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Achievement Objective

At the end of this unit you will be able to demonstrate your knowledge and understanding of the causes and effects of migration as a result of major conflicts.

Focusing Questions

For a case study nation such as Germany:

- How did World War I (1914–1918) and World War II (1939–1945) affect migration?
- What can we learn about the causes and effects of migration during the Cold War?
- What can be learned about the socio-economic and political conditions that led to the movements of people in (i) and (ii)?
- How did migration affect Germany’s development and stability as a nation?

There are a number of very important concepts that you will be ‘meeting’ in this chapter, perhaps for the first time. Be alert to the following key concepts in the text – look out for them! Your teacher will help you and your classmates to develop your understanding of these concepts. Remember – key concepts are important ideas that are specific to the study of history.
Introduction

Migration is when people move from one place to another to live. People often migrate because of political, economic and social changes going on at the time at the local, national and even global level. In this part of the textbook, we will look at how political and economic changes that resulted from global war and conflict affected migration for a very important European nation – Germany.

In the Year 12 History textbook, there are two approaches to the study of migration:

i the push/pull model of migration,

ii the structures approach to global labour migration.

The Push/Pull Model Of Migration

The Push/Pull Model of Migration

Activity 1

Revise the Push/Pull Model of Migration in groups of 2–3 students. Your teacher may suggest a question-based learning activity for you to use.

Global Labour Migration

A global labour migrant is someone who leaves his or her country to work in another country. Many such migrants are willing not only to travel long distances from home, but are also willing to travel to countries where the culture, language and economy are completely different from their own. Labour migrants want to earn money – and often they want to earn this money to support their families at home.

Figure 1.0.1 The Push/Pull model of Migration

Figure 1.0.2 Periphery and core
Labour migration is when people move from areas where there are poor job opportunities (geographers describe such areas as 'periphery' areas) to areas where there is good employment (geographers describe such areas as ‘core’). The terms ‘core’ and ‘periphery’ describe countries or groups of countries that have these different characteristics. However, labour migration affects both the periphery and cores areas, as these diagrams show.

**Figure 1.0.3 The downward spiral of the periphery**

**Figure 1.0.4 The cumulative causation model shows how a new economic activity (new industry) is a catalyst for growth**

Labour migration is affected and influenced by political and economic conditions in countries. When such conditions change, the type and volume of labour migration changes. Before World War II most labour migrants were European people, who moved within colonial empires (e.g. people within the British empire who migrated from Britain to Australia, Canada, New Zealand and South Africa), or between them, or who moved from Europe (e.g. from Poland, Russia, Germany, Scandinavia and Italy) to the United States. Most of the people who made such labour movements were highly skilled. Since World War II, however, this overall situation has changed. The general changes have been:

- the movement of labour from developing countries to developed countries
- in the 1950s and 1960s, the global labour migration was dominated by the movement of semi-skilled or unskilled labour
- the current trend in global labour migration of highly skilled labour – particularly in the information technology areas.
Europe – a Core Region?

Europe is made up of individual nations. The area to the west is often referred to as ‘Western Europe’ and that to the east as ‘Eastern Europe’. The countries of Western Europe are generally wealthier and can be described as ‘core’ countries. But as a core area, Western Europe is surrounded by countries that have weaker economies, and are not wealthy. These are periphery areas, which border the core countries.

---

Europe is a collection of self-governing nations. Before World War II (1939–45) each nation operated as an individual entity with its own internal and external policies. Some, like Britain, were important on the world scene because they controlled large global empires.

These nations had dominated world affairs for many centuries but the 1939–45 war, which was fought in Europe, Asia and the South Pacific, changed that. The costs of reconstruction were enormous and colonies took advantage of the situation to demand independence. European trading empires disintegrated and new global superpowers emerged – Russia, the United States and Japan. The small countries of Europe felt they had to work together in the second half of the twentieth century and three trading blocs developed.

1. The countries of East Europe grouped together in a communist bloc, Comecon (Council for Mutual Economic Assistance), under Russian control. This lasted until the break up of the USSR in the late 1980s.

2. The democratic countries of West Europe developed:
   - the European Free Trade Association (EFTA)
   - the Common Market (or EEC – European Economic Community). This developed into the European Union (EU).

The EU, which has grown at the expense of EFTA, has become a very prosperous, politically stable and influential area of the world.

The post-war political groupings listed above have had a big impact on migration in Europe.

- The Russians erected physical barriers (the Berlin Wall and minefields and armed border police) to stop people moving to and from the communist bloc. These effectively stopped east–west migration for 30 years between 1960 and 1990, until the Soviet Union collapsed and its satellite countries in Eastern Europe became independent.

- Barriers to migration between member countries of the EU have been removed.

- Restrictions have been placed on entry of people from outside the European blocs.

Figure 1.0.5 Map of migration

Figure 1.0.6 Core and periphery areas in Europe
Germany: A Case Study
‘Core’ Country In Western Europe

We will study the migration history of Germany. This makes a good case study because:

- the German government keeps very good statistics about its population
- political changes to Germany’s boundaries over time mean that large numbers of German people who lived in what once was part of Germany now live outside of Germany in neighbouring countries (e.g. parts of Eastern Germany now returned to Poland)
- these boundary changes have been affected by the outcomes of World War I and II
- Germany has had very high levels of immigration since the end of World War II
- Germany is the main destination in Europe for asylum seekers (people who claim to be fleeing persecution and discrimination in their own countries and need a safe, secure country to live in) – many became asylum seekers in the 70s, 80s, even 90s because of the Cold War
- Germany has accepted most of the migrants from Eastern Europe since 1988
- immigration has had a very important impact on Germany’s economic development, its society as well as its politics.

