The story of modern world is of trade, expansion, migrations, settlements, imperialism, colonialism and challenges to it. Modern World is the product of a unique type of trading chain in which Western Europe was clearly at the centre. This interconnected global trade was carried on, and was dependent upon, three major developments of these centuries: 1. mining of silver with the help of forced labour in the Americas; 2. forcible transfer of millions of African slaves across the Atlantic Ocean; and 3. levying of tribute by the European powers on Asian shipping and land.

Columbus's discovery was followed by the exploitation of the silver mines of the Americas

with the help of local manpower. Population of Mexico dropped from 25 million to about half a million during the course of the 16th century, on account of small pox, influenza and other diseases. This necessitated the search for new labour which was forcibly acquired from the African coast. As a result full-fledged plantation colonies of African slaves began to be established in Brazil and the Caribbean islands. The mining of silver brought unprecedented wealth to Europe. Asian spices, textiles, silk and indigo were in demand in the West. Europe's trade with Asia was greatly facilitated by the availability of silver obtained from mines in Americas with the help of African slave labour. But the trade with Asia was also not of an equal nature.

Between 1500 and 1800, Western Europe acquired 35% of the globe's land surface. This is despite the fact that in 1800, Europe's population was only 190 out of 900 million living on the planet earth. Great Britain was the architect of the biggest overseas empire, an empire over which "the sun never set". The population of Great Britain in 1838 was only 19 million but this country acquired large chunks of Asia and Africa with many millions of inhabitants. The scholars of European expansion agree on the superiority of European political organization and Western warfare over the various types of non-Western people. Gunpowder arms and modern state infrastructure of the West Europeans aided expansion in the extra-European world. Initial technological edges were transformed into huge political advantages. The superiority of the Western navies especially as regards long-range bulk transport was one of the principal factors behind the successful establishment of maritime empires in the extra-European world. The unlimited oceanic range of the Western ships gave them what could be termed as global reach. Afro-Asian states could not challenge the maritime supremacy of the Western naval powers. The passing of control on the Indian Ocean from Asian to European hand was a matter of great

political and economic importance. The Arabs lost control over the spice trade between South East Asia, India, Egypt and Arabia. The maritime powers also enabled the European trading companies to establish coastal enclaves in most of the territories whose shores lapped the Indian Ocean. These coastal enclaves became the bases from which the Europeans expanded.

In 1839, two British frigates defeated 29 Chinese war junks near Hong Kong. Besides technology, in theory also the Afro-Asians were lagging behind the maritime European powers. One of the characteristics of the theoretical works produced during Renaissance was the application of geometrical figures and symbols. Diagrams were used for elucidating theories as well as for analyzing the different stages of particular great battles. The eighteenth century European states established naval schools where mathematics along with Newton's Principia was taught. The Mughals had a riverine navy which conducted marine warfare against the Zamindars of Bengal and the Magh pirates in the Chittagong region during the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries. But these ships were no match against the European men of war. In 1498, Vasco da Gama arrived at Calicut on the Malabar Coast. In the same year, eight ships sent by Zamorin encountered a single Portuguese caravel. A caravel had a triangular sail and weighed about 200 tons. The bronze cannons of the Portuguese ship made mincemeat of the Indian ships which tried to fight with arrows, swords and lances. Shivaji set up the Maratha navy in 1659. The most famous Maratha admiral was Kanhoji Angre (1669-1729). For modernizing his fleet, Kanhoji hired Portuguese deserters.

In 1739, a single Portuguese frigate defeated Sambhaji Angria's squadron of 17 vessels. Gheria, the Maratha naval headquarters finally fell to the bombardment of British battleships.

While the Royal navy protected the British sea lines of communications, the Company's marine took care of coastal security. By 1934 it had been rechristened as the Royal Indian Navy. When Ceylon and Pondicherry were lost, the French Navy found that Mauritius was too far away for operating around the subcontinent. The lack of a maritime base near India hampered French maritime operations. This in turn choked the supply of men and materials to the French Army under Count de Lally. After the defeat of

Lally in the late eighteenth century, there was no European military competition to the East India Company's army in the Indian subcontinent. The British naval supremacy in the coastal waters of India also shaped land warfare in favour of the Company. Tipu's attempt to get aid from France was unsuccessful. And, the Mysore navy could achieve little against British sea power. After the defeat of Tipu, there were no more naval challenges from the indigenous powers. In 1848 when Mulraj the Diwan of Multan revolted, the Second Anglo-Sikh War broke out. And then the Company's navy practiced what could be categorized as 'Littoral Warfare'. Naval power came to the aid of the British during the crisis of 1857 Mutiny. Towards the end of May 1857, steamers brought white troops from Madras to Calcutta. The Royal Navy also brought reinforcements from Britain and Crimea into India during 1857-58. Sea power enabled the British government in India to project power in various parts of Asia. The company was able to put together a bureaucracy capable of launching distant amphibious operations. During the Dutch War of 1795, it was decided to send troops from India to Malacca. Burma teak was highly valued by the Royal Navy and the British merchantmen. And this was a contributory factor for the Second Anglo-Burma War during 1852-53. The emergence of shallow draft steamboats equipped with guns enabled European penetration into the interiors of Africa through the rivers. The British penetration into southern Nigeria through the Niger delta involved use of naval vessels. Bruce Lenman claims that in the early eighteenth century, the Dutch and the French by introducing gunpowder among the American tribes raised the level of organized violence. The original inhabitants of the New World did not use iron. Most of them employed Stone Age technologies. Hence, Hernan Cortes with 500 Spaniards and 14 cannon was able to defeat the Aztek Empire repeatedly between 1519 and 1521. At the siege of Cuzco in 1536, 200,000 Inca soldiers were defeated by 190 Spanish soldiers. The French towards the end of the seventeenth century realized that without Indian allies it was impossible to conduct colonial warfare successfully in North America. In 1712, the French allied with the Ottawa and Potawatomie attacked the Fox tribe. The Indian tribes of North America, who were allied with the European powers during the seventeenth century, taught the Europeans several tactical

lessons like marksmanship, scouting, looking for cover and concealment in the jungles.

Cooperation with the Indians was essential even in Central and South America. Economic potential and demographic resources did not necessarily generate great military power. For explaining European military superiority over Afro-Asia in general and India in particular, most of the historians followed Edward Gibbon's emphasis on gunpowder weapons. Geoffrey Parker asserts that the military balance changed in favour of the West because of the Military Revolution which unfolded between 1500 and 1750. The military revolution on land actually was an amalgamation of two revolutions. The first involved a Revolution in Siege Warfare due to the emergence of trace Italians (star shaped scientific fortress architecture) and siege artillery. Then a Revolution in Field Warfare occurred due to the rise of firearms equipped infantry supported by field artillery. Another characteristic of the Military Revolution was sustained growth in the size of the European armies. Artillery was so costly that only the monarchy could maintain it. The Europeans were well advanced in the field of international finance. The international credit network sustained the Western military activities across the globe. The Afro-Asia armies lacked any regular cohesive organization. Soldiering was a part time occupation of the cultivators and pay was irregular. Professional standing armies were absent in pre-colonial Afro-Asia. Hence, the Afro-Asian soldiers were indisciplined. In battles, the Africans and the Asians fought as aggregates of individuals and not as cohesive bodies of soldiers. Warfare in South-East Asia was also lagging behind the type of organized violence practiced by the West. Bloody conflict resulting in total destruction of the enemy force and permanent conquest were trends introduced by the Europeans.

While by the 1850s most of Asia was under the Europeans, even as late as 1876 less than 10% of Africa was under the Europeans. This was due to lack of surface communication in the jungle-filled continent and the prevalence of diseases which hampered operations of the European armies in the 'dark continent'. In West Africa, half of the white soldiers died within three months of their arrival. While the eighteenth century witnessed the conquest of

Asia, European expansion in Africa really gathered speed during the late nineteenth century. Structural contradictions prevented the Mughals, Persians and the Chinese from modernizing their army. They also did not possess the sea faring culture of the Western maritime nations. All these factors resulted in the passing away of the big Asian land empires. Then the culture of warfare in America and Africa also aided European conquest. State organization was virtually non-existent in most parts of the new World and in Africa. All the non-European polities were fragile entities and characterized by divisible sovereignty. This made possible playing off various ethno linguistic and religious groups against each other by the Europeans. It in turn facilitated not only conquest but also consolidation of imperial rule over the two American continents as well as in Afro-Asia. Thus it was a combination of social, technological, strategic and cultural factors that gradually brought about the entire world under European domination.

Along with human beings, this migration also involved movement of animals, plants and diseases. Long before Columbus, the Vikings in their long ships discovered Greenland and also made a landfall in Newfoundland. The Germans attacked the Western Roman Empire due to rising demographic pressure and the riches that could be obtained by plundering the rich Roman provinces of Gaul (France), Spain and Italy.

The lure of fertile land, pillage and plunder as well as prospect of trade also encouraged migrations and settlements. The gradual desiccation of Central Asia pushed the steppe nomadic tribes into Southern Asia and Eastern Europe. Due to the drying up of the heartland of Eurasia and falling water table, the horse riding nomads attacked the sedentary civilization. Increasing cold in Scandinavia also encouraged Viking migration in the late medieval age. The Vikings settled in Denmark, England, Normandy province in France and also in south Italy. Besides economy, climate, demography and technology, culture has also been an important determinant of migration and settlement. The era of mass migration of the Europeans in the extra-European world was preceded by what could be categorized as the 'Age of Discovery'. The latter term refers to intensive maritime exploration of the oceans by the European mariners. For the

first time, Ferdinand Magellan circumnavigated the globe during 1519-22.

The principal motive behind Europe's expansionist drive was the search for trade. Africa and Asia exported gold, jewel, silk, carpets, spices and porcelains to Europe. All these created the notion among the Europeans about luxury, wealth, skilled artisans and thriving craft industries in Afro-Asia. Instead of the Italian cities which were most interested in maritime trade, it was the West European powers which took the lead in oceanic voyages. Initially the European enclaves in the newly discovered lands were forts and ports. In Asia the indigenous potentates were quite powerful. The Ottoman Empire, the Ming Empire and the Mughal Empire were formidable entities. In such a scenario, the Europeans found themselves in the role of supplicants and observers rather than as conquerors and settlers. Since indigenous resistance in the New World was weak, the European coastal enclaves quickly expanded into big territorial empires. Columbus found gold in Hispaniola which in turn attracted more European settlers. The search for labour resulted in the conquest of Puerto Rico in 1508, Jamaica in 1509, and Cuba in 1511. The North American tribes practiced rudimentary hunting and fishing. The British in North America after settling down became fishermen, farmers, traders, etc. The early English settlements in Americas were at Jamestown and Virginia. In 1760 fight broke out between the British and the Cherokee whose hunting land in east Tennessee and west North Carolina were under pressure due to the advancing frontier of British American control and settlement. The rise of European population in British North America was greater than in New France because the British were willing to accept people of all religious backgrounds. By contrast, the French colonial policy was to establish catholic colonies in North America.

Among the early migrants there were more men than women. So, many Spaniards and Portuguese took Indian women as wives or concubines. Their offspring were known as mestizos and they settled mostly among the coastal regions. The Germans and the Dutch were minor players. The Russians unlike the West European maritime powers expanded the frontiers of Europe in East Asia by overland migration.

In the tropics most Europeans died or could not sustain self-replicating populations. But, in temperate America where few Europeans went they flourished demographically. Tropical diseases like malaria and yellow fever checked the Portuguese migration in Africa. Disease brought by the Europeans devastated the indigenous population of the New World. After 1704, influenza and smallpox caused rapid decline of the Maya people. During 1743-9, half of the indigenous population of the Amazon Valley fell victim to measles and smallpox. Smallpox wiped out half of the Cherokee in North America in the late 1730s. British cattle were introduced into Virginia. They multiplied rapidly and the agricultural lands of the Indians were changed into grazing and pastoral land. Horses spread throughout North America through trade and theft. Instead of allowing the Indians to grow their vegetable crops, the Spanish introduced sugar plantations, cotton, tobacco and vineyards. The Europeans introduced timber and dyewood in Brazil which were exported. Citrus fruits bought from Spain were introduced in the new World in the early sixteenth century. The Spaniards brought banana in 1516 to West Indies from the Canary Islands. Actually the Portuguese had introduced banana in the Canary Islands from tropical Africa. Catastrophic mortality among the 'native' Americans following the arrival of the Europeans generated search for cheap labour for working in the estates, plantations and mines. The resulting slave trade altered the demography by initiating a major movement of the Africans from Africa to South America, West Indies and the southern states of North America. Between 1680 and 1860, the loss of population due to slavery from West Africa was a little over 10%. Slaves were acquired from Africa either by raiding or through contacts with the African rulers. The slaves were sold to the European traders in return for guns, gunpowder and European clothes. And the African potentates used the guns for acquiring more slaves for selling the Europeans. Thus a vicious 'gun-slave' cycle developed. During the fifteenth century, African slaves were transported to Lisbon for sale. Founded in 1575, Luanda in Angola became the leading port through which slaves were shipped to Brazil. Congo was a vital source of slaves. In 1515 African slaves for the first time were sent to the Americas. Spain sent the African slaves to Hispaniola in the Caribbean and started receiving slave grown American sugar. Direct

large scale trans-Atlantic traffic in slaves started from 1532. The British transported more slaves than the French. Between 1691 and 1779, British ships transported 2,300,000 slaves from the African ports. In the sixteenth century about 367,000 African slaves were sent to the Americas. Angola supplied 2 million slaves in the eighteenth century mostly to Brazil. Most of the Africans transported as slaves in the eighteenth century went to Brazil and West Indies, and less than a fifth went to North America. The Portuguese moved slaves into the sugar plantations of Northeast Brazil and from 1710s into the gold and diamond fields of Minas Gerais. In the late eighteenth century the slaves were used in the sugar and coffee plantations near Rio De Janeiro. In most cases the number of black slaves exceeded the number of white colonists. The extensive scope of slavery in the New World becomes clear. Brazil between 1800 and 1850 had between 1,000,000 to 2,500,000 slaves. The slaves amounted to 33% of the population of the country. Slavery was rampant in the southern states of USA. Individuals were taken away from their communities and families in Africa. Many died while being captured. In the port towns and in the ships while being transported across the Atlantic, they were crowded together in hazardous circumstances. About 10% of the slaves died while being transported across the Atlantic. Hacking down sugarcane was a backbreaking task. Slaves lived in deplorable conditions. They were less well fed, housed and clothed than the white population. Some white settlers were also coerced by the state to migrate overseas. Between 1720 and 1763, the British Parliament passed another 16 Acts that established transportation as a penalty for crimes of perjury and poaching. Imperialism is the system of political control exercised by the metropolis over the domestic and foreign policy and over the domestic politics of another polity, which we shall call the periphery (countries at the margins of the economic hierarchy). Four important characteristic features of imperialism are:

- Sharp increase in international flow of commodities, men and capital,
- Interdependent set of relations between countries at different levels of industrial development,
- Advanced and superior technology in imperialist countries, and

- Competition between advanced capitalist countries

There were many empires in history but empire in the era of capitalism is imperialism. In earlier eras the motive was exaction of tribute. Under capitalism the economies and societies of the conquered or dominated areas were transformed, adapted and manipulated to serve the imperatives of capital accumulation in the imperialist countries placed at the centre of the economic hierarchy. Imperialism is a specifically European phenomenon whereas colonialism is the system prevalent in the colonies. Imperialism can be both formal and informal. Formal imperialism involves annexation and direct rule while informal empire means indirect rule by local elites who are independent legally but politically dependent on the metropolis.