Activity 2

Work in pairs to ask one another questions using the following question grid. The answers are in the timeline opposite. Study it carefully.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What was the Berlin Wall? What was the ‘Iron Curtain’?</th>
<th>What is Prussia? What role did it have in the creation of the Republic of Germany?</th>
<th>Name the capital cities of the former GDR and FRG.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What was another name for the Federal Republic of Germany?</td>
<td>Name two factors that contributed to the growth of the economy of FRG after World War II.</td>
<td>What was the Treaty of Versailles and what effect did it have on Germany’s boundaries?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When was the border between the two Germany’s closed?</td>
<td>Which country took control of Germany to the east when World War II ended?</td>
<td>What was another name for Eastern Germany?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did You Know?

**1871**: The German Empire is formed. Several small self-governing states unite under the leadership of Prussia.

**1914**: Germany declares war against its near neighbours – and loses. Under the Treaty of Versailles, Germany loses territory (post 1914): Nazi Party wins power in Germany and governs 1930s, 1940s: German armies invade neighbours.

**1945**: Germany defeated – Russian armies take control from the east, French, British and American armies take control from the west.

- Boundary between communist East and democratic West formed
- Two new countries formed: Eastern German = German Democratic Republic (GDR or East Germany; Soviet controlled); and Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany, or FRG).
- Capital city of FRG = Bonn; capital of GDR = East Berlin.
- Some parts of the German Republic were lost to Poland and to the Soviet Union.

Post World War II: The two Germanys develop two very different economies.

GDR experiences economic decline – farmlands and factories pass under state control; infrastructure deteriorates; living standards low.

FRG experiences the benefits of post-war American investment. Massive rebuilding programme. Migrant workers brought in to rebuild towns, factories, and infrastructure.

**1961**: Border between the two Germanys was closed. Migration between the two Germanys banned ('Iron Curtain', Berlin Wall).

**1989**: Economy of GDR in ruins.

**1990**: Economy of FRG one of the strongest in the world.

**1990**: Reunification of East and West Germany ratified. Berlin becomes the capital of the reunited Germany.
How did World War I (1914–1918) and World War II (1939–1945) affect migration?¹

¹Adapted from: ‘Germany: Immigration in Transition’ by Veysel Oezcan, Humboldt University Berlin May 2002, Used with permission.

In the nineteenth century, Germany was a country of emigration. More people migrated out of Germany than migrated in. This changed a little at the beginning of the twentieth century, when larger numbers of workers from Poland came into Germany to work as miners.

**Germany 1918–1945**

Germany, as a nation, was very weak after World War I. The army was defeated, the economy was in ruins and there was great political uncertainty, as different groups tried to win political power. The Weimar Republic was set up after World War I in Germany as a new system of government, but as you have learned already in your studies of History, it faced many problems. You will be familiar with the economic turmoil that developed in Germany in the 1920s and into the early 1930s, and the serious effects this had on the economy and on political stability. The hardships that German people experienced made it easy for extremist political parties such as the Nazis to gain more and more support. In 1933, the Nazi leader Adolf Hitler became the chancellor of Germany and went to work to restore Germany’s greatness. Under Nazi rule, the economy improved and stability was restored. Later, through warfare, Hitler regained many of the territories that Germany had lost at the Treaty of Versailles and took over many territories that had never before been part of Germany. This seemed to meet the needs of many desperate German people – for employment, for food and housing and overall economic security; the need to regain a sense of national identity and pride as Germans; and the need for certainty in terms of governance.

But the successes were to come at a price. Hitler established a totalitarian form of government which limited personal freedom and gave very serious consequences to those who voiced opposition to it. The government under Hitler also enforced its views on the supremacy of the Aryan race – with terrible consequences for Slavic people, gypsies and Jews.
Movement Of People During The Nazi Regime

It is not very easy to judge how great the opposition was to the Nazi regime between 1933–1945 because officially the Nazis said there was no opposition. The Nazis made sure that opposition to their rule was very dangerous, and even life threatening. In other words, if people opposed the Nazi government, they risked their lives.

Voluntary Movement

The voluntary emigration of members of certain cultural, social and ethnic groups during this period of time can be seen as a signal of such opposition (as well as movement to seek safety and protection). For example:

- Opposition from artists and authors was common but their opposition tended to focus on the restrictions that the Nazi government placed on artistic freedom. Some chose to either suffer in silence or to leave Germany. One famous emigrant was Albert Einstein, the scientist.

- Even before Hitler came to power, he had set out his racial views very clearly. He told those who would listen that the Jews were an inferior race and that they had worked with the communists to try and ensure that Germany would lose World War I. He also persuaded people that the Jewish people in Germany were trying to ruin the German economy. Nazi propaganda continually reinforced this message and it came to be accepted by more and more German people. Once Hitler gained power, he acted on his views very quickly. The persecution of the Jews by the Nazi government began. For example:
  - 1 April 1933 a boycott of Jewish shops began throughout Germany. In some places, Storm troopers stood outside Jewish-owned shops and stopped people from going inside and would murder, beat up and publicly humiliate Jews
  - in 1933, Jews were banned from having jobs in the public sector or government, as well as in medicine, teaching and journalism
  - in 1935, Jews were banned from public places such as swimming pools, restaurants, movie theatres etc.
  - in 1935, the Nuremberg Laws were passed to take German citizenship away from Jews and outlawed marriages and relationships between Jews and non-Jews
  - hundreds of Jews were arrested and sent to concentration camps.

Not surprisingly, many Jews tried to emigrate from Germany. In the 1930s, half the German Jewish population left the country. Many others could not afford to leave because the Nazis took their money, or they found that some countries outside Germany did not welcome Jewish refugees. Others found that other countries would take only a limited number of Jewish refugees. Still others did not want to leave their homeland and hoped that things would get better, so they stayed. But things did not get better.
Involuntary, Forced Movement

Some of the people who opposed the Nazi regime were punished by being sent to labour camps. For example:

- At first the Nazis tried to maintain good relationships with the churches as many Germans were committed church-going Christians, and opposing the churches might lessen their support for the Nazi party and government. At first, the churches seemed very positive about working together with the Nazis. In 1933, the Catholic Church and the Nazis signed an agreement called the Concordat. The Church agreed not to make comments on political matters if the Nazis did not interfere with religion or Catholic property and schools in Germany. But Hitler failed to keep this agreement, and interfered more in church matters. In 1937 the Pope denounced Nazism, and called it anti-Christian. In 1941, a letter from the Pope was read out in churches – it criticised the human rights abuses of the Nazis. Hitler responded by sending nuns and priests to labour camps. Similarly some Protestant churches agreed not to criticise Hitler and the Nazis, but others who called themselves ‘the Confessing Church’ realised that Hitler and Nazism were unjust and spoke out and were sent to prison or executed.

- The Nazis made use of concentration camps. These were labour camps where ‘enemies of the state’ could be sent. Discipline was harsh, and food very poor. Not many people survived their time at these camps. At first, most prisoners were communists or trade union leaders. Later, people who were classified as ‘undesirable’ were sent to the camps. These were: people from Eastern Europe; Jews; homosexuals; and religious fundamentalists like Jehovah’s Witnesses.

- In January 1942 at the Wannsee Conference in Berlin, a ‘Final Solution’ to the ‘Jewish Problem’ was found. All the Jewish people of Europe were to be rounded up and sent to extermination camps where they would be put to death. In the summer of 1942, six concentration camps were converted into extermination camps. Over the next three years, almost six million Jews were killed in these camps. This was to be called the Holocaust.

- Migration into Germany became very important during World War II – millions of people were brought in to Nazi Germany’s occupied territories, and were forced to work, often as slave labour, in the German heavy manufacturing sector during World War II. This sector produced military equipment as well as weapons needed in Germany’s war effort.
Post World War II Immigration

Germany’s post-World War II immigration history has two very important overall patterns:

i ethnic Germans returning from other countries, and

ii the flow or movement of foreigners with no German ancestry.

Ethnic German Immigration

Let us first look at the immigration history of ethnic Germans to Germany.

Between 1945 and 1949, nearly 12 million German refugees and expellees (people who had moved into countries Hitler had conquered and which had been freed from the Nazis) moved in large numbers to the territory of today’s Germany. They were either German nationals who had lived in areas that in the past had been a part of Germany but, due to boundary changes, became part of other countries; or, they were ethnic Germans from other parts of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Yugoslavia. Some Germans had gone as skilled migrants to other countries in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (e.g. to Russia, Bulgaria and Romania) and had formed German-speaking communities there.

The name for the ethnic Germans is Aussiedler (people who have moved). About two-thirds of these returning migrants settled in the western part of Germany. Their ability to settle easily in their new homeland was helped by their ethnic origin (being German and speaking the German language) and the post-war economic boom.

Between 1945 and the construction of the Berlin Wall in 1961, 3.8 million Germans moved from East Germany (the German Democratic Republic, or GDR) to West Germany (the Federal Republic of Germany, or FRG). In fact, even after it was finished, the Berlin Wall did not completely stop this flow of migrants and some lost their lives trying to escape to the West past armed border guards.

Post-War ‘Guest Worker’ Boom

Inflows of immigrants with non-German or foreign ancestry began in a serious way in the second half of the 1950s. Germany needed labour for its post-war reconstruction efforts – people to work in the factories and industries. There was a labour shortage, particularly of semi-skilled or unskilled labour. Germany signed a series of bilateral recruitment agreements – these were agreements with the governments of different countries to help people who wanted to come and work in Germany. The first agreement was signed with Italy in 1955, then with Spain (1960), Greece (1960), Turkey (1961), Portugal (1964), and Yugoslavia (1968).

At the very centre of these recruitment agreements was the inclusion of Gastarbeiter (guest workers) into the industrial sector, for jobs that required few qualifications. An important feature of these agreements was the so-called ‘rotation principle’. This principle stated that the mostly male migrants who entered Germany to work would be allowed to do so for one to two years. After two years they had to return to their home country to make room for other guest workers. There were two reasons for this policy, to:

i prevent guest workers from permanently settling in Germany, and

ii help as many workers as possible from poorer countries to get experience in industrial work.
At the end of World War II the countries that defeated Germany insisted that some of its reparation would be to help poorer countries. West Germany realised that this would help it rebuild.

In 1960, the number of foreigners already stood at 686,000, or 1.2 percent of the total German population. At that point, the most important country of origin was Italy.