These types are:

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

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

- (1) End of 15th to mid 17th Century-rise of commercial capital and rapid growth of world commerce.
- (2) Mid 17th to later 18th Century-commercial capital ripens into a dominant economic force.
- (3) Late 18th Century to 1870s-the era of industrial capital.
- (4) 1880 to World War I – rise of monopoly capital, division of Globe, etc.
- (5) Post World War I-socialism, decolonization, rise of multinational corporations.
- (6) In this sense, stages of imperialism coincide with stages of capitalism.

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

The theories of imperialism can be grouped into two broad types, economic (J.A. Hobson, Hilferding, Rosa Luxembourg and Lenin) and political (Schumpeter, Fieldhouse, Gallagher and Robinson). They can also be distinguished as metro centric (Schumpeter, Lenin, Hobson) and pericentric (Gallagher and Robinson, Fieldhouse).

In *Imperialism* (1902) Hobson explains imperialism as an outcome of the capitalist system. The key concept used is under consumption. Industry looked for foreign markets as it could not find domestic markets for its goods, wages being low. With major industrial powers competing for foreign markets there was a race for colonies which would serve as captive markets. Under consumption also leads to over saving as domestic investment does not make sound economic sense when there is little purchasing power. Thus Hobson concluded that "...the dominant directive motive" behind imperialism "was the demand for markets and for profitable investment by the exporting and financial classes within each imperialist regime." Dismissed other motives as secondary, be it power, pride and prestige or "trade follows the flag" or the mission of civilizing the natives. For Schumpeter, "Imperialism is the objectless disposition on the part of a state to unlimited forcible expansion." Political expansion was a function of commercial expansion- "trade with informal control if possible; trade with rule when necessary." Gallagher and Robinson's explanation of imperialism was pericentric. In their view imperialism was a process driven by pressures from the peripheries-Asia, Africa and Latin Africa. The scramble for colonies was a preemptive move by European powers to occupy whatever territory they could in Asia and Africa so as to keep out rival nations. Fieldhouse advanced a political explanation for imperialism. The new imperialism was the extension into the periphery of the political struggle in Europe. At the centre the balance was so nicely adjusted that no major change in the status or territory of any side was possible. Colonies became a means

out of this impasse. A whole range of theories and explanations have been offered for imperialism and are now available with us. These can broadly be classified into economic and non-economic explanations. The economic explanation include the factors pertaining to overproduction and under consumption (Hobson), requirements of finance capitalism (Hilferding), unequal exchange between the imperial powers and the colonies (Rosa Luxembourg), and the highest stage of capitalism (Lenin). The non-economic explanations have looked at imperialism as a pre-modern atavistic force (Schumpeter); or have offered a pericentric view concentrating on the developments in the colonies rather than the metropolis (Gallagher and Robinson); or have seen it merely as an expression of political struggle within Europe (Fieldhouse). In 1500 Europe's dominant position could not be taken for granted. The Ottoman Empire, China under the Mings and India under the Mughals were at the same stage of development. They suffered from one major drawback, however, and that was their domination by a centralized authority which did not provide conditions conducive to intellectual growth. Improved cartography, navigational tables, the telescope and the barometer made travel by sea safer. This strengthened Europe's technological advantage further. The discovery of America and of the route to the Indies via the Cape of Good Hope had great consequences for Europe. It liberated Europe from a confined geographic and mental cell.

The old colonialism had its natural limits. Flow of precious metals declined. By the late 18th century Spanish and Portuguese power declined and they lost their colonies. Dutch monopoly on shipping ended. Britain was now the world leader in empire, finance and trade. Europe's conquest of America, Africa and Asia from the sixteenth century was possible only because of her mastery of the seas. In this the countries on the Atlantic seaboard, Portugal, Spain, France, Britain and Holland, had an obvious advantage because of their geographical location. Europe's domination was disastrous for other people: the indigenous populations in the Americas were wiped out and twelve million Africans were made slaves between 1500 and 1860. Europe benefited vastly in this era when merchant capital controlled the world economy. Institutions such as the modern state and bureaucracy and the scientific revolution in

knowledge laid the foundations of the modern world. Hobsbawm describes the Industrial Revolution in Britain as that unusual moment in world history when the world's economy was built around Britain. The early British industrial economy relied for its expansion on foreign trade. Overseas markets for products and overseas outlets for capital were crucial. The cotton industry exported eighty per cent of its output at the end of the nineteenth century. The iron and steel industry exported forty per cent of its output in the mid nineteenth century. In return Britain bought specialized local products such as cotton from the US, wool from Australia, wheat from Argentina. etc. The age of mercantilism was over and with it tariff barriers stood dismantled. The new watchword was free trade. With the spread of industrial capitalism the need grew for colonies as markets for manufactured goods especially textiles and suppliers of raw materials such as cotton and food grains. The colony emerged as a subordinate trading partner whose economic surplus was appropriated through trade based on unequal exchange. This international division of labour condemned the colony to producing goods of low value using backward techniques. By the 1860s other countries like Germany and United States, were catching up with Britain in industrialization. In 1900 Britain was the unquestioned world leader. Her empire extended to twelve million square miles and a quarter of the world's population. The race for colonies speeded up from the 1880s with the entry of Germany, Italy, US, Belgium and Japan into the race for colonies. These imperialist rivalries which carved up the world into colonies, semi colonies and spheres of influence also divided Europe into blocks armed to the teeth, the logical corollary of which was World War I. The informal empire of trade and finance was added to the empire of industrial capital. Capital accumulation on a large scale took place because of the development of trade and industry at home and extended exploitation of colonies and semi colonies. The stranglehold of monopoly capital can be gauged from the statistic that by 1914 European nation controlled over 84.4 per cent of the world. Capital was concentrated in and channeled through first, the City of London and then New York, the centre of the international network of trade and finance.

Between 1870 and 1913, London was the financial and trading hub of the world. By 1913

Britain had 4000 million pounds worth abroad. Most international trade was routed through British ships at the turn of the twentieth century. After World War I Britain lost this position to the US. The US became the major dominant capitalist economy. She was now the world's largest manufacturer, foreign investor, trader and banker and the US \$ became the standard international currency. The drain of wealth or the unilateral transfer of capital from India after 1765 amounted to two to three per cent of the British national income at a time when only about five per cent of the British national income was being invested. In the 19th Century India emerged as a major market for British manufacturers and supplied food grains and raw materials. Opium from India was sold in China, enabling Britain's triangular trade with China. Railways were a major area of investment of capital. Britain's international balance of payments deficit was handled by the foreign exchange got from Indian exports. British shipping grew in leaps and bounds on the back of its control over India's coastal and international trade.

India played a crucial role in the development of British capitalism during this stage. British industries especially textiles were heavily dependent on exports. India absorbed 10 to 12 per cent of British exports and nearly 20 percent of Britain's textile exports during 1860-1880. After 1850, India was also a major importer of engine coaches, rail lines and other railway store. Moreover, the Indian army played an important role in extending British colonialism in Asia and Africa. Throughout this stage the drain of wealth and capital to Britain continued. The Home Charges (India's payments for receiving "good" administration from Britain) and the interest payments on the Indian Public Debt were important in financing Britain's balance of payments deficit. Thus the pride and glory underlying the slogan of 'the sun never sets on the British Empire' were used to keep workers contented on whose slum dwellings the sun seldom shone in real life. The British Indian army was the only large scale army contingent available to Britain. It was therefore not a surprise that the British Empire in Asia and Africa collapsed once Britain lost control over the Indian army and finances.

If imperialism is what happens in the metropolis, then colonialism is what happens in

the colonies. The same system of capitalism that produced development in the Western world created under development in the colony. In this sense imperialism and colonialism are two sides of the same coin.

Typology of colonies: colonies of settlement and of exploitation, inland colonies and overseas colonies, colonies under direct rule and colonies controlled only indirectly. South Africa, Australia, Canada were colonies of white settlers whereas India and Indonesia were colonies exploited economically and politically over centuries. Neo-colonialism is the continuation of colonialism by non-formal means. Economic policies were dictated and military might was harnessed by the imperial power. The US was the foremost neo-colonial power in the later phase. Andre Gunder Frank's major contribution was followed by those of C. Furtado, Theodore Dos Santos, Paul Prebisch, Paul Baran, Samir Amin, Immanuel Wallerstein, Arghiri Emmanuel and F. Cardoso. According to the dependency school (Andre Gunder Frank, Samir Amin etc.). A colony would continue to be economically dependent even after achieving political freedom, as long as it remains a part of capitalism-as the capitalist class was incapable of undertaking the task of development. Wallerstein's world systems approach divided the capitalist world into the centre, periphery and semi-periphery, between which a relationship of unequal exchange prevailed. The core economies of the centre produced high value products and had strong states. The periphery was constrained by low technology and low wages, the state was weak as was the capitalist class and the economy was dominated by foreign capital. The countries on the semi-periphery, like India, were marked by greater control of the state in the national and international market. Economic nationalism was the hallmark of such States. Cultural aspects of colonialism were highlighted by Amilcar Cabral, Franz Fanon and Edward Said. Colonialism is as modern a historical phenomenon as industrial capitalism. It is a well structured whole, a distinct social formation in which the basic control of the economy and society is in the hands of a foreign capitalist class. Colonialism is a specific structure. Colonial economy was neither pre-capitalist nor capitalist, it was colonial, i.e., a hybrid creation. Colonialism was distorted capitalism. Integration with the world economy did not bring capitalism to the colony. Colonialism did not develop social and productive forces, rather, it underdeveloped them.

Colonialism is a social formation in which different modes of production coexist from feudalism to petty commodity production to agrarian, industrial and finance capitalism. Unlike capitalism, where the surplus is appropriated on the basis of the ownership of the means of production, under colonialism surplus is appropriated by virtue of control over state power. One basic feature of colonialism is that under it the colony is integrated into the world capitalist system in a subordinate position. Colonialism is characterized by unequal Exchange. The exploitative international division of labour meant that the metropolis produced goods of high value with high technology and colonies produced goods of low value and productivity with low technology. The colony produced raw materials while the metropolis produced manufactured goods. Unequal exchange, external integration and internal disarticulation, drain of wealth, and a foreign political domination may be understood as the four main features of colonialism. The colonial state is integral to the structuring and functioning of the colonial economy and society. It is the mechanism by which the metropolitan capitalist class controls and exploits the colony. The colonial state serves the long term interests of the capitalist class of the mother country as a whole, not of any of its parts. Under colonialism all the indigenous classes of the colony suffer domination. The colonial state guaranteed law and order and for its own security from internal and external dangers. It suppressed indigenous economic forces hostile to colonial interest. The colonial state actively fostered the identities of caste and community so as to prevent national unity. The colonial state relied on the whole on domination and coercion rather than leadership and consent. There were three distinct stages of colonialism. The stages were the result of the following factors:

- The historical development of capitalism as a world system;
- The change in the society, economy and polity of the metropolis;
- The change in its position in the world economy and lastly;
- The colony's own historical development.

First Stage: Monopoly Trade and Plunder

The first stage had two basic objectives. In order to make trade more profitable indigenously manufactured goods were to be bought cheap. For this competitors were to be kept out, whether local or European. Territorial conquest kept local traders out of the lucrative trade while rival European companies were defeated in war. Thus, the characteristic of the first stage was monopoly of trade.

Secondly, the political conquest of the colony enabled plunder and seizure of surplus. For example, the drain of wealth from India to Britain during the first stage was considerable. It mounted to 2 to 3% of the National Income of Britain at that time. Colonialism was superimposed on the traditional systems of economy and polity. No basic changes were introduced in the first stage.

Second Stage: Era of Free Trade

The interest of the industrial bourgeoisie of the metropolis in the colony was in the markets available for manufactured goods. For this it was necessary to increase exports from the colony to pay for purchase of manufactured imports. The metropolitan bourgeoisie also wanted to develop the colony as a producer of raw materials to lessen dependence on non-empire sources. Increase of exports from the colony would also enable it to pay for the high salaries and profits of merchants. The industrial bourgeoisie opposed plunder as a form of appropriation of surplus on the ground that it would destroy the goose that laid the golden eggs. In this stage changes in the economy, policy, administration, social, cultural and ideological structure were initiated to enable exploitation in the new way. Capitalists were allowed to develop plantations, trade, transport, mining and industries. The system of transport and communications was developed to facilitate the movement of massive quantities of raw materials to the ports for export.

Third Stage: Era of Finance Capital

Large scale accumulation of capital in the metropolis necessitated search for avenues for investment abroad. These interests were best served where the imperial powers had colonies. This led to more intensive control over the colony in order to protect the interests of the imperial power. A major contradiction in this stage was

that the colony was not able to absorb metropolitan capital or increase its exports of raw materials because of overexploitation in the earlier stages. A strategy of limited modernization was implemented to take care of this problem. The conquest of Africa took place in the last decades of the nineteenth century. Till as late as 1880 only 20 per cent of Africa had come under European rule. The first phase, 1880-1919, was one of conquest and occupation. The colonial system was consolidated after 1910. The second phase, 1919-35, was that of the independence movements. The third stage was from 1935 onwards. The impact of colonialism in Africa was tremendous. The self sufficient African economies were destroyed, transformed and subordinated by colonial domination. Class differentiation in African society occurred as a result on the impact of colonial domination. The links of African countries with each other and with other parts of the world were disrupted. European powers reduced the economies of Africa to colonial dependencies through the power of finance capital. The loans for the Suez Canal enmeshed Egypt in debt.

The imperialist school of thought would have it that Africans welcomed colonial rule. Social Darwinism justifies colonialism by arguing that the domination over the weaker races was the inevitable result of the natural superiority of the European race. The positive effects of colonialism, if any, were byproducts; they were clearly not consciously intended. The negative impact was huge and in all shares, with long lasting legacies. For example, ethnic conflicts which paralyzed many parts of Africa today are rooted in the arbitrary superimposition of territorial boundaries on an essentially tribal society.