**Activity 1**

What can we learn about the socio-economic and political conditions that led to the movements of people into and out of Germany after World War I? What about after World War II? How did migration affect Germany’s development and stability as a nation after World War I and II?

1. **a** Write sentences to describe the socio-economic conditions and the political conditions in Germany between World War I and World War II. Key words and phrases include:

   - High Inflation
   - Humiliation
   - Insecurity
   - Unemployment
   - Anxiety
   - Oppression
   - Distrust
   - Instability

   **b** Write sentences to explain what you described in the previous question. Key words and phrases include:

   - Great Depression
   - Extremist Parties
   - Aryan Race
   - Reparations
   - Economy
   - Totalitarian Government
   - Weimar Republic
   - War

2. Write an essay on the following topic:

   Describe the types of population movement that occurred in Germany from World War I through to World War II. Explain how these movements were affected by the social and political conditions of the times.

3. Answer these questions in your workbooks.

   **a** Who and what is an Aussiedler? Why did Aussiedlers migrate to Germany in large numbers at the end of World War II?

   Construct a simple push/pull model of migration to describe and explain the movement of Aussiedlers to Germany in the early post-war (World War II) years.

   **b** Who and what are Gastarbeiteirs? Why and how did Gastarbeiteirs migrate to Germany in large numbers in the early post war (World War II) years?

   Construct a simple push/pull model of migration to describe and explain the movement of Gastarbeiteirs to Germany in the 1950s and 1960s.

4. Write an essay on the following topic:

   Describe the main types of population movement that occurred in Germany after World War II. Explain how these movements were affected by the social and political conditions of the times.
Think carefully about this two-part question:
What were the effects of migration on Germany’s development and stability as a nation after:

i World War I?

ii World War II?

Here are some secondary questions to help you when you are thinking about an answer to (i). You must give reasons for each of your answers.

❑ Was there much migration and movement of people in Germany after World War I?
❑ What types of movement occurred during this inter-war period? What were the main reasons why people moved?
❑ Did the movement of people at this time contribute to the economic and social development of Germany as a nation?
❑ Did these movements of people help develop national stability?

Here are some secondary questions to help you think about an answer to (ii). You must give reasons for each of your answers.

❑ What type of movement affected Germany after World War II? What were the main reasons why people moved?
❑ How many people migrated to Germany during World War II and in the early years after World War II?
❑ Where did the migrants come from? Did their movement have an impact on the economic development of Germany at the time? Did these movements help Germany’s national stability?
Migration During The Cold War

What can we learn about the causes and effects of migration during the Cold War (1945–1990s)?

2Adapted from: ‘Germany: Immigration in Transition’ by Veysel Oezcan, Humboldt University Berlin May 2002, Used with permission.

Ethnic German Immigration

Migration from the GDR to the FRG totalled nearly 400,000 between 1961 and 1988. This immigration was actually welcomed because the FRG’s expanding and growing industries needed workers. This flow of migrants to the FRG was also welcomed politically because it was seen as a rejection of the GDR’s communist political and economic system.

At the end of the 1980s, the immigration of Aussiedler (or ethnic Germans) from places beyond Eastern Europe rose dramatically. Until then all Aussiedler had come from Eastern Europe, where they had managed to stay despite efforts to expel them in the aftermath of the Second World War. Between 1950 and 1987, about 1.4 million such Aussiedler immigrated to West Germany. Most of them came from Poland (848,000), while another 206,000 arrived from Romania, and 110,000 emigrated from the Soviet Union following difficulties between Germany and the USSR in the late 1970s and 1980s.

Reunification

With the fall of the Iron Curtain, and the end of travel restrictions from the former Eastern Bloc countries, an additional 2.7 million ethnic Germans returned to Germany between 1988 and 2000. Almost 1.9 million of these arrived from the former territory of the Soviet Union, with Poland (575,000) and Romania (220,000) providing the remaining flows.

The number of these arrivals reached 400,000 in 1990. However, by the early 1990s, after the initial excitement and happiness of the end of the Cold War and German reunification, the government began to take steps to manage and control the return of ethnic Germans. Some of the steps the German government took were to:

- give aid to ethnic German communities in Russia so as to improve their living standards and to persuade them to remain there
- establish a quota system – a system of controlling how many ethnic German migrants could enter and settle in Germany each year. From 1993 to 1999 the quota was set at 225,000 people per year. This was subsequently...
reduced to 103 000. As a result, in 2000 and 2001, the immigration of ethnic Germans was approximately 100 000 per year.

Besides affecting numbers of ethnic German migrants, the government’s steps also affected the population in the countries of origin. Since 1993, more than 90 percent of the total Aussiedler immigration has come from the territory of the former Soviet Union. The remaining Aussiedler came from other Eastern European countries. However, Aussiedler have had to prove to the German government that they face discrimination because of their German origin in the countries that they are living in. (Because of what Hitler did to them, some people in Eastern European countries were anti-German and did discriminate against ethnic Germans who had lived for several generations in their country.) If this can be proved, the German government is more likely to give permission for them to immigrate to their ancestral homeland.

When they arrive in Germany, Aussiedler have certain privileges that other immigrants to Germany do not have. These privileges are supposed to help them to integrate into German society and into the labour market. These privileges include help with language training, employment, and welfare. Despite the extra support, Aussiedler (especially those who came during the 1990s) continue to face serious economic and social integration problems. Many are poorer and unskilled. Some don’t have a very good knowledge of the German language. Others have more of the culture of the country they come from (e.g. are more Russian than German).

Yet Aussiedler are seen or considered as Germans and not as foreigners, when they migrate to Germany.

Post-War ‘Guest Worker’ Boom

After the construction of the Berlin Wall in 1961 and thus the reduction of the number of German migrants from the GDR, West Germany increased its recruitment of guest workers. Up until 1973, when recruitment stopped, the number of foreigners increased in terms of both numbers and their share of the labour force.

At the same time, the dominant source countries also changed. The number of foreigners now amounted to 4 million, and their share of the population reached 6.7 percent of Germany’s total population. Some 2.6 million foreigners were employed – a level which has not been seen since then. By 1973, the most important country of origin was no longer Italy, but rather Turkey, which accounted for 23 percent of all foreigners. One reason for the change has been because Italy’s economy improved and far fewer Italians wanted to find better jobs in Germany. Other countries of origin included Yugoslavia (17 percent), Italy (16 percent), Greece (10 percent), and Spain (7 percent).

Halting Guest Worker Recruitment

The demand for foreign workers declined in 1973, when Germany suffered economic recession that was partly caused by the oil crisis of that year (the oil crisis was a world wide economic event). In the recession, unemployment rose, as jobs were lost due to factories closing down. The German government decided to ban foreign workers. The country no longer wanted semi-skilled workers – because jobs had decreased, and many German citizens were unemployed.

The German government then had to decide what to do with all the foreign workers who were already living in Germany. It was not that simple – many foreign or guest workers living in Germany had already applied for and received residence permits – permits that allowed them to stay for a longer period of time (more than the 1–2 years in the recruitment agreements). Some guest workers had successfully
applied for and received permanent residency. In addition, Italians now had the right to freely cross the border because it was a right that all member states of the European Community were given in 1968. The German government now realised that many foreigners now planned to stay longer or even permanently.

Many guest workers did leave, however, but despite the ban on more guest workers, there were still high levels of immigration because of family reunification of the guest workers already there. Guest workers, who were staying and staying longer, used the German immigration laws to become reunited with close family members. Thus throughout the 1990s the number of foreigners stayed more or less constant at between 4 and 4.5 million. However, the labour force participation of immigrants decreased.

In 1988, the 4.5 million foreigners in Germany were 7.3 percent of the whole population. Some 1.6 million of them were wage and salary earners; another 140 000 were self-employed. The most important countries of origin remained the former recruitment countries. Greece held special status for freedom of movement because it was a full member in the European Community – a status that Spain and Portugal would achieve in 1992.

By this time, a large number of the foreign population was being born in Germany, the so-called second generation. Unlike in the United States and elsewhere, these children were not granted German citizenship at birth and along with their parents were treated as foreigners under the law.

**Asylum Seekers And ‘Safe Countries’**

By the end of the 1980s, Aussiedler were not the only immigrants whose numbers had increased. Numerous crises within the European continent meant there were more people who wanted asylum in Germany. Whereas in 1987, 57 400 people applied for asylum, between 1988 and 1992 a total of 1.1 million people applied for asylum. The peak was reached in 1992, when nearly 440 000 asylum seekers filed applications.

This growth in population due to immigration happened at the same time as some Germans had racist reactions to non-German immigrants. There were some very tragic and violent encounters against foreigners and asylum seekers. This situation resulted in many heated political debates in parliament.

For example, the Christian Democrat party (who were the senior partners in the ruling coalition at the time) wanted to reduce the number of people applying for asylum. The opposition party (the Social Democrats) and many members of the Free Democrats party (the ruling coalition’s junior partner) argued for broader and more ‘progressive’ measures for immigration, integration, and citizenship. The final outcome was an inter-party agreement in 1993 to make the asylum law more restrictive.

One of the main provisions of this new agreement was a system where Germany classified specific nations or countries as ‘safe’. If these were the countries of origin for the asylum seekers, then Germany would not allow would-be asylum seekers from or through one of these safe countries to apply for asylum and would return them to their place of origin/transit. This change spread throughout the European Union and had a dramatic effect on asylum applications. In the following years, the number of asylum seekers declined steadily.

In 2000, asylum applications totalled 78 564. The countries of origin accounting for the largest numbers of applications were Iraq (11 601), Yugoslavia (11 121),
Turkey (8968), and Afghanistan (5330). In addition to the asylum seekers, Germany offered protection to 345 000 refugees from Bosnia–Herzegovina in the early to mid-1990s. However, this was temporary only and by the end of 2000 more than 90 percent of them had returned home.

The Re-emergence Of Temporary Labour Programs

Soon after the fall of the Iron Curtain, Germany once again entered the temporary labour market. This time, the geographic focus was only on countries from central and Eastern Europe, among them Yugoslavia (1988), Hungary (1989), and Poland (1990). These countries were chosen because:

i the German government hoped to use the migration potential in Eastern Europe and Germany needed workers again

ii Germany wanted to support the long-term foreign and economic policy objectives in the region, which would also be good for Germany’s trade. The German government hoped that the remittances and work experiences of the returning workers (back to Poland, Yugoslavia and Hungary) would help to strengthen the weaker economies in these nations.