Colonialism in South-East Asia lasted five centuries, from the late fifteenth to the mid twentieth century. Even after the heyday of the spice trade, South-East Asia remained important as a supplier of basic raw materials like oil, rubber, metals, rice, coffee, tea and sugar. The impact of colonialism in this region was considerable, even on countries like Thailand, which did not formally become colonies. Traditional forms of government disappeared, trading patterns were disrupted and the rich cultural tradition of these regions were destroyed.

Wallerstein would have it that there was a basic paternalism which ran through the

philosophies of all the colonial powers. But this basic paternalism expressed itself in very different forms, depending on the history and national character of the colonial powers. From the beginning there was a sparseness and economy about British colonial policy. The British used trading companies to acquire colonies, insisted that colonies be self sustaining and varied the political structure in each of the colonies to suit local needs. "This, then, is the classic contrast between Africa's two colonial powers, Britain and France: Britain-empirical, commercial, practicing indirect rule, keeping Africans at a distance, verging on racism; France- Cartesian in its logic, seeking glory, practicing direct administration, acting as apostle of fraternity and anti-racism." In practice the differences were not so clear in fact, there were parallel degrees of political, social and economic discrimination in two settler territories like Kenya and Algeria. There was also parallel absence of legal discrimination. In Britain civil servants were nonpartisan whereas in France junior civilians were political.

There were broadly four types of decolonization:

- (1) Self government for white settler colonies as it happened in Canada and Australia.
- (2) Formal end to empire followed by independent rule as in India.
- (3) Formal empire replaced by informal empire or neo-colonialism as in Latin America.
- (4) Mere change of imperial masters- in Indo-China when the French reluctantly left, the US move in.

The explanations of decolonization have been classified as follows:

- The nationalist approach
- International context approach
- Domestic constraints approach

In the nationalist view indigenous resistance and anti imperialist struggle led to independence. According to D.A. Low, the primary factor behind the end of empire was anti-imperialist movements-the metropolitan response only influenced the nature of this confrontation, not the outcome. The British imperialists presented the unraveling of empire as an orderly and rational process but the messy reality was much less consistent and unavoidable, as John Darwin

has pointed out. In short, far from a planned withdrawal from empire, there was the irreversible erosion of position as imperial powers struggled to retain power by one means or another, conciliation or repression.

According to the approach highlighting the international context of decolonization, empires could not survive in the new world order after the Second World War. The changed international climate was reflected in the Atlantic Charter issued by the Allies during the War which called for the independence of colonial people. The United Nations General Assembly went a step further in 1960 in its Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and people. It sharply condemned colonial rule as a denial of fundamental human rights in contravention of the UN Charter.

This international approach attributes the end of empires to the opposition of the US and USSR to 'old style imperialism'. The US and USSR had nothing to gain from the older imperial powers, such as Britain and France, retaining their colonies. They had everything to gain from the end of empire as this enabled these two emerging superpowers to establish their influence over the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa. The metropolitan or domestic constraints approach focuses on how the colony became too big a burden on the mother country. In this explanation the end of empire is seen as a political choice made under pressure of domestic constraints and calculations of national interest. The mother country's will to rule slackened once empire became too much of a nuisance, financially, militarily and in international relations. Historians John Gallagher and other scholars in the imperialist tradition argued that British imperial interests in India were declining, that India no longer fulfilled its role in the maintenance of imperial interests in the fields of either defence or commerce or finance and that, in fact, over the years it had become a liability for the British.

Another factor was the post war expansion of the welfare state. Decolonization gathered pace once social reform became a priority and empire began to be perceived as a drain on resources. The twentieth century was the era of decolonization. At the end of the twentieth century the world was no longer Eurocentric. The twentieth century had seen the decline and

fall of Europe, which had been the centre of power, wealth and western civilization at the beginning of the century. In the first decade of the twentieth century the nationalists posed a challenge in Asia and Africa. They were encouraged by the ability of Japan, a small Asian country, to inflict a crushing defeat on Russia, a European power, in 1905. Some of the well known leaders of the national movements were Sun Yat Sen in China, Arabi Pasha in Egypt and Bal Gangadhar Tilak in India. These movements were led, in this stage, by English educated middle class elites whose demand for a say in the running of their countries was changing into a demand for independence.

The First World War further fuelled nationalist discontent. The War effort had meant increased exploitation of colonies for raw materials, manpower and taxes and nationalists naturally questioned why the colonies should bear this burden. In 1919 when a new international order was emerging in Europe the national movements in the colonies underwent a transformation in a mass direction. In India this change was brought by Mahatma Gandhi; China had the May 4th Movement; in Turkey Kemal Ataturk rose to power, and in Indonesia the national movement reached a membership of 2.5 million. Difference emerged between the old imperial powers like Great Britain and the newer ones like the US and Japan, on whether the old order should continue at all, and if so in what form? This stance of the newer world powers encouraged nationalists greatly. In the years after the Russian revolution the process of colonial emancipation and decolonization went much further. Anti-imperialist activity was fuelled because of the world wide depression of 1929. Sharpening of conflict as in Egypt and India and victory of Republican ultras under De Valera in the Irish elections of 1932 were belated anti-colonial reactions to the economic breakdown. The impact of the depression was the loosening of links between the colony and the metropolis, which encouraged independent capitalist growth in the colony.

World War II showed up Great Britain as a second fiddle to the US in the Anglo American alliance. After 1945 the US and Russia became the two superpowers.

In the third world, the Second World War had caused great upheavals, political and

economic. Within years of the end of the War many colonies gained independence, but often after protracted disagreement, encouraged by the imperial power, on the contentions issue of distribution of power, leading to partition and civil war. Various areas of troublesome conflict in the 1970s and 80s, Middle East, Cyprus, South Africa, Kashmir, Sri Lanka, were legacies of British decolonization.

There are also significant differences between, for example, French and British decolonization. For example, if the British maintained strategic, political and cultural interests in its erstwhile colonies through the Commonwealth, the cultural integration was the mode of association preferred by the French. The French had no mechanism like the British Commonwealth to ease the transition of colonies to independence. Whereas the liberation of India from British colonial rule set off a chain reaction of independence in other British colonies, such as Burma and Ceylon, France continued to cling to its colonial possessions. France refused to see the writing on the wall in Indo-China. By 1945 there were popular revolts against the French in many parts of Vietnam, which then came under communist control, with the help of the quite remarkable Vietnamese guerrilla army. The French were conclusively defeated in the battle of Dien Bien Phu in 1954.

Indian independence in 1947 was followed by independence in Burma in 1948 and Ceylon in the same year. Malaya gained independence nine years later. Ghana gained independence under Kwame Nkrumah in 1957. Togo, Cameroon, Somalia and Nigeria became independent in 1960. In 1964 all seven British East and Central African colonies, Somaliland, Tanganyika, Uganda, Zanzibar, Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia became independent. Botswana and Swaziland followed in 1966. Britain was not willing to hand over power in Kenya because of white settlers there and hence got embroiled in suppressing a protracted and violent revolt, such as the Mau.

The French colonies of Morocco and Tunisia gained independence in 1956. In contrast, independence was completely ruled out for Algeria as it was seen as an integral part of France. This short sighted policy was to lead to a bloody war, as in Vietnam. In Africa local

autonomy was granted in 1956 but the colonies were placed in a union, termed the French Community, strictly controlled by France. Eight colonies in French West Africa, four in French Equatorial Africa and Madagascar gained independence in 1960. Thus there were three different policies followed by the French in Africa. In the words of Immanuel Wallerstein, "as a result of their special Framework of thinking concerning the colonies, the British were the first to begin the process of decolonization." They accepted national independence as a legitimate objective. They were anxious to avoid a repetition of what happened in America in their other settler colonies, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. "The French concept of constitutional advance was to draw colonies closer to France, not push them farther away." French Africans were elected to legislative bodies. The British associated Africans with local bodies whereas the French associated Africans with French bodies. The British sought to maintain influence in their colonies after the end of empire by encouraging their ex-colonies to follow the

Westminster model of parliamentary government with its multi party system. The French did not care what form of government was adopted, their concern was with cultural rather than political influence. The British and French opposed federations in French West and Equatorial Africa as the nationalists were behind them whereas the British worked towards federation as they would be useful in the post-independence situation. There were differences between the British and French perceptions of the role of the civil service. In Britain, civil servants were nonpartisan whereas in France junior civilians were political. However, this made little difference after independence. Yet, the outcome of these very different policies of the British and French was the same. Widespread economic and political discontent in Africa led to the uniform collapse of empire across British and French colonies. This seriously questions the view that French and British Africa were poles apart.

Indian independence had an amazing demonstration effect. The achievement of independence in India triggered off a wave of similar developments across Africa and Asia.



World War Changed the World

The theatre of war in World War I was mostly Europe. But the rest of the world was forced to contribute as colonies, or others like the USA entered the war for their own reasons. They were total wars (fought not merely by professional armies, but as much by civilian populations engaged in war efforts and being targeted as combatants). Mobilization of resources was colossal, and the level of destruction left observers speechless.

The capacity and nature of destruction now acquired new features. The first was genocide, or the killing of an entire group of people. This was first attempted between 1915 and 1923 on the Armenians by Turkish nationalists, and then by the Nazis on Jews and Gypsies (Roma) during World War II. Never before in history had killing on this scale been attempted. More significantly, it was not carried out in bursts of anger, as in communal riots, nor even by small organizations, but by the modern state. The genocides were modern, and belonged entirely to the modern world. That was a singular aspect of the crisis of modernity in the twentieth century.

The other notable feature is that modern civilization had, during the war, acquired the capacity for the annihilation of the human species. This was revealed when atomic bombs were dropped over Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945. Modern class society, built around the central drama of the struggle between capital and labour, became obsolete in Europe and America, as new technologies and organization systems led to new social relations, collectively called the postindustrial.

The wars put an end to the nation-state system, with supra-national agglomerations taking shape. The sovereignty of the nation-states of Europe was now subordinated in the Cold War to the power blocs of East and West, led respectively by the USSR and USA.

Imperial and colonial rule came to an end with the expulsion of the British from India, the French from Indo-China and finally the Americans from Vietnam, besides numerous decolonization processes in Africa and the Middle East.

The Wars were in every sense a struggle for the mastery of the planet. At the beginning of the century, the world saw six contenders for domination of the earth, the USA, UK, France, Germany, Russia, and Japan. The two Wars reduced the six to two; USA and USSR.

It is still not yet clear what form the power structure will assume in the twenty-first century, whether the USA will retain its supremacy, whether the European Union and China would become challengers, whether Russia would revive and in what form, and whether India would play a leading role at all. But one thing can be said for sure is 'World wars changed the World for ever'.

Growing Rivalries

The world economy of capitalism from mid 19th century onwards was a conglomeration of national blocs or national economies which had emerged with the growing number of nation states. These states protected their industrializing economies against competition from other nations. Thus these nations also became rival economies.

The period inevitably saw the hunt for more profitable investment and more markets. This led to the clamor for colonies outside the areas traditionally dominated by Britain. Economic competition and economic rivalry between nation states led to imperialism of the 20th century and to the genesis of the 1st World War.

Germany's strength was increasing more so after the unification. France was defeated in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870. Under the subsequent Peace of Frankfurt in 1871 France had to pay an indemnity of 200 million pounds

and agreed that thirty thousand German troops would remain in Paris until the amount had been paid. Bismarck evolved the "system of the great European alliances."

Apart from the growing strength of Germany, another important development in this period was the expansionism of Russia. As the Ottoman Empire weakened and the nationalist aspirations of the Balkan peoples became stronger, the Russians could not restrain themselves. Many of the subject nationalities of the Ottoman Empire were Slav and therefore had a strong ethnic affinity with the Russians. Hence Russia gave support to the secessionist moves of these various Balkan peoples, especially the Rumanians and Serbians. This went against the interests of Britain which did not want a dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire.

France was also unhappy. From as early as the time of the Crusades, France had been regarded as the protector of Christian rights in the East. But now the Russian Tsar, by posing as the champion of Orthodox or Eastern Christianity, which was the version of Christianity largely followed in the Balkans region, was challenging the French claim.

French imperialism in Africa made rapid strides in the 1880s. Tunis was occupied in 1881. Madagascar was brought under control in 1884. It desired to advance into the Sahara region for which it would have to control Morocco. But Germany and Spain were also interested in the Morocco region. French expansion into the Sudan region led to conflict with Britain and confrontation on the Niger and at Fashoda. Moreover, by 1882 France had to forego its control over Egypt to Britain.

The Treaty of San Stefano (which concluded the Russo-Turkish war) was placed before a Congress of all the major European powers—Britain, France, Turkey, Russia, Italy and Germany—in June 1878 at Berlin. Russia's gains were reduced while Austria stood to gain by being allowed to occupy and administer Bosnia and Herzegovina. Britain got Cyprus and France was promised a free hand in Turkey's North African territory of Tunisia. However, Italy and Germany did not gain any territories as a result of this Congress.

But what was even more alarming for Britain was Russia's expansion in the Central Asian

region prospect of a Russian takeover of Afghanistan, which was a buffer state within the Britain sphere of influence. In 1885, Russian forces occupied a part of Afghan territory. The British Prime Minister asked Parliament to vote him eleven million pounds for resisting the Russians. But once again the Tsar, Alexander III, realizing that it was better to exercise discretion, decided to withdraw and to turn his energies instead towards expansion in China.

Power Combinations

Austria-Hungary was steadily losing its importance during this period. However, for Germany it was a natural ally, especially against Russia. Though the alliance of the Three Emperors (Russia, Germany and Austria-Hungary) known as the Dreikaiserbund had been forged in June 1881 and renewed in 1884, it finally broke down in 1887. As differences between Russia and Germany increased, Austria-Hungary as well as Italy drew closer to Germany. This process culminated in the formation of the Triple Alliance in 1882. By the 1890s Russia was experiencing great isolation. So was France. This brought the two together in a Dual Alliance in 1893. Thus, in the 1890s, two sets of European alliances existed.

In 1904 the Entente Cordiale or Anglo-French agreement was signed. It settled all their main differences over colonies. France recognized British interests in Egypt while Britain in turn endorsed French interests in Morocco. This agreement was only a "friendly understanding", not an alliance. But Germany's aggressive postures, especially in Morocco, brought the French and the British closer to each other. It also brought Germany and France very close to war in 1906 and it was only an international conference at Algericas, in which the independence of Morocco was reaffirmed, which defused the issue.

In 1905 Russia suffered an ignominious defeat at the hands of Japan. This humbled Russian aspirations and the Anglo-Russian Agreement of 1907 settled the long-standing rivalries between the two powers over Afghanistan, Persia and Tibet. Thus a Triple Entente of Britain, France and Russia, to rival the Triple Alliance of Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy, had materialized.