Guest workers in several categories, such as trainees, contract, and seasonal work, received temporary residence. Work permits ranged from three months for seasonal workers to a maximum of two years for contract workers. Contract workers generally came to work on a larger project, which a firm in Germany recruited them for, e.g. construction projects. In 2000, a total of 50 000 temporary work permits were granted, more than 90 percent of them for contract workers. Another 238 000 permits were issued for seasonal workers.

Today’s Immigrants

By 2000, the number of foreigners legally living in Germany was 7.3 million. This was 8.9 percent of the total population. Citizens of the former guest worker countries continued to make up the largest share of this number, which notably included 2 million Turkish citizens, of whom 750 000 were born in Germany. Another 425 000 Turks have been naturalised since 1972 and do not show up in the statistics of the foreign population.

The foreign population also included 1 050 000 people from the former Yugoslavia; 590 000 Italians and 360 000 Greeks. Other important countries of origin included Poland (277 000), Austria (184 000), and the United States (183 000). About 25 percent of the total foreign population was from countries of the European Union, and an additional 55 percent came from other Western and Eastern European countries like Norway, Switzerland, Russia, Ukraine and Hungary. Overall, 80 percent of the foreigners came from Europe, while almost 12 percent were Asians.

Since the asylum law was tightened in 1993, illegal immigration has been growing. However, there are no reliable estimates on the number of illegal migrants staying in Germany.

In 2000, there were almost 1.1 million refugees in the legal foreign population of 7.3 million. This included 294 000 recognized asylum seekers and their family members, along with another 200 000 refugees whose applications for asylum were still being processed. There were also 370 000 de facto refugees.
De facto refugees are those people who have taken this status on but have not applied for asylum. They have protected status but this is only temporary. De facto refugees are also those whose application to the German government has not been accepted but who cannot be returned to their home countries for a variety of reasons and therefore received a temporary residence permit. Another 137,000 of the 1.1 million refugees are Jews from the former Soviet Union who have come to Germany since reunification. This last group is not required to prove that they, as individuals, have been persecuted in order to immigrate to Germany.

**Key Policy Developments**

Since 1998, when a coalition of the Social Democrat Party and the Green Party came into power, several immigration-related Bills have become law.

- In 2000, Germany passed a new citizenship law. It was the first such law in nearly 90 years. For the very first time, children born to foreigners in Germany automatically receive German citizenship – if one parent has been a legal resident for at least eight years. Children can also hold the nationality of their parents, but must decide to be citizens of one country or the other before age 23. Germany does not accept dual citizenship. It grants dual citizenship only in exceptional cases, e.g. temporarily or if the applicant’s country of origin does not easily release the migrant from his/her original citizenship. In 2001 the first German citizen of non-German parents, a man of Turkish origin, was voted into the federal Parliament.

- In August 2000, Germany introduced a ‘green card’ system to help satisfy the demand for highly qualified information technology (computer) experts. This green card allows residency up to a maximum of five years. About 9200 highly skilled workers have entered Germany up to August 2001, with 1935 Indians accounting for the largest group. Another 1293 persons who completed their university studies in Germany were allowed to stay and work for five years under the provisions of the green card scheme. Without the green card, they would have had to leave.

**Looking Ahead**

Despite Germany’s long history of recruiting foreign workers, the current trend in Germany is towards a more organised and focused recruitment of highly skilled labour. This is a big change. Such a change, together with Germany’s demographic shift toward a more elderly population and a continuing low total fertility rate (now at 1.3) has led to a discussion about developing a newer, formal immigration policy that takes these factors into account.

Supporters of such new legislation say declining population (low birthrate) and the growing shortages of qualified personnel make this necessary. Opponents to such policies argue that Germany still has a persistently high unemployment rate. In 2000 the unemployment rate stood at 9 percent for the total working population, but was higher (16 percent) for foreigners. Opponents also say German society can’t integrate more foreigners. Both groups, nevertheless, agreed on the need to improve the integration of foreigners – especially those from former recruitment countries.

In 2000, the German government set up a commission to work out ideas for an immigration and integration policy. In July 2001, the commission presented a report titled ‘Structuring Immigration, Fostering Integration’. This report highlighted well-known demographic developments, such as increasing life expectancy, low birth
rates and decreasing numbers of people who are gainfully employed. The commission recommended:

- controlled immigration for foreigners who had the background that would enable them to integrate easily into German society as well as meet labour market needs

- a point system that would select 20,000 immigrants per year based on criteria of education, age, and language skills. A point system is one where the more points an applicant gets overall the better his or her chance for being selected. For example, an applicant who had a university education, was over the age of 30, and had very good knowledge of the German language would get more points than an applicant who had not finished secondary school, was over 50 and had little or no knowledge of German

- whenever there are any urgent labour shortages, permitting another 20,000 immigrants into the country on a five-year basis

- ways to speed up the asylum procedure and ways to make it more difficult for false applications to succeed

- that the ‘fundamental right of political asylum’ guaranteed by the Constitution be removed

- serious efforts to foster the integration of immigrants, citing knowledge of the German language as a crucial point.

Despite opposition, both houses of the German parliament passed a new immigration law. This new law includes several of the commission recommendations listed above. The immigration of those who plan to establish a business is also welcomed, and there is no limit on the numbers of such entrepreneurs. However, companies can only hire temporary migrant workers outside of the categories outlined above if there are no Germans (or foreigners such as EU nationals, who are legally treated as Germans) available for the work.

The legislation also provides for compulsory German language classes for immigrants in the future. If immigrants refuse to take German language classes, they may fail in getting extensions to their residency permits.

The new immigration law will guide Germany on how it will deal with newcomers at a time when immigration itself is changing. As in many other developed countries, Germany is replacing waves of low skilled labourers, recruited to feed an economic boom, with more skilled workers that it carefully selects to meet the needs of the information age. At the same time, more of Germany’s new arrivals are relatives of established immigrants than previously. The true test of the new legislation will be how well it helps Germany balance its need for workers with concerns about how well immigrants integrate and their national identity.
Activity 1

What can we learn about the conditions that led to the movements of people in Germany during the Cold War?
How did migration affect Germany’s development and stability as a nation during the Cold War?

1 a Write sentences to describe the socio-economic conditions and the political conditions in Germany during the Cold War.

b Write sentences to explain what you described in the previous question.

2 Write an essay on the following:
Describe the types of population movement in Germany during the Cold War. Explain how these movements were affected by the social and political conditions of the times.

3 Write an essay on the following topic:
Describe the main types of population movement in Germany during the Cold War. Explain these movements in terms of ‘core’ and ‘periphery’ ideas and explanations.

4 Think carefully about this question:
What were the effects of migration on Germany’s development and stability as a nation during the Cold War?
Here are some secondary questions to help you think about your answer to the main question. You must give reasons for each of your answers.
❑ What types of movements affected Germany during the Cold War? What were the main reasons for these movements of people?
❑ Where did the migrants come from? Has their movement had an impact on the economic development of Germany? Did these movements help Germany’s national stability?

Figure 1.2.1 Foreign population as a percentage of the total population, 1990 to 2002

SOURCE: Statistisches Bundesamt (Federal Statistical Office)
## Part 1 – Summary

Think about what you have learned in this unit. Ask yourself if you can do each of the following skilfully, and with in-depth knowledge and understanding.

1. I can explain the impact of World War I and World War II on migration movements of a specific country (i.e. Germany).
2. I can examine the causes and effects of migration during the Cold War.
3. I can identify and investigate the socio-economic and political conditions that led to the movement of people in Germany at these historical times.
4. I can examine the effects of migration on the development and stability of a country such as Germany.
Achievement Objective

Students will understand the nature of imperialism and the responses of the colonised people in their struggle for independence.

Focusing Questions

❑ What was the relationship among countries in the Balkan region from 1900 to 1914? What attempts did different ethnic groups make to gain independence?

❑ Discuss and evaluate attempts by satellite states to gain independence during the Cold War.

❑ Identify European motives for annexing (taking possession of) colonies in selected Asian countries during the nineteenth century.

❑ How effective were the strategies former colonies used in opposing colonial rule?

❑ How did colonial powers respond to the strategies former colonies used to gain independence?

This Part looks at imperialism and nationalism and decolonisation within Europe and Asia. These three concepts are inter-related as the effect of one leads to the rise of the other.

Imperialism and colonisation of the Balkan states led to the emergence of nationalism as these states wanted to form their own nation states.

The seven years conflict between Vietnam and the French was a conflict of nationalist aspirations of the Vietnamese on one hand, and the imperialist motives of the French on the other hand.

All over the world, in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries indigenous and suppressed people fought to regain their independence from the colonial powers who had exploited not only the land, but also the people.
What was the relationship among the countries in the Balkan region from 1900 to 1914? What attempts did different ethnic groups make to gain independence?

Three factors in the Balkan region influenced the nature of the relationship between the countries:

i imperialism

ii colonialism

iii nationalism.

They were all inter-related because the effects of one led to the rise of the other.

Balkan is the Turkish word for ‘mountain’ and was the way the Turks referred to that part of the empire. The Balkans is the often mountainous region in south-east Europe bounded by the Adriatic, the Aegean and the Black Sea. From 1900 to 1914, this region was full of chaos and conflict, and the place where an incident escalated into World War I. The underlying cause for the conflicts in the region was nationalistic pressures from different ethnic groups who wanted to break away from their former rulers and form their own nation states.

**Imperialism And Colonialism**

Imperialism and colonialism in Europe was when powerful nations wanted to create or extend their empires by taking over the less powerful ones. In the Balkans, this was done either through war or diplomacy between the nations. Four main powers that wanted to extend their influence in the Balkans were:

- Turkey
- Austria–Hungary
- Russia
- Serbia.

**Turkey**

In the Balkans, the Turkish Empire (also called the Ottoman Empire) had ruled for five centuries and was considered the strongest nation at that time. However, in the early 1900s, other powers called Turkey ‘the sick man of Europe’ as it no longer had the military strength and had lost some of its territories as a result. For instance, ethnic groups such as Serbs, Greeks and Bulgars had successfully revolted against Turkey, and set up their own nation states.
In 1908 a group of radical nationalist Turks, called ‘The Young Turks’, took control of Turkey and aimed at rebuilding the empire again. They introduced some reforms to acknowledge that Christians have equal privileges with Muslims. They also wanted to take back former Turkish territories. However, this did not happen because the former Turkish subjects demanded not reform but independence. For instance, in 1908, Bulgaria declared itself free from Turkish rule.

**Austria–Hungary**

Austria–Hungary also wanted to add more territories to its empire. Its empire was a multi-national one as besides its German-speaking majority it had under its rule different ethnic groups. Turkey had once ruled these ethnic groups but had lost them in wars.