Balkan Problem

The outbreak of a revolution in Turkey in 1908 by a group of liberal patriots, who called themselves the "Young Turks", overthrew the Sultan's rule. As fallout of these developments, Austria decided to annex Bosnia and Herzegovina, which it had been administering since 1878. This brought protests from Russia. It demanded that Austria's action be brought before an international conference. The Serbians, who had nurtured hopes of acquiring Bosnia-Herzegovina some day, joined the Russians in their protest.

But Germany and Austria held that they would not agree to a conference unless the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina was recognized beforehand. Ultimately, they had their way largely because Russia, after its defeat at the hands of Japan, was in no position to go to war against Austria-Hungary and Germany at this juncture. This incident revealed the might of Germany and its growing ability to strongly assert itself, though on this occasion on behalf of Austria. This tendency had ominous forebodings for the future. Italy entered into a secret understanding with Russia in 1909 whereby it promised to support Russia's interests in the Straits of Dardanelles in return for Russia's support for Italian designs in Tripoli (Libya).

Run Up to the War

In 1889 England had adopted a "two-power standard" whereby the British would have a naval fleet 10% stronger than the combined navies of the two next-strongest powers. Germany had in 1898 embarked on a course of naval expansion which made it the second-strongest naval power in the world by 1914. This was galling for England which felt that Germany did not really require a navy, especially since it already had such a powerful army. A naval build-up could only mean that it wished to challenge Britain's naval supremacy sometime in the future. The naval rivalry worsened relations between Germany and Britain considerably.

1912, Italy suddenly decided to take the plunge and annexed Tripoli. It had secured the consent of all the major powers in this campaign and hence there was no major Moroccan-type crisis this time. In October 1912 Greece and Serbia invaded the Ottoman Empire and decisively defeated it. By the Treaty of London of May 1913,

the Ottoman Empire lost all its European possessions except the region adjacent to the Straits of Dardanelles.

In the immediate run-up to the First World War the growing strength and aggressive designs of Serbia were an important contributory factor. This small country was determined to add to its territories. Immediate cause of the First World War was the assassination of Archduke Francis Ferdinand, heir to the Austrian throne at the Bosnian capital of Sarajevo on 28 June 1914. A secret society of Serbian nationalists called the "Black Hand" was responsible for the killing. Even though the Serbian government did not have any hand in the assassination, Austria was determined to punish Serbia for the murder. On 28 August 1914, it broke off diplomatic relations with Serbia and declared war on it. Russia, anxious about Serbia's fate, also prepared for war against Austria.

Germany, on seeing this, sent an ultimatum to Russia demanding that it cease its preparations for war. On receiving a reply from the Tsar that this was impossible, Germany declared war on Russia on 1 August 1914. It followed it up with a declaration of war on France two days later. The idea was to strike France at its most vulnerable spot, at the border between France and Belgium. It was Germany's invasion of Belgium which brought Britain into the war. Behind Serbia was the long-standing conflict between the Russians and the Austrians. Austria had Germany as a strong ally and Russia had France. If France was threatened with invasion, Britain felt vulnerable and was therefore compelled to come to the rescue of France.

Reasons of World War 1

The beginning of the century witnessed the division of the world into major international forces based on distinct ideologies. Since their conflicts and rivalries could not be resolved through any peaceful mechanism, they resulted in the outbreak of the two world wars. The two wars were caused by a variety of factors. Some of the most important ones are discussed below.

Industrialization & Economic Rivalries

The opening years of the nineteenth century saw the industrial manufacturing techniques extended beyond England to more and more states, such as Belgium (1815-30), Sweden,

France, United States and Prussia (1840-60), Norway, Russia and Japan (1870-90). Rapid growth of the American and German economies began to displace England from this position of pre-eminence from the 1880s. The growth of Japan after the Meiji restoration (1868) and industrialization of Russia further altered the global economic environment.

A crisis seemed imminent as the expanding industrialization tended to globalise the economy. In fact, the world system of capitalism was still working in the form of competing "national economies". The closing years of the nineteenth century did see the crystallization of this trend.

The latecomers in the field of industrialization (such as Prussia, Russia and Japan) were staking claims beyond the "national territories". The Pan-German League, founded in 1893 and representing right-wing conservative forces wanted economic and territorial control over Central Europe. They claimed Belgium, the French iron ore district, the French channel coast to the Somme and a Mediterranean base at Toulon, along with Poland and the Baltic states. They also envisaged a Central European federation comprising Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Finland under the leadership of Germany together with German, French and Belgian colonies attached to it.

Hitler not only wanted a union (Anschluss) with Austria but also aimed to get sufficient living-space (Lebensraum) for the German 'people'. The Italian right-wing similarly used class-concepts of 'proletarian' (have-nots) and 'plutocratic' (have) nations to redefine international relations and to claim colonies for a 'proletarian' Italy. In Japan, similarly, the right-wing militant nationalists (Black Dragon Society 1901), Empire Foundation Society (1926), and Japan Production Party (1931), demanded an "equitable distribution of world resources". They even favoured military action to establish "A Co-prosperity Zone" in the East under the Japanese leadership.

Camp Formations and Arms Build Up

In 1879, Germany and Austria-Hungary agreed to go to war if either country was attacked by Russia. Italy joined the agreement in 1882, and it became known as the Triple Alliance.

In 1894, France and Russia agreed to mobilize troops if any nation in the Triple Alliance mobilized forces. They agreed to help each other if either were attacked by Germany. In 1904, alarmed by German naval buildup, Britain ended their "splendid isolation". It not only settled the past differences over colonies but also signed the Entente Cordiale (friendly agreement) with France. Although the agreement contained no pledges of military support, the two countries began to discuss joint military plans. In 1907, Russia joined the Entente Cordiale, and it became known as the Triple Entente. These alliances left Europe divided into two hostile camps.

The First and Second Hague Conferences (1899 and 1907) failed to achieve anything concrete on the issue of armament reduction. The Court of Arbitration set up at Hague to deal with inter-state conflicts also proved futile. The armament race and military build-ups by the European powers, in anticipation of this war, continued at a frenzied pace.

In the end, on one side stood a united Germany, already the most powerful land power militarily and economically, allied with the large and outwardly confident empire of Austria-Hungary as also with Italy. On the other side stood France, bitter in enmity over its defeat and loss of Alsace-Lorraine to Germany in 1871, seeking security by allying with Russia in 1892 and forming an 'entente cordiale' with its traditional rival Great Britain in 1904.

Both sides amassed armaments, which were becoming more lethal as advancing technologies of explosives, metal design, petroleum fuel, and shipbuilding were applied to them. Military chiefs (notably Alfred Von Schlieffen of Germany) planned strategies that relied on swift mobilization, rapid offensive strike, and inevitable escalation, which compressed the time for political decision making and diplomatic control of crises. Newspapers stimulated feelings of danger, deprivation, and patriotism in public opinion, which came to think of war as possible, even desirable.

World War 1 Begins

Austria-Hungary declared war on Serbia on 28th July, 1914. Germany declared a war on Russian on 1st August and on France on 3rd August. Belgium was invaded by German forces

on the same day and France was invaded on 4th August. German violation of Belgium neutrality gave the British a convenient excuse to enter the war on the side of France and Russia. British world-wide interests made the war a global conflict, drawing into it the dominions of Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa and the greatest British colonial possession, India, and later the United States, because of close British links with it.

Austria-Hungary attacked Russia on 6th August and France and Britain declared war on Austria-Hungary on 12th August. Italy, diplomatically aligned with Austria and Germany since the Triple Alliance of 1882, declared its neutrality on 3rd August. In the following months it was avidly pursued by France and Britain. On 23rd May 1915, the Italian government succumbed to allied temptations and declared war on Austria-Hungary in pursuit of territorial expansion.

Trench Warfare

Expectations that war will be swift and short were belied. Soon, it got deadlocked into positional trench warfare along the Western Front; a massive seize of 600 miles from Switzerland to the North Sea. This continuous front marked the end of local, small, isolated and restricted warfare. Now millions of men faced each other across the sand-bagged, parapets of trenches, under which they lived like, and with rats and lice. The opposing systems of zigzag, timber-revitts, sand-bag reinforced trenches were fronted by tangles of barbed wire and scattered covered dugouts for providing shelter for troops.

The heavy artillery and machine gun fire used by the opposing armies made it almost impossible to achieve any breakthrough. In order to break the stalemate, each side tried to expand its war-production. This necessitated total mobilization of human and industrial resources. e.g. The battle of Verdun (February-July, 1916) in which the Germans attempted a breakthrough was a battle of 2 millions, with one million casualties. The British offensive on the Somme, designed to force the Germans to break off the Verdun offensive cost Britain 420,000 lives.

In this battle, British artillery was provided with 23,000 tons of projectiles whereas the French Artillery in the celebrated battle of Waterloo had used only 100 tons. Karl von Clausewitz, the

philosopher of war had defined War as "an act of violence pushed to its utmost bounds". The phrase 'home front' acquired wider usage during World War I. The supply line of opponent became the first natural target of military strategy. The economic warfare was symbolized by naval blockade and unrestricted submarine warfare during World War I.

Naval Blockade

The Allies attempted naval blockade on the Central Powers (Germany, Austria, Hungary) and their co-belligerents Turkey and Bulgaria. The blockade proved unsuccessful as the Central Powers continued to get their supplies through neutral countries. Germany launched attacks on Allied commercial shipping in October, 1914 through its submarines-the-U-boats. Such attacks intensified in 1915-1917. By mid-1915, average monthly sinking of Allied ships was 116,000 gross tones and touched 866,000 tonnes by April, 1917. However, the political disadvantages outweighed any logistical damage, since there was strong American reaction to these sinking.

Technological Innovations

By the end of the nineteenth century, black powder was supplanted by nitrocellulose based propellants popularly known as 'gun-cotton'. Alfred Krupp (1851) built an all steel gun drilled out of a single block of cast metal. Breech-loading mechanism used in 1860s and 1870s helped in cutting spiral grooves into the bores of artillery pieces or solved the problem of rifling. Its advantages were immense. By imparting spin to the projectiles, rifling produced greater accuracy. Another technical device solved the recoiling problem by absorbing the shock of discharge and leaving the gun in approximately same position after firing as before. The trench warfare of World War I gave an impetus to the production of heavier guns in greater number with longer ranges and better fire-control. Shooting became based on map coordinates and carefully calculated ballistic parameters without a forward observer. Artillery communications also improved aided by field telephones and radios.

The World War I witnessed development of heavy machine-guns. The first successful automatic machine-gun was invented by Hiram Stevens Maxim. These were first used by the British army in 1895. After 1915, lighter machine-

guns such as British Lewis guns, French Chauchat and US Browning automatic rifle (BAR) were used for greater mobility and portability. In 1918, a German named Louis Schmeisser first developed a sub machinegun.

Some new forces of mechanized warfare such as tanks, aircrafts (fighter and bombers), submarines, aircraft carriers were discovered during World War I but their destructive potential was realized only in the Second World War. First tanks- 'Little Willie' and 'Big Willie' were designed in Britain in 1915. French developed the Schneider. Submarines became a major factor in World War I. Germany employed U-Boats to destroy surface merchant ships by using a self-propelled underwater missile or torpedo. German Zeppelins were early military aircraft used during World War I. Their use did not prove very effective.

Germany used chlorine along a six kilometers front at Ypres on 22 April 1915 against French and Algerian Territorial Army. Later phosgene and mustard gas were also used during the World War I. However, introduction of better gas masks, protective clothing reduced the effects of chemical warfare.

End of War

The 'Great War', as it was known before the Second World War made this the First, carried on for more than four years, with neither side on any front willing to accept defeat or negotiate peace. The Russian Revolution of 1917 brought a cease-fire on the eastern front in December with Russia losing substantial territory and monies to Germany in the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. The US declared war on Germany only on April 6, 1917 but the entry of American troops, aero plans and fresh supplies in 1918 nullified German gains on both fronts. An armistice was declared on November 11, 1918 and a peace conference opened in Paris on 18 January 1919.

In the World War I, the total number of people killed and dead for other war-related reasons was well over 8 million. It was also an age of mass flight. The aftermath of World War I saw a large number of homeless and stateless people, including the two millions who fled from the Russian Revolution and accompanying civil strife. 13 million Greeks were repatriated to Greece mainly from Turkey. In all, the period 1914-22 created roughly 4-5 million refugees. A

new document, a certificate delivered by national authorities on the recommendations of League of Nations High Commissioners for Refugees in 1920s, the so-called 'Nansen passport' was accepted as a travel document by over 50 countries.

Post War Developments

US President Woodrow Wilson was a dominating figure of the peace conference so that his moralistic 'fourteen points' were incorporated into the resulting treaties, which transformed the map of Europe on the principle of 'self-determination of nations', and established a League of Nations to uphold the peace on the principle of 'collective security'.

Germany was punished territorially and financially. Alsace-Lorraine was restored to France. The port of Danzig was made a free city and a Polish Corridor ran through the eastern provinces of Germany. Rearmament of any kind was forbidden, as was fortification of the Rhineland or union with Austria. Colonial possessions were detached and unspecified amounts demanded in reparations.

The Habsburg Dynasty was dismissed and its Austria-Hungary Empire dismantled. Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland became independent. Austria ceded South Tyrol, Istria, the Dalmatian coast and some Adriatic Islands to Italy, and its southern Slav provinces of Slovenia, Croatia, Dalmatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina to Yugoslavia. Other territorial transfers took from Bulgaria and added to Romania. The Ottoman Empire too was abolished with the Treaty of Sevres, 1920; Turkey became a republic, its Arab provinces were placed under British/French mandate.

Outcome of the War

Territorial changes failed to solve the basic problems of insecurity in Europe, dividing the continent into 'satisfied' but weakened powers such as Britain, and dissatisfied or revisionist states, including Germany and Russia. The economic consequences of the peace compounded the high cost of the war to cause inflation and unemployment, undermine currencies, and disrupt trading patterns, leading to the Great Depression of the 1930s. At the core of a complex process lay the problem of allied war debts to the US. A weak League of Nations could take no

effective action against Japan in 1931, Italy in 1935, or Nazi Germany in successive violations of the Treaty. All this ultimately led to World War 2.

Versailles conference was dominated by three major actors: President Woodrow Wilson of the United States, Georges Clemenceau of France and Lloyd George of Britain. The real debate was between Wilson's liberal vision over the post-war settlement and Clemenceau's nationalist insistence on extracting harsh terms from Germany.

Wilson's vision was a broader one. His Fourteen Points stressed the ideals of self-

determination, sovereignty and justice. Wilson's idea was to provide for a new programme stability for the modern state system. While Wilson's was a liberal programme speaking of a new world order, world government (the League of Nations), Lenin's was a radical cry to overturn the old state system through a world revolution.

The harshness with which the victors treated Germany, and the unwillingness to give freedom to the colonies gave considerable weight to Lenin and the Bolshevik's assertion that World War I was essentially a war among imperial powers to re-divide the world among themselves.



The Russian Revolution took place in 1917, during the final phase of World War I. It removed Russia from the war and brought about the transformation of the Russian Empire into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), replacing Russia's traditional monarchy with the world's first Communist state. The revolution happened in stages through two separate coups, one in February and one in October. The new government, led by Vladimir Lenin, could solidify its power only after three years of civil war, which ended in 1920.

Although the events of the Russian Revolution happened abruptly, the causes may be traced back nearly a century. The Russian Revolution of 1917 centers around two primary events: the February Revolution and the October Revolution.

Conditions for Revolution

First socialist revolution was made in 'backward' Russia, a society that was capitalist with strong remnants of feudal social and economic power intact, a working class still linked with land, and a peasantry that primarily aspired to individual land ownership. Essentially, it was the increasing contradictions of late and growing capitalism that created the social premises for the revolutionary outbreaks in Russia.

In Western Europe the growth of capitalism had led to the evolution of liberal-constitutionalism and parliamentary democracies. The Russian autocracy oppressed all the other nationalities of the Empire, and stood firmly against all democratic movements in Europe, earning for itself the label 'Policeman of Europe'. The nature of the Russia state, therefore, became increasingly incompatible with the new demands that the new and changing social and economic forces engendered.

Serfdom was abolished in 1861. Even as peasant agriculture became commercialized and there emerged a 'kulak' rich peasant strata, the fundamental conflict in the countryside on the

urgent questions of land, rents, wages and rights over commons remained that between the landed aristocracy, which still held the major portion of the land, and the peasantry as a whole. Expropriation of landed estates and land for the peasants was a demand that neither the Tsarist autocracy nor any other political group, except the Bolshevik, was prepared to endorse. At the same time, timing and nature of Russian industrialization also created scope for a workers movement that was both very militant and political.

Freedom from national oppression in the Tsarist Empire coincided with the victory of the socialist revolution. Apart from the alienation felt by the peoples of the Baltic region, Central Asia, Transcaucasia and other areas as a result of political and cultural discrimination, the economic backwardness that Tsarist economic policies entailed for these regions ensured that they remain predominantly agricultural with a strong stake in the land question.

The Bolsheviks supported land for the peasant as well as the right to secession and a voluntary union. The peasantry in these areas, therefore, played a crucial role in the victory of the socialist alternative to the tsarist autocracy, completely bypassing all liberal solutions to nationalist aspirations.

The Russian Revolution: In Stages

Lenin was the most important leader of the Bolshevik party. The Bolsheviks did not simply transfer Marxism to Russia. They found viable answers to their specific revolutionary problematic in Russia within the framework of Marxism. The 'hegemony of the working class' was necessary in the first bourgeois-democratic stage of the revolutionary, strategy was the 'alliance of the working class and the peasantry' in the context of a two stage revolution and the leading role of the working class, while transforming their strategy to bring them about.

The Russian Revolution may be said to have gone through three distinct stages and took almost twelve years to complete. The first stage led to the creation of a parliament, called the Duma. The second stage, known as the February revolution in 1917, led to the establishment of a Provisional Government at the centre though the rule of the tsar still prevailed. Finally, the Revolution completed its third and final stage in October 1917 when the rule of the tsar was overthrown and a peoples' republic was established.

The first major assault on the autocracy occurred in 1905, sparked off by firing on a peaceful demonstration of workers on 9 January 1905. This day came to be known as Bloody Sunday. The workers and peasants began to demand a 'democratic republic'. They also created the first soviets, grass-root, elected political organizations of workers, peasants and soldiers, which Lenin later called the 'embryos of revolutionary power' and which eventually formed the basis of the post revolutionary state, and from which the socialist state derived its name USSR.

The February Revolution of 1917 began with a demonstration of women workers over shortage of bread in Petrograd. Later, it spread to other cities and to the countryside. Strikes by all sections of society, peasant uprisings, and revolutionary action by the soldiers sealed the fate of the autocracy. The Russian autocracy was overthrown and replaced by a provisional Government dominated by the liberal bourgeoisie.

The Revolution achieved political freedom for the first time. Fundamental and civil rights were created. New post-February revolution regime could not continue for long. The peasants were disappointed that they did not get any land, and the entire working people and soldiers were disappointed that the war still continued. The Bolsheviks easily emerged as closest to the popular mood with their slogans of: Land for the peasant, immediate end to war, Workers' control over industries, Right of nationalities to self-determination, and above all Bread.

Early Changes

The early legislation aimed at destroying the legal and economic bases of capitalism and in laying the foundation for socialism. One of earliest

measures was the abolition of private resources in industry, and the establishment of workers' control. A second major intervention was in agriculture. By the Land Decree of November 1917 landlordism was abolished, and the entire land nationalized and given over to peasants for hereditary use under individual production. The land communities, the village gatherings and peasant soviets acted as autonomous organs of social and political transformation in the countryside. Within the space of a few years millions of acres of land changed hands and was divided among the peasants.

On 28 December 1917 all private banks were nationalized, and in February 1918 all shareholders in banks expropriated and all foreign debts repudiated. Within a few months of the revolution the government published all the secret treaties of the old government, and proclaimed that all treaties and agreements between Soviet Russia and other countries will be open and public.

By Decree on Peace, peace was offered without any annexations, conquests or indemnities. Govt. withdrew claims over areas; took a public stand against colonialism, and in support of all national liberation struggles.

War Communism

Then, this entire process of revolutionary change was brought to a crisis by mid-1918. The revolutionary forces were confronted by Civil war in the form of armed hostility of the forces of the former landed aristocracy and the bourgeoisie, which merged with an equally determined armed intervention by the capitalist countries to dislodge the new socialist regime. The Bolsheviks responded in Jun 1918 with a series of economic and political measures that have subsequently been designated as War Communism. Loss of economically rich resource areas during war, and the emphasis on production for war effort and machinery to broaden the production base, led to decline in production of consumer goods.

The Soviet Government responded with forced requisition of grain surplus from the peasants in order to feed the urban poor and soldiers, and state control of all enterprises in order to revive industry. Nationalization of industrial enterprises was accelerated for maximum mobilization of resources. By a March

1918 decision the railways were taken away from 'workers' control and placed under semi-military command. While the failure on the economic front led to peasant wars and urban disaffection, the growth of black market encouraged an ethos inimical to socialist ideals.

The spirit of voluntarism came under severe strain even as the 'world socialist revolution' in Europe failed to materialize. Recruitment for the Red Army became a problem. Workers' opposition to the principle of state control and the uprising of Kronstadt sailors in February 1921 was the final straw after the wide spread peasant rebellions. Lenin was forced to announce that change of policy had become necessary.

NEP

The New Economic Policy (NEP) was a response to a political and economic crisis, though at its core were economic changes that marked a change in the strategy of transition to socialism. Grain requisition was replaced by a fixed tax. In 1924 the tax in kind was replaced by a money tax, followed by legalization of private trade. On 17 May 1921 the decree nationalizing small scale industry was revoked and smaller units were actually de-nationalized, some of them being restored to their former owners.

Just as War Communism had enabled the Bolsheviks to tide over the immediate difficulties and to consolidate the Revolution, the NEP (New Economic Policy) changes made possible economic recovery in the ensuing years and also won the confidence of the majority of peasants.

However, potential for conflict again between town and country, the peasant and working class remained in a long term sense. Reason was that private sector was predominant in agriculture throughout NEP, and a lot of industry was still a state monopoly. NEP changes could not resolve the problems and social contradictions that derived not merely from the war situation or specific policies but from the larger social contradictions that arise when the revolutionary working class is called upon to build socialism in the midst of a vast peasant majority.

The early socialist state heroically experimented with guaranteeing full employment, free and equal education for all, free healthcare, equal access to culture and cultural advance, and equality for women.

Internationalism

For the Bolsheviks the Russian revolution was always inseparable from the world socialist revolution. This, together with the cardinal Marxist principle of the unity of the interests of working classes all over the world, and their socialist vision of an oppression-free world, was the basis of their internationalism. This internationalism was given shape in the form of the Socialist International.

When the social-democratic parties of Western Europe refused to oppose their own ruling classes in the interest of the working classes in Europe, as the Bolsheviks saw it, the Bolsheviks broke away from them, changed their name to communist party, and accordingly formed a new Communist International. Initially, for the Bolsheviks their revolution had to spread elsewhere, as backward Russia did not have the productive capacity to sustain advanced socialism. However, it was Russia that gave the first Socialist State.

The Communist International was envisaged as the vanguard of internationalism of revolution. As soon as the Bolsheviks proclaimed in November 1917 the right to secession as part of self determination, the Allied powers made this issue a part of their armed intervention. The Comintern, at this stage modified their right to be that of the workers and peasants in the different areas. It developed the idea of a United Front between national liberation movements and the Communist Parties in Europe and Soviet Russia.

The strategy of the communists in these areas was strongly influenced by the Comintern, where the national-liberation struggles were seen as not only against the imperialist powers and the feudal landlords in their own country, but also against the bourgeoisie in their own country. The agrarian revolution was seen as the basis of the national liberation struggles with the workers playing the leading role.

In the 1920s as the Bolshevik's struggle with their peasantry seemed muted with the NEP changes, a similar accommodation occurred in the Comintern policy towards the co-relation of social forces in the national liberation struggles. The Comintern recognized and supported the 'positive' role of the bourgeoisie in these countries against Imperialism. This policy continued well into the 1920s and Communist Parties were

formed in many Asian countries. The links with China were particularly strong, and early strategies of the communist groups in China, India, Turkey and Afghanistan were strongly influenced by Comintern policies. Communist members of these countries were also represented in Comintern.

Planning for Industrialization

Soviet economic development from 1926 to 1941 constitutes the first global attempt at comprehensive state planning and is therefore important in the history of world industrialization. Marxists like the Soviet Bolsheviks had always believed in 'planning' of the economy. Marx had argued that a socialist society would be free of the arbitrary control of market forces, or the self-interested control of the capitalist class to maximize profit. Instead socialist society would control resources directly and plan production to meet the real needs of the people.

As the dominant Soviet leader Stalin became more and more impatient with the rates of growth within the market economy of the NEP, careful planning gave way to the demands of politics. Instead of a planned economy running according to carefully formulated estimates of economically practicable targets, there appeared a 'command' economy, running according to the political orders and priorities of the government.

Stalin nursed certain obsessions that were detrimental to planning as a process of balanced and realistic economic growth. Demand to build gigantic industrial complexes on a scale beyond the available resources to construct or operate. This obsession was accompanied by an unrelenting insistence on haste, captured in the slogan, "tempos decide the whole thing." The First Plan had mixed results. Consumer goods, agriculture and, temporarily, military strength were sacrificed to a rapid growth in heavy industry.

In the decade after 1928, Soviet industry developed at a rate and on a scale entirely without precedent in world economic history. Industrial production in 1937 reached 446 per cent of the 1928 level according to official Soviet figures, and 249 per cent according to the most conservative Western estimate; the corresponding annual per cent rates of growth were 18 and 10.5.

While the state had succeeded in extending and consolidating control over the greater part of industry by nationalization, the predominance of private peasant farms meant that production and marketing decisions in agriculture remained beyond central planning and therefore state control. Lenin had argued that the government would have to gradually persuade peasants to give up their private farms and join together in collective farms. This would have to be done by providing peasants with modern equipment, credit and agronomic support. During the 1920s agronomists and land-consolidation experts occasionally succeeded in persuading the households involved in the consolidation of landholdings divided into strips to set themselves up as collective farms. But such collective farms tended to be small and few. Peasant farming methods and technology under NEP had remained extremely backward. The small size and fragmentation of farms prevented modern farming methods and the use of better implements. One third of land was not sown at any given time. Although grain production had recovered to pre-war levels by the mid-1920s, much less grain was marketed in the 1920s than before the First World War. This was partly a consequence of the increase in rural population. The problem for the state was to attract a greater share of the marketed harvest to its own collection agencies rather than to private traders.

Despite a good harvest in the autumn of 1927, peasant marketing and state procurement of grain fell far below expectation to a level that was insufficient to feed the towns and the army, and export grain in order to pay for the import of machinery. If the state had chosen to raise its procurement prices for grain, to match private market prices, funds available for industrial expansion would have suffered.

The rapid rise in industrial investment during 1927-28 was a major factor leading to the grain crisis from October 1927. Consumer goods became even more scarce (the "goods famine") as investment shifted to heavy industry; and, they cost more to buy as state procurement prices for grain remained low.

In answer to this goods famine, the peasant went on what the regime called a "production strike" by refusing to market at state-determined prices the quotas of grain set by the state. Instead, the peasants chose either to sell to private traders

at higher prices or to meet their tax obligations by selling higher priced industrial crops or livestock products.

Soviet leaders faced two alternatives. They could continue with the New Economic Policy balanced industrialization, gradual collectivization, and adjust agricultural delivery prices to induce the peasants to market more grain; this was the policy advocated by leaders like Bukharin. Or they could institute a radical new policy of accelerated collectivization and forced industrialization. Stalin opted for the second alternative.

The peasants met forced collectivization with large-scale passive resistance and sporadic armed resistance. Rather than hand over their animals, to the Kolkhoz, many peasants slaughtered them, the attack on the peasant economy was accompanied by a fierce campaign against the Orthodox Church, the centre of traditional peasant culture. In March 1930, in an article called "Dizzy with Success", Stalin blamed local officials for excesses he had authorized. He called for a temporary halt the collectivization drive resumed but with clearer guidelines this time. Tens of thousands of communists and urban workers were urgently mobilized to work in the countryside as Kolkhoz organizers and Chairmen. Villagers were steadily persuaded or coerced by discriminatory taxation to return to the collectives. By 1937, 86 per cent of sown area had been brought within the Kolkhozes and collective farms accounted for 89 per cent of the grain harvest and 87 per cent of grain procurements by the state. Collectivization, sometimes called the "Second Revolution", changed the peasant way of life more radically than did the Bolshevik Revolution. The fact that it was not carried out by peasants voluntarily, but by a largely urban and proletarian Party, and by force, meant that it was authentically a 'revolution from above'. The lynchpin of the difference between peasant life before and after collectivization was that the collective farmer had

no control over the grain and cash crops that were produced on the collectivized land. His second need was not only to defeat the opposition but to attack and root out the source of all potential opposition and criticism in the democratic traditions of party leadership. Third need, was to move from a single-party to a single-ruler state. "Trial of the Sixteen" (August 1936), "Trial of the Seventeen" (January 1937), the military chiefs, were arrested, accused of treasonable collaboration with Germany and Japan, and shot. It was known as "The Trial of the Twenty-one" (March 1938). This was only the tip of the iceberg. The Great Purge decimated between 35 and 50 per cent of the entire officer corps of the Soviet armed forces. Most estimates agree that about five per cent of the population was imprisoned during the period, making a total of some eight million persons, of whom perhaps ten per cent were killed. Three crucial aspects of the Russian economy and polity between the period 1928 and 1941: industrialization through planning, collectivization of agriculture and the purges of the 1930s. Planned industrialization meant setting targets for industrial production for a period of five years and systematically going about achieving the targets. Collectivization of agriculture stood for a transformation of plots of agricultural land under individual possession into large collectives which could be exposed to modernized farming through state initiative. Large scale opposition to Stalin's policies both within and outside the party coupled with a desire to convert Russia from a single party rule to single ruler state led to the purges of the 1930s. In these purges a number of trials took place in which old Bolsheviks, members of Lenin's politbureau, a number of army officers and many state officials were executed. Virtually anyone who did not agree with Stalin's policies was put to death. All dissent was suppressed. Whereas the victims of collectivization were invariably members of the rural population, the purges of the 1930s targeted mainly the urban population, the military and the political elites and the educated sections of the population.



Security Threats

The League of Nations was Wilson's great internationalist project for the new era. The League was to provide the foundations for order in the post-war scenario, to remake the international state system which had been successively undermined by conflicts among European powers. The league's main project was 'collective security'. But in reality, different countries in Europe perceived their security needs differently. For instance, Britain perceived Soviet Russia to be the main enemy, France saw the main threat from the neighbouring Germany.

French moved towards a policy of bilateralism and concluded a series of independent pacts with states surrounding Germany. Locarno treaties of 1925 were born out of a previous German request that France and Germany conclude a pledge of not resorting to war between each other, something which would also involve Britain and Belgium. By 1925 the British agreed to guarantee such a treaty, which would also include the Belgium-German frontier. The sum total of the Locarno treaties was as follows: Britain would guarantee the frontier of Belgium against future (German) aggression while France would do the same in the east-protecting Poland and Czechoslovakia. Germany would join the League of Nations.

The Locarno treaties were followed up by the Kellogg-Briand pact of 1928 also known as the Pact of Paris. The pact was universal in scope and the signatories renounced the use of force as an instrument of international relations. Ultimately Sixty Five States signed the treaty.

Economic Crisis

To a great degree, the 'recovery' in Europe in the years after World War I was built almost entirely on US loans. The process also ensured a constant supply of liquidity back to US lenders. To take an example, the US lent money to Germany in the 1920s for her recovery. In turn

Germany passed on money to the French and the British as part of reparation payments. The French and the British for their part re-routed money back to the US as part of repayment for war loans. The world economy was flush with money supply, most of it US-dominated. The atmosphere was ripe for speculation.

The crisis actually began over the rapid drop in agricultural prices in North America. With European recovery the world agricultural surplus began to rise, and the North American producers (who had vastly increased production during the war period) were convulsed by rapid drop in prices. Bankruptcies began in US agriculture and saw a rapid drop in expenditure. It was only a matter of time before the stock market would be affected.

The actual events began to unfold in October 1929. On 24th and 29th of October 1929, thirteen and sixteen and a half million shares were sold. In that month US investors lost 40 billion dollars, a huge sum at that time. The meltdown had begun. The crash was followed by the world-wide fall in agricultural prices. Given the fairly advanced integration of the world economy for agricultural products, millions of primary producers were affected.

This crisis had earlier been predicted by writers like Karl Marx who had spoken about the cyclical nature of capitalism: how its chaotic and unplanned character would lead to periodic crises of over-productions. In fact, the tendency towards over-production in capitalism is blamed by many writers for its cyclic nature.

However none of the previous downturns of the world economy had such serious consequences as that beginning in 1929. The downturn of 1871 was significant in that it undermined British hegemony in the world-economy, but in no way did world-wide depression occur. The only country that was relatively unaffected by the crisis was the Soviet Union.

Fascism

Fascism emerged in Europe as a synthesis of organic nationalism and anti-Marxist socialism. Organic nationalism means a belief in the harmonious collectivity of Nations superseding all other forms of human identification. Its organic nationalism accounts for its deep-rooted hostility to internationalism and organizations and movements based on internationalism such as communism, freemasonry, the League of Nations, finance capital and the multi-national Jewish community.

Fascism emerged as a radical movement based on the rejection of nations of liberalism, democracy and Marxism. The Fascist synthesis symbolized the rejection of a political culture inherited from the Enlightenment and its ideas such as rationalist materialism, individualism and pluralist autonomy.

The other major cultural variables of fascism were: activism, vitality and social-darwinism. Sorel's philosophy of action was based on intuition, energy and elan. Its activism was used to mobilize the masses. Social Darwinism believed that people in society compete for survival and only superior groups and races succeed.

The war did provide sociological and psychological conditions for the crystallization of Fascism. It revealed the capacity of nationalism in the mobilization of masses and economic resources. It further demonstrated the importance of unity of command, of authority, of moral mobilization and of propaganda in the service of the modern state. Its perfect expression being the quasi-sacred figure of the leaders like the Duce (as in Italy) or the Fuehrer (as in Germany).

A party militia was often used to reinforce the sense of nationalism and constant struggle as well as to wipe out opposition. The exaltation of youth and the specific tendency towards an authoritarian, charismatic, personal style of command (whether elective or non-elective) were other features related to this militarization of politics.

The ideas of corporatism (as a community of people, of producers free from class strife) emerged in reaction to individualism, social atomization and new centralizing states. Its two distinct forms were societal corporatism (based on autonomy to corporations) and state

corporatism. At the same time it also made use of anti-semitism and an embryonic militant group of young activists.

Another trend toward the crystallization of the fascist right was symbolized by an instrumental, modernizing radical right which combined domestic modernization with militant nationalism. It is important to understand the ideological range that is covered by the right-wing regimes. All of them are not similar, and can cover a broad spectrum starting from conservative regimes to extreme fascist ones.

Fascism in Italy

Fascism in Italy was created by the convergence of certain existing trends. The split in the radical syndicates Confederation of Trade Unions took place in 1914 over the issue of Italian participation in the war. The syndicates believed in the 'self-emancipation' of the 'producers', which could be achieved through 'regulation at factory level', and not through 'seizure of state power'. The state would be replaced at an appropriate time by worker's syndicates or associations, which would act as the instruments of self-government of the producers.

The Syndicate wing which moved towards fascism embraced extreme nationalism, and nations were described by it in class terms as proletarian or plutocratic. The futurists who rejected traditional norms and existing institutions and exalted violence, and were fascinated by speed, power, motors and machines, or all the modern technological possibilities, were another major ideological factor. Mussolini's socialistic views, and ideas on leadership, mass-mobilization and national revolution contributed yet another strand.

The growth of fascist squads led by ex-military personnel and supported by the local police and army especially in northern and central Italy—the Po Valley and Tuscany was directly linked to the actual or perceived threat of the left. The King appointed Mussolini as the Prime Minister on 29th October 1922, who temporarily observed all the constitutional norms after the assumption of power.

In February 1923, a fusion of Fascist Party and Nationalist Association of Italy (ANI) took place. This fusion with a conservative, elitist, monarchist right-wing was essential to gain

broader support among army officers, academics, civil servants and businessmen. The traditional right groups co-operated with fascists in passing the Acerbo Bill in 1923 which proposed that the party receiving a quarter of votes in an election, should be automatically given two-thirds of seats in the parliament.

Using force and fraud, Fascists swept the 1924 election. Mussolini went ahead with his institutionalization of dictatorship. In October 1926, all opposition parties were banned. The press was shackled, and the Public Safety Law (1926) made the security of state take precedence over personal liberty. The Syndical Laws (1926) brought labour under the control of state, in the interest of production. The law confirmed the fascist unions in their monopoly of negotiations, set up tribunals for compulsory arbitration and banned strikes and go-slows.

The 'Corporate State' was formally created in 1934 with 22 new combined corporations of employers and employees, Mussolini also tried to appease the church. Large grants were made for the repair of war damaged churches. In 1923, religious education was made compulsory in secondary schools.

A military type Militia developed out of the fascist squads. It was trained to use all kinds of weapons and centered around a core of professional soldiers. Its cadres were indoctrinated and used against opponents. The semi-military propaganda-type organization included Balilla, young vanguards and the young fascists.

However, unlike the Nazi German state, Fascism in Italy never achieved a day-to-day institutional control. The state intervention in the economic life of the nation was marginal in the early part of regime. The Direct state investment during the Depression was only an emergency measure. The Fascist State also introduced certain welfare schemes for workers in 1930s. e.g. family allowances were given in 1934.

The Italian state also lacked any policy of racial anti-Semitism, at least, up to 1937. In November 1938, however, under the influence of Nazis, racial laws were passed which banned marriage with Jews, denied jobs to them in public services, debarred them from joining the Fascist Party and from owning more than 50 hectares of land.

Dictatorship in Spain

The first phase of authoritarian government in Spain was established during 1923-30 by General Miguel Primo de Rivera. It emerged as a kind of military reaction to the socialist pressure for democratic reforms and above all the attempt of Spanish Parliament to fix 'responsibilities' for disastrous military campaign in Morocco. Initially the overthrow of the Spanish Cortes or parliament was intended to be a temporary step. But a dictatorship was institutionalized gradually.

The demise of Rivera's dictatorship inaugurated a new phase of mass democracy and led to the radicalization of Spanish politics along both left and right lines. CEDA or the Confederation of Spanish Right groups was the main conservative authoritarian party during 1933-36. Its youth movement (JAP) underwent a certain vertigo of fascistization but remained ambivalent.

The failure of militant nationalistic ideology in Spain stemmed partially from the influence of intense regional nationalism (or sub-nationalism) of Catalans and Basques, directed against the unified Spanish nation-state. Moreover, Spanish Civil war (1936-39) produced a polarized revolutionary-counter revolutionary conflict in which leadership passed completely in the hands of the insurgent Nationalist Army which created the Franco regime.

Fascism in Germany

The regime that took over in Germany in 1933 represented the most extreme form of fascism. Crisis of parliamentary democracy in Germany in the 1920s created conditions for the rise of fascism.

In the realm of ideology, there were strong precursors to the doctrines of the Nazi era. Racialism and imperialism were powerful themes in the aspirations of the Wilhelmine German elite, for whom the phrase Weltpolitik signified their search for great-power status and a world mission. In Vienna, the Christian Socialist mayor combined social and administrative reform with virulent scapegoating of the Jews for all social ills. The repeated attempts by the communist to bring about a soviet-like seizure of power sharpened tensions, spread fear among the middle classes and conservative elements, and contributed to an atmosphere of extreme polarization.

German Politics & Failure of Weimar Republic

The Weimar Republic underwent a crisis in 1922-23. The collapse of the monetary system resulted in hyperinflation, with one pound exchanging for 15 million marks in September 1923. In January 1923 the French army occupied the Ruhr in response of Germany's defaulting on reparations payments. There was high unemployment, far too great a dependence on foreign investment and stagnation in German agriculture. Political instability was endemic, with no single party majorities, as many as 15 ministries between 1919 and 1928.

The Weimar Republic refers to the political system that came into place in Germany after World War I and continued till the Nazi take-over in 1933. The name comes from the town of Weimar in Germany where the Republic's constitution was promulgated. The threat from revolutionary socialism, which became the Communist Party, was to be a constant feature in the Weimar period till the rise of the Nazis. Stresemann was the most important political leader in the country. He vigorously opposed the French occupation of Germany's Ruhr valley. He got the Dawes plan of 1924 for the economic reconstruction of Germany ratified in the Reichstag of Parliament. He gained German admission to the League of Nations in 1926, and also encouraged and helped stimulate German economic recovery by rationalizing German industry through a series of cartels, and an aggressive export drive.

Despite all efforts, Weimar experiment collapsed under the weight of the economic crisis after 1929. The Wall Street Crash of October 1929 had a terrible impact on Germany, with the withdrawal of American loans, loss of export markets, and collapse of industrial production. Unemployment rose to 5.6 million in 1932. A series of political intrigues in January 1933 led to an agreement to a conservative coalition to be led by Hitler as Chancellor.

There were to be only three Nazis in a twelve-member government, and the conservatives believed that they could use Hitler to suppress the left. In a series of ruthless political move Hitler proved them disastrously wrong, as he consolidated his hold on power, crushed all real and potential opposition, and created a highly centralized state.

The Enabling Act (Law for Removing the Distress of People and Reich) was passed on 23 March 1933. This became the legal basis for Hitler's dictatorship. Legislative power was transferred to the executive, politically undesirable and 'non-Aryan' civil servants dismissed. After the Reichstag fire of 27 February 1933 a state of emergency was proclaimed the following day. On 2 August 1934 Hindenburg died and Hitler assumed the office of President. Henceforth all armed forces personnel were required to swear and oath to the Fuehrer and the Chancellor.

Anton Drexler in Munich founded the German Workers Party in 1919. In 1920-21 Hitler has emerged as the leader of the party, which soon after became the German National Socialist Worker's Party (NSDAP). On 14 July 1934 the NSDAP was declared the only political party in Germany, with attempts at forming other parties punishable under criminal law. After the Enabling Act was passed, major changes were introduced which rapidly altered the juridical basis of the state.

Thus, the legal lights of the Third Reich proudly proclaimed that "Hitler is the Law", and produced theories transforming the principle of the legal state into that of the leader state, or Fuhrerstaat. The extra-legal notion of the Leader, to whom the civil service and the Army swore "unconditional obedience" by "sacred oath", assumed crucial importance in administrative functioning and signified a decisive break with constitutionalism.

The fascist bureaucracy in Germany formally submitted to the "leader-principle", that is, a single charismatic leader controlled the entire movement, the party, and the state.

Ascendency of Nazism

The new regime's attitude to women and the family was an admixture of ultra-conservative patriarchal sentiment and the racist biological characteristic of Nazi ideology. The slogan "Kinder, Kirche, Kuche" (kids, church, kitchen), became the favourite mode of referring to the social role of women. The production of "racially pure" babies became the Nazi's obsession, and various financial and ideological incentives were offered to females to give birth to more children. These incentives ranged from marriage loans and child subsidies to parents with large families,

towards such as the Honour Cross of the German Mother in bronze, silver and gold, for mothers of four, six, and eight children.

The Nazis were highly antipathetic to liberal and cosmopolitan culture. Chambers whose decisions had the validity of law were set up for every sphere of cultural life, including the fine arts, music, theatre, literature, press, radio and films. The Press was completely controlled by standing directives and oral instructions issued. All education from primary school curricula to university instruction was Nazified, Textbooks were re-written and Mein Kampf was elevated to the status of unfailing pedagogical guiding star.

Teachers were required to join the Nazi Teachers League and swear allegiance to Hitler. Jews were forbidden to teach. "Racial Science" was introduced in curricula, which required teaching the racial theories of the Aryan-German master race and the Jews as the breeders of all evil. Hitler was nominally a Catholic. However, his stance toward the churches of various denominations was hostile, and at best utilitarian.

Nazi party program spoke of the need for a "positive Christianity". Within the Protestant tradition too, there was conflict, but Nazism fed upon the anti-semitic prejudices of the Lutherans. (Martin Luther was ferociously anti-Jewish and a staunch believer in absolute obedience to authority.) On the whole however, the churches remained loyal to the regime and fulfilled its needs by ordering all pastors to swear allegiance to the Fuehrer. During the war the 30 point program for the national Reich Church of Germany outlined Nazi church policy, which included the elimination of Christian teaching, the cessation of the publication of the Bible and the placement on altars of nothing except a copy of Mein Kampf and a sword.

Genocide

The most oppressive aspect of Hitler's regime was a systematic persecution of the Jews. The

Nuremburg Laws of 15 September 1935 deprived Jew of German citizenship, confining them to "subject" status. Marital or extra-marital relations between Jews and 'Aryans' were forbidden. Three more laws over the next few years outcast them completely.

The first concentration camps came up in 1933 under the SA. After the Roehm purge of June 1934, the camps were turned over to the SS, with guard duty being assigned to the Death's Head units. Thus did the names such as Dachau, Auschwitz, and Buchenwald acquire notoriety. The actual process of extermination was begun with the so called euthanasia practiced on 70,000 mentally infirm Germans between 1938 and 1941. In late 1941 this method was applied to concentration camp victims unfit to work- camouflaged gas vans were employed to gas Jews.

Mass extermination in gas chambers began in Belzec, in Lublin district of Poland in March 1942. Jewish slave labours were also systematically machine-gunned. The largest camp was Auschwitz-Birkenau, where between 2 to 3 million Jews, along with gypsies, Poles, and Soviet prisoner of war were murdered.

Conclusion

Fascism has been interpreted in multiple ways. According to the Marxist position, Fascism is a violent, dictatorial agent of finance capital. It has been billed as a unique expression of Middle Class Radicalism or product of a cultural and moral breakdown. It was the result of Extreme Neurotic or pathological impulses.

Some theorists have tried to understand Fascism as product of the rise of amorphous masses with the breakdown of traditional identities based on kinship, church, guild and residence, etc. and a form of Bonapartism or an autonomous authoritarian government independent of specific class-domination.



The Second World War was a 'total' war, unprecedented in its destruction of military and non-military assets and people, and truly world-wide in its scope. Its outbreak in Europe in September 1939 was preceded in August 1937 by the Sino-Japanese War and succeeded in December 1941 by the entry of the US against both Japan and Germany.

The peace treaties of 1919, coupled with the Russian Revolution of 1917 and a fundamentally weak League of Nations, did not resolve the basic problems of security of Europe. Deep seated ambitions, fears, insecurities, and mistrust there were bound to clash politically and militarily in the absence of habits, institutions, and mechanisms to facilitate the peaceful resolution of conflict.

Nazi Germany in general and Adolf Hitler in particular was primarily responsible for the war and deliberately prepared for it, whether or not he intended the exact timing of its outbreak or expected its ultimate scope. Britain and France were equally responsible for the war because their leaders had appeased Hitler's ambitious demands instead of checking them, had neglected to build an anti-fascist alliance, and had encouraged an eastward expansion of Germany so as to draw the Soviet Union into war.

Germany was penalized by the 1919 peace treaties but not destroyed; it remained potentially the strongest power in Europe. Germany harboured many grievances that some people in Britain and the US considered legitimate and was the leading proponent of 'revisionism' even while it strove in the 1920s toward acceptability in world councils and democracy at home under the Weimar Constitution. That constitution could not withstand the strain of coping with economic depression. The Nazi Party had eliminated all opposition, especially of the Communists and the Socialists. Hitler led a 'resurgence' of Germany on an explicit ideology of 'Aryan' racial purity, virtue and superiority, reunification by 'self-determination' of the German race, lebensraum

or 'living space' for them, and cancellation of the 1919 peace treaties.

The US was at fault for not participating in the League, for being isolationist and ambivalent about Germany in the 1920s and 1930s, and then for encouraging Britain, France and Poland to resist without clearly warning Hitler. Poland was at fault for not forming a common front with the Soviet Union and then for not submitting 'peacefully' to German demands. Mussolini was blamed for support and encouragement of Hitler, before joining the Western allies in 1943.

The Soviet Union was responsible for propagating the idea of an 'inevitable' conflict between communism and capitalism/fascism, but most of all for entering into a non-aggression pact with Nazi Germany in August 1939 and so giving it a 'green light' for attack on Poland while simultaneously annexing several territories itself. This temporary alliance was reversed when Hitler ordered an invasion of the Soviet Union on 22 June 1941 and his armies advanced towards Moscow and other cities before being halted at Stalingrad in the winter of 1942-43.

In East Asia and the Pacific militarist Japan took on an aggressive role with all its neighbors to build on Economic Co-Prosperity Zone, antagonizing the US, another Pacific Ocean power that tried to deny Japan access to oil and other raw materials. When Japan destroyed part of the US fleet anchored at Pearl Harbour in Hawaii on 6 December 1941, and Hitler declared war on the US on 11 December 1941, the US entered a new global war against both Japan and Germany, which ended only with their 'unconditional surrender' in 1945.

Reasons of World War 2

The treaties (of Versailles, Riga, Lausanne, Locarno, etc.) simply redrew the map of Europe. Four great empires, the Russian Romanov, the Hohenzollern, the Habsburg, and the Ottoman faced defeat and collapsed. Germany became a republic, suffering from the stigma of defeat and burdened by allied reparations. The victorious

western democracies gained territories. France, for instance, gained Alsace-Lorraine which was with Germany since 1871. Discontent over the severity of the Allied peace terms and squabbles over the newly drawn frontiers contained seeds of future conflicts.

The idea of a world organization for maintaining peace in the globe was proposed by Woodrow Wilson, the American President. But it did not generate much hype as the treaty of Versailles, the cornerstone of this organization-the League of Nations-was not ratified even by America. Moreover, the defeated powers were also not invited to become members. Germany was allowed to join the League only in 1926. League sponsored Disarmament Conference in Geneva (1932-34) failed to reach any agreement. Cracks began to appear in global peace in the early 1930s. The League lacked the executive powers to impose peaceful solutions. Japanese Militarism, Italian Fascism and German Nazism became increasingly strident in their demands.

In 1931, Japanese forces seized Manchuria, a region of China rich in natural resources, and made in a puppet state called Manchukuo. Italian forces invaded Abyssinia (Ethiopia) and conquered it by May 1936. In Germany, Hitler started a program of military build-up-in violation of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. In March 1936, he notified to the western powers the existence of a German Air Force (Luftwaffe). In the same year, Germany and Italy formed an alliance, called the Rome-Berlin Axis, which was joined in 1940 by Japan.

Germany abrogated the disarmament clauses of the Treaty in December 1933 and proceeded to build an army, air force and navy machine oriented to the future that virtually overran Europe in 1940-41. Germany recovered the Saar region by plebiscite in January 1935, overturned the free city status of Danzig between 1934 and 1936, and remilitarized the Rhineland in March 1936.

Months of negotiations and increasing tension culminated in a four power conference of Britain, France, Germany and Italy in Munich on 29 September 1938 renouncing war and permitting German military occupation of most of Czechoslovakia.

In March 1938, German army moved into Austria to achieve union (Anschluss) with Germany. In 1938, Hitler sought the control of Sudetanland, a region of Western Czechoslovakia dominated by German speaking people. Britain

wished to preserve peace at all costs, by meeting Hitler's demands and following a policy of appeasement.

In September 1938, British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain and French Premier Daladier agreed to turn over the Sudeten-land to Germany and forced Czechoslovakia to accept the agreement (which became known as the Munich Agreement). The failure of appeasement soon became clear. Hitler violated the Munich Agreement in March 1939 and seized the rest of Czechoslovakia. Similar treatment was meted out to Poland later on.

In Spain in 1936, a 'popular front' of republicans, socialists, anarchists and syndicates assumed power. The army leaders and right-wing parties, socialists, anarchists and syndicates assumed power. The army leaders and right-wing parties feared the program of this front and rebelled under General Franco. The situation thus became ripe for other world military powers to show their powers. The divisions were quite apparent. The Fascist and Nazi regimes provided military support to General Franco while the Soviet Union helped the Republicans. The Republican forces also received "volunteers" from many countries though liberal democracies desisted from a direct national participation at this time.

Division Of World In Ideological Camps

In the Second World War, division of the world into two armed camps followed more or less same pattern as for the First World War. Only a few states such as Italy, Japan, Turkey, and Romania switched their sides Germany, Italy and Japan (Known as the Axis Powers) were joined by Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, Albania, Finland and Thailand. The Allied armed camp mainly consisted of Britain, France, Soviet Union, Belgium, Denmark, Turkey and the United States. But more important was the ideological camp formations.

After the World War 1, liberal democracies re-established their control over the Central European Empires, helped by reformist, compromising socialist leaders in many cases. However, using ultra-nationalist slogans, induced by economic problems, Fascist and right-wing dictatorships soon gave a stimulus to establish a powerful right-wing armed front in countries like Italy, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Poland, Spain and Japan. These dictatorships arose especially in countries that lacked traditions of democratic

institutions. The central doctrine of these variegated dictatorships was the supremacy of state as opposed to the liberal democratic ideal.

Benito Mussolini established a Fascist regime in Italy in October 1921 when dissatisfaction with parliamentary democracy was high, and the peace settlement was unpopular for having brought only limited gains. Italy's territorial ambitions in southeastern Europe were opposed by France, an uncompromising upholder of the Treaty settlement, and Italy's bid to augment its north African colonies by occupying Ethiopia in 1935 antagonized Britain as well as created a crisis in the League of Nations, which was unwilling to enforce meaningful sanctions against Italy under Article 16. Mussolini had come to admire the more efficient Adolf Hitler and signed a pact with him to create a 'Berlin-Rome Axis' in 1936. Their first collaboration was to assist militarily General Francisco Franco in overthrowing a newly formed and fragile Republic in Spain governed by a left-oriented coalition called the Popular Front.

The spectrum of politics had created three major hands in the 19th century-left, centre (liberal democratic) and right (counter-revolutionary). The War put the squeeze on ideological space (hegemonic space) available within a state. It tended to homogenize citizens, within territorially organized states, at least in their attitudes towards war and national defence and in demonizing enemy states. The left spectrum of this divide was mainly inspired by socialist ideology. Similarly liberal democratic parties represented the centrist politics of promoting industrial capitalism in their respective countries.

Britain, France, America, the main allies in both wars, had well-established liberal democratic traditions. Germany, Austria, Italy, Japan, Hungary lacked such democratic traditions. Although Japan and Italy helped the Allies in the First World War, both left them during inter-war period itself and with their dictatorial, authoritarian regimes found their natural allies (the Central Powers) during World War II.

The Russian autocracy under the Romanovs supported western democracies owing to economic compulsions as 25% of investments from abroad came from France (1914) and Russian banking, railway development and the Southern Russian Industrial Complex all depended on French capital.

During World War II, ideological compulsions again compelled Communist Soviet Union to ally itself with western liberal democracies against the danger of extreme right-wing dictatorships despite inter-war recriminations. The Ottoman Empire supported the Central Powers during World War I; however, a democratically reformed Turkey joined the Allies in the Second World War.

German Constitution of 1871 entrusted formal sovereignty to a Federal Council (Bundesrat) whose members were nominated by the executives of member-states. It also established a Reichstag or Parliament of 400 deputies elected by a direct, secret, adult male suffrage. However, there was complete lack of parliamentary responsibility in this system as the Imperial Chancellor, appointed by the emperor, and enjoying enormous powers, was not accountable to the Reichstag. The German empire, therefore, emerged as a hybrid of Prussian military hegemony and imperial federation, combining modern franchise with ancient monarchical authority. The Emperor retained control over the three pillars of absolutism in the dominant Prussian state, the army, the bureaucracy and the foreign affairs. Similarly, the Habsburg monarchy of Austria-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire were also dominated by medieval social institutions and military methods.

During the Second World War, liberal democracies of Britain, France and USA, etc. and Communist Soviet Union allied together to wipe out right-wing dictatorships. The outcome in 1945 left the two contending armed camps (Western democratic camp and Communist camp), antithetical to each other, reviling each other, but both with the same end in view, that of, global domination.

Japanese Aspirations

Japan's modernization drive since the late 19th century led it to graft what it considered the best of America, Britain, and Germany on to its own homogenous and disciplined society, to alliance with Britain in 1902, a victory against Russia in 1904, the annexation of Korea in 1910, and a self-image of being the leader of Asia. Though it received the Shantung province of China (formerly controlled by Germany) in 1919, Japan's other '21 demands' were not met at Versailles.

Japanese officials felt that they did not receive equal treatment in the Naval Disarmament

Conferences of 1922 and 1927, or in the Council of the League of Nations. Japan's assertiveness was externally expressed in expanding its commercial and industrial reach into Western markets, the Manchurian province of northern China, through Southeast Asia, and to the western Pacific basin where it rivaled the US. Internally, Japan's civilian and parliamentary government came under increasing strain, especially as economic depression deepened, and soon passed under the control of a militaristic clique of army and naval officers. Japan announced its withdrawal from the League in 1933 and joined an Anti-Comintern Pact with Germany and Italy in November 1937.

Armed Camps

The nature of modern warfare was the result of two simultaneous processes. First was the idea of 'nation in arm' or conscription in the French Revolution. This gave men equality in battle which was denied to them in actual life. This democratization of war transformed wars into mass-wars or people's war in which civilians and civil-life itself became the proper and sometimes the main target of military strategy. The other was the growth of industrial economy which provided the resources, the organizational techniques and methods of motivation needed to fight mass-wars, thus remodeling them as total wars.

The 19th and 20th centuries witnessed the transformation of war from specialized activity of a professional military group. First into the total mobilization of industrial resources to produce weapons, then into total involvement of entire industrial societies in the process of hurling concentrated mechanized forces against military or civilian targets anywhere on the globe, and finally into a scientific contest to develop weapons of mass destruction. The armament race among major powers continued, fuelled by the profit motives of the private firms such as Krupp in Germany, Vickers Armstrong in Britain, Schneider-Creusot in France, Skoda in Austria and Putiloff in Russia, collectively known as 'the merchants of death'.

Massive Mobilization Of Resources

The character of industrial mobilization changed markedly during the World War II. Instead of the mass production of a few key items, as in the First World War, the second global conflict drew on virtually every phase of industry. The new engines of war, tanks, aircrafts, radar

etc, were highly complex and delicate. It required an elaborate system of mass production of several million items according to schedules and priorities which went on shifting with new technical developments and the changing emphasis of war strategy. This could be planned only by states at a high level of economic development. When the war came, all major combatants channeled their production capacities into the manufacture of goods for sustenance of war.

During the World War II, European war economies also adopted the American system of mass-production. Standardized interchangeable parts were produced in bulk and the end product was put together on the assembly line.

In five war years, USA economy produced 300,000 military aircraft and 86,700 tanks. Germany produced 44,857 tanks and assault guns in the same period and also produced 111,767 aircraft during 1934-44. It became necessary to conscript the entire economy and civilian life to achieve these military targets.

A high level of armed mobilization, which hovered around 20% for most powers during the Second World War, and which lasted for a few years, produced a kind of social revolution in the employment of women outside the household, temporarily in the World War I and permanently in the World War II. Only Germany avoided this integration of women in the labour market for ideological reasons, as the Nazi State did not consider women worthy of employment outside their houses.

Another important aspect of war was that it was waged as a zero-sum game, i.e., as a war which could only be totally won or totally lost. Unlike the earlier wars which were fought for specific and limited objectives, world wars were waged for unlimited ends. In the Second World War, this found expression in the phrase "unconditional surrender". The USA removed all restrictions on Allied armament contracts, including those of immediate payment through the lend-lease agreements.

The new military establishments took on many of the features of great industrial enterprises; Modern business method, office organization, system of record keeping. The use of duplicating, sorting and communication equipment and all such paraphernalia for carrying on large industrial operations and emergence of a kind of corporate leadership in the management of military strategy gave military

institutions many characteristics of a large business corporation. The army officers became "the managers of violence".

In most of the belligerent countries, there was suspension of market mechanism in favour of controls and direction designed to ensure the restructuring of national economies according to the needs and priorities of war production. War was no longer a matter predominantly of purely financial costs-but assumed the form of mobilization of all economic resources.

Technological Innovations

After World War I, fully automatic weapons in the rifle weight class or the Assault Rifles were developed which combined the burst-fire capability of the sub-machineguns with the range and accuracy of the infantry rifle. The better known were German MP-44, and after World War II, the Soviet Kalashnikov and AK-47.

In World War II, anti-aircraft guns became more improved and lethal. The role of field and naval artillery declined-the tank partly relieving its field role and the tactical bomber aircraft its bombardment role. Light and mobile guns were more in demand during World War II. Some important anti-aircraft guns used during World War II were-the Bofors 40 mm gun of US and UK, Soviet M-1939, 37 mm gun and German 88 mm guns. Arrival of Tanks was countered by the development of armour-piercing ammunition.

In the World War II, heavier machineguns were used. The lighter variety of machineguns such as German MG-34/42, the Soviet Degtyarev, British Bren and US BAR fired 350-600 rounds per minute. The sub machineguns such as German MP-38/40 series, popularly known as 'burp' guns, Soviet PPD and PPsh, American Thompson and the British Sten were also used extensively.

Submarines were used on a larger scale in the World War II in the Atlantic by Germany and in the Pacific by the US. US navy's Agronaut during Inter-war period and Gato and Balao submarines during World War II played decisive role in the naval warfare.

German Zeppelins were early military aircraft used during World War I. Their use did not prove very effective. Later, military aircrafts were improved. The bombers were also improved, with Boeing Aircraft Company producing B-9 bombers in 1931-the progenitor of all modern combat aircrafts.

During the Second World War, chemical weapons were stockpiled but were not integrated into military planning. Military ineffectiveness and fear of retaliation prevented their use. During the World War II, Germany developed V1 and V2 missiles (1944-45) nicknamed in German as 'Vergeltungswaffen' (or Vengeance weapons) which became the precursors of modern ballistic missiles.

Nuclear Weapons

US entered the World War II in December 1941 and started the Manhattan Project to make atom bomb. Colonel Leslie Groves became the head of the Manhattan Engineer District. In October 1942, after reorganization, J. Robert Oppenheimer became the director of Project Y (group that actually designed the bomb). A plutonium weapon-Trinity was tested in July 1945 in South Central New Mexico. On 6 August 1945 at 8.15 am, local time, a US B-29 bomber named Enola Gay flew over Hiroshima. The untested U-235 bomb nicknamed Little Boy was air-burst 1900 feet above the city to maximize destruction.

The effects were devastating-about two-thirds of city was completely destroyed and 140,000 persons died by the end of the year (out of a population of 350,000). A second weapon, a duplicate of plutonium-239 implosion assembly which was tested as Trinity, and nicknamed Fatman was planned to be dropped at Kokura on 11 August 1945, but schedule was moved up two days to avoid bad weather, to 9 August, the US bomber, unable to sight Kokura, dropped it on the secondary target of Nagasaki.

Results of War

World War 2 involved mass destruction of physical resources, productive capacities and human resources of both the victors and vanquished. The estimated deaths in the World War II were between 3-5 times the estimated figures for the World War I. It included about 5.1 million Jews. About 20% of total population of the USSR, Poland and Yugoslavia was wiped out in the second war.

The loss of productive capacities was also enormous. About 20% pre-war capital assets of USSR 13% pre-war assets in Germany, 8% in Italy, 7% in France and 3% in Britain were destroyed during the World War II. The night of 9 November 1938, the night of broke glass (Kristallnacht in German) inaugurated the Holocaust (or the mass murder of about 5.1

million European Jews by the Nazis). On the night of 9 November 1938, a number of Jews were killed and about 20-30,000 were sent to concentration camps.

In the World War II, the number of stateless, the uprooted people in Europe were 40.5 million, excluding non-German forced labourers in Germany and Germans who fled before the advancing Soviet armies. About 13 million Germans were expelled from the parts of Germany annexed by Poland and the USSR, from Czechoslovakia and parts of South-Eastern Europe. Other major byproduct of war, partition of India and the Korean War produced 15 million and 5 million displaced persons. The Establishment of Israel-another war-effect, uprooted about 1.3 million Palestinians.

World: Post World War 2

In the decisive phase of the war the forces of liberal democracy and socialism got together to defeat and eliminate the third force, fascism. But sooner, the world was split between a Communist bloc, an anti-Communist bloc, and a small number of neutral states. In February 1945, Churchill (British Prime Minister), Roosevelt (American President) and Stalin, leader of Soviet Union met at Yalta in the Crimea. It was easy for the Allies to agree in their objective of defeating Germany and Japan. But differences of interests, opinion and ideas surfaced when the question of future opened up.

Britain and America disliked communism and feared its spread in the devastated countries of Europe. The display of Russian strength during the war also alarmed them. The allies had agreed to free elections in the East European Countries liberated by the Red Army such as Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania. But Stalin imposed communist governments of these countries. Eastern Poland was exchanged with German Silesia by Stalin, thus moving the Russian frontier further west. Britain intervened in Greece and toppled a Communist government there.

Germany was initially divided into four zones. Berlin, the capital city under Russian-controlled zone was also similarly divided. In 1948, three western zones introduced a new currency, without consulting the eastern zone, resulting in rail and road traffic blockade by Soviet Union for eight month during which the British and Americans air-lifted all supplies to Berlin. The Soviet on the one side and US, Britain

and France on other side, opposed each other in every sphere. The Eastern European countries under Soviet hegemony refused to accept American aid under the Marshall Plan, for reconstruction of their economies. The Soviet Union made the atomic bomb in 1949 and the situation of hostility further intensified which was called the Cold War. Peace remained elusive in this open ideological war.

Certain non-European forces were of great significance within European from World War 2-end to until the end of the 1980s. These were, for example, the preponderance of American influence in European affairs, the dominance of the dollar in the global financial system, and the sustained hostility between the two militarized politico-economic blocs that emerged after the war. The West European powers, especially the United Kingdom, had been financially depleted by the war and been displaced from their great power eminence; they now opted, with varying degrees of reluctance or enthusiasm, for a subordinate relationship with capital-surplus USA.

In Yugoslavia, the situation was complicated by the presence of two distinct pressure groups, the communist National Liberation Front led by Josip Broz Tito on the one hand, and on the other, the nationalist and royalist Chetniks under Draza Mihailovich. Yugoslavia was exceptional for the communists having seized power without the assistance of the Red Army; it was therefore able to join the Soviet Bloc and leave it subsequently of its own volition.

Poland had been bifurcated during the war and occupied by both Germany and the Soviet Union: The nationalist Home Army worked in co-operation with the exiled government in London. But it was decimated by the Germans after the failure of the Warsaw Uprising in 1944. In Soviet occupied Poland, the communist-led Polish Committee of National Liberation managed to seize the initiative with the help of the advancing Soviet Red army. Given the destruction of the home Army, it was able to dominate the Provisional Government of National Unity that was formed by the merger of the two rival provisional governments based in London and Soviet-held Poland.

However, not all of Europe followed this pattern. Unlike so many other cases, the resistance movements in Denmark, the Netherlands, and Norway were relatively unified. They posed little difficulty for post-War national political revival.

Of the major European countries outside the Soviet bloc, Spain, Portugal, and Greece witnessed prolonged dictatorships: it was not until the 1970s that electoral democracy was restored.

Stable multi-party coalition arrangements emerged the most significant and perhaps the most peculiar of such supra-national projects was the making of the two Germanies. "Race for Berlin" led to the partition of Germany into four zones, one under each occupying power. The initial Franco-US agenda, overriding British objections, proposed to de-industrialize Germany. But later, US shifted perspective from the relatively isolationist "America First" stance to the pursuit of an unambiguously interventionist one described as the "leadership of the Free World."

From this now flowed the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. The Truman Doctrine announced its support for "free people who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure"; and the Marshall Plan, known officially as the European Recovery Programme, set out to revive and reconstruct Europe, including West Germany. The Marshall plan was set within the framework of the new monetary and trading system based on the supremacy of the US dollar and the dismantling of trade barriers. The latter were envisaged by the Bretton Woods institutions (World Bank and International Monetary Fund or IMF) and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

The French, British, and American zones were merged in 1949 to create the Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany). However, sovereignty was granted to the Federal Republic only in 1955 after its defences were secured by a limited remilitarization and its induction into NATO. The zone of Soviet occupation, or East Germany, went through the same process of being restructured to ensure integration with the Soviet power structure. The new state was established in 1949; Berlin, the capital of undivided Germany, having been likewise divided, continued to remain the focus of hostilities, from the Blockade of 1948 to the building of the wall in 1961.

Economic Recovery Continues

The Council of Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON) was established in 1949 as a trans-continental military body, and the European Coal and Steel Community appeared in 1951 with the specific economic concerns. The European Economic Community of 1957 and the European

Community of 1957 had larger objectives that prompted apprehensions of loss of national sovereignty, notably in Britain. In response, Britain initiated in 1959 the European Free Trade Association (EFTA).

The first phase of economic recovery, from 1945 to 1947, was effected though bilaterally negotiated US loans and grants and the food aid disbursed through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency (UNRRA). These sufficed to avert the general collapse of the economy that industrial dislocation and poor harvest threatened; they were adequate even to raise industrial output to pre-war levels.

During the next phase of recovery, 1948-1951, European countries willing to participate in the US-sponsored recovery program received 13 billion dollars. This was supplemented by a 1 billion dollar loan from the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank). The largest beneficiaries of this program were Britain, France, Italy, and West Germany.

It established an international body of recipient nations, the organization for European Economic Co-operation, to which each nation submitted a national plan every four years. These aid-receiving nations were required, under the "counterpart" clause, to make available a fund of domestic currency equal to the aid received and to be spent in ways approved by the US. They had to agree to use the aid to finance food imports only from the US whether or not cheaper alternative sources were available. They had to also employ the service of US shipping and insurance for 50% of aid financed purchases, besides also ensuring preferential treatment to American oil interests.

It led on to a long economic boom that lasted until the mid-1970s. Although the deflationary policies created some employment, they also led to the economic boom. As a result the period after the 1970s witnessed a near full employment. It yielded a "new capitalism" of near full employment, high productivity, high wages, and extensive social welfare. All these combined to blunt class antagonism and to generate consensual politics.

However, the results were uneven across West Europe. Less developed countries like Ireland, Spain, and Portugal were less affected by the quantitative and qualitative transformations achieved by the more advanced

economies. However, the long boom came to an end in 1973 with the first oil shock, when oil-producing countries unilaterally and dramatically raised the prices of oil. European economies suffered inflationary pressures, output decelerated, and unemployment rose. They immediately led to restrictive policies within the parameters of the existing system of economic management, and more gradually, to a change of economic perspective.

From the late 1970s, in country after country, the social democratic consensus broke down. New political program proposed to restrict social welfare to the minimum necessary. They repudiated government intervention and demand management. All these led to the privatization of nationalized industries, extensive deregulation, and the adoption of monetarist and supply side policies.

The idea of the "social democratic consensus" itself is valid only in post-war terms. It was based on a substantial and pragmatic dilution of the pre-war program of social democracy to accommodate fundamental tenets of conservatism (the sanctity of private property) and of liberalism (the limited state). Social Democracy thus conceded the possibility of the gradualist reform of capitalism.

This consensus allowed stable coalitions of right-centre and left-centre groupings: occasionally, in the immediate aftermath of bitter electoral conflict, even "grand coalitions" of the left and the right were possible. Except for Britain in West Europe, the predominant tendency was towards the formation of coalition governments even where the electoral system was not based on proportional representation.

Economic Recovery in Soviet Block

In the Soviet bloc, reconstruction was hindered by the relatively lower capacity of the leading power, the Soviet Union. External capital

was in short supply, except on terms that were unacceptable to the Soviet system. Capital for the industrialization program therefore had to be internally generated. In the newly Soviet countries, nationalization permitted rapid expansion in heavy industrial capacity. Radical agrarian programs of farm collectivization and nationalization on the Soviet model soon plunged the agricultural sector into turmoil and led to food shortages.

East Europe was thus preoccupied with the problem of adjusting to a new system of production and stagnation in the very sectors whose boom was the basis of West European prosperity. The plan-driven economies of the eastern bloc, with the exception of the USSR, began with a very low industrial base. Since investment priorities were largely determined by the state, national plans focused excessively on developing heavy industry. The resulting imbalance led to chronic shortages of consumer goods.

In the initial stages, trade and economic relations were confined to the region, that is, the eastern bloc. However, the shortage of capital and of agricultural products, especially wheat, led to a parallel dependence on western countries. Poland and Romania borrowed extensively from the West in the 1970s to finance their industrialization programs; By the early 1970s, the USSR was compelled to import grain from the USA.

Imports of food grain and light industrial from the hard currency areas (West), without corresponding exports resulted in a combined balance of payments deficit of 10 billion dollars by 1975. These were financed by borrowings from western banks. Imports were cut back and the deficit was eliminated; but, by 1982, East bloc debts stood at 81 billion dollars and its debt service ratio stood at 100 percent, that is it was borrowing money solely in order to pay back debts. Soviet export earnings deteriorated with the collapse of world oil prices in the mid 1980s.