Of the 50 million people in Austria–Hungary, less than half belonged to the two groups that controlled the empire – the German speaking Austrians and the Magyars of Hungary. The bulk of the population was made up of:

- eight million Czechs and Slovaks,
- five million Poles,
- four million Ruthenians,
- five and a half million Serbs, Croats and Slovenes,
- three quarters of a million Italians,
- groups of Bulgarians, Romanians, Albanians, Turks and Greeks not in their own countries.

Of the various groups, the South Slavs were the most restless and best organised. They wanted to break away from Austria–Hungary and form southern Slav kingdoms. Serbia was therefore seen by Austria as a threat to her continued survival. If Serbia, the largest of this ethnic group, was able to chip away at its empire, then the Austro–Hungarian Empire would disintegrate as the Turkish empire had.

In 1908, Austria–Hungary annexed the Turkish provinces of Bosnia–Herzegovina that it administered.

**Serbia**

Serbia broke away from Turkey and set up its own nation state. Serbia belonged to a group of people called Serbs (who speak a Slavonic language), and tried to encourage other Slavs under Austro–Hungarian rule to break away and form one big southern Slav state. However, other southern Slavs (Croats who were mainly Catholic) and Muslim Slavs were not very willing because they had different religions and did not want to be dominated by the Serbs.

**Russia**

The other empire with territorial designs in the Balkans was Russia. Much of Russia’s trade passed from the Black Sea into the Mediterranean via the straits of Constantinople. Because ports in the north of Russia’s empire iced over for six months of the year, continued access to warm water was vital. Direct control or influence over the Balkans would protect this vital waterway. The Russians also sympathised with the Serbs and other Balkan nationalists. They share the same Orthodox religion as most of the Balkan Slavs. Indeed, Russia saw itself as the champion of the Slav people. However, the Croats, Slovenes and Muslim Slavs did not favour Russia for the same reason they did not want to join with Serbs. They wanted independence from Austria–Hungary but did not want to leave one empire only to be taken over by another.
**Nationalism**

Nationalistic feelings were strong among the different ethnic groups. They had always been subjects of a big empire (Turkey) and now they wanted to form their own nations and run their own affairs. The problem was however, that some ethnic groups were displaced. For instance, half were living in areas still under the Turkish rule, while others were living in areas or subjects of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

Nationalism was one of the reasons for World War I.

In the Balkans, nationalism was the driving force behind Serbia’s quest to unite all south Slavs under its rule. Austria-Hungary, which had under its rule Slav subjects, would fall apart if the Slavs broke away. Austria-Hungary was prepared to fight to prevent that. Both Serbia and Austria-Hungary were tied to other European powers in a network of alliances. Serbia was backed by Russia while Austria-Hungary was backed by Germany. If Russia entered the war, Germany would attack Russia, France would step in to back Russia and eventually Britain would step in as an ally of France. So a crisis in the Balkans between Serbia and Austria-Hungary would draw the big powers in through the network of alliances. Also hostilities among different ethnic groups (among Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Muslim Slavs, Bulgarians) made alliances difficult. In fact for a while Austria-Hungary and Turkey were able to control their empires, because their ethnic minorities were fighting among themselves.

**Incidents In The Balkans**

Two incidents saw the clash of imperialistic motives and nationalistic aspirations of the different nations in the Balkans.

**Balkan Wars 1912–1913**

In 1912, encouraged by Russia, a Balkan League was formed. In the league were the states of Serbia, Greece, Bulgaria and Montenegro. In October of the same year, the armies of the league attacked Turkey and less than seven weeks later Turkey surrendered.

Serbia came out as the strongest of the Balkan states. Austria-Hungary felt uncomfortable as a strong Serbia would give too much power to Russia, and Austria-Hungary wanted to wage war against Serbia. However, an attack on Serbia would draw in the Great Powers and at that time, none were ready for war.

The Great Powers (Russia, France, Britain) forced a peace settlement on the Balkan nations. The Turkish lands were distributed among the league while they recognised as an independent nation the people who lived in the area between Serbia and the Adriatic Sea. This country, Albania, was of a mainly Muslim ethnic group that was not Slav and had its own language and culture and had long wanted its independence from the Turks. This angered Serbia as it had planned to add Albania to its list of territories.

Not long after the peace settlement, the Balkan League began to quarrel among themselves. Bulgaria felt that there were too many Bulgarians living in areas given to three other countries – namely central Macedonia to Serbia, Salonika to Greece and Dubrodja to Romania. In June 1913, Hungary attacked the Balkan League countries. Turkey, which hoped to win some its provinces back, joined on the side of the league. Bulgaria was soon crushed and lost all the lands it gained from the first Balkan war as outlined under the Treaty of Bucharest 1913.
The result of the Balkan war saw Serbia increase in might and size. Also, the relationship with Austria–Hungary had deteriorated because Serbia felt cheated for not getting Albania, and Austria–Hungary still ruled over six million Serbs and a further one million in Bosnia–Herzegovina. Therefore, terrorist attacks by Serbians on Austria–Hungary subjects were openly applauded.

Assassination at Sarajevo, 28 June 1914
On the 28 June 1914, the Austrian Crown Prince and heir to the Austro–Hungarian throne, Archduke Franz Ferdinand, and his wife Sophie were driving through the streets of Sarajevo, the capital of Bosnia. They were assassinated by Gavrilo Princip, who belonged to a group of young Bosnian terrorists armed by the ‘Black Hand’ – a Serbian secret society headed by Colonel Dragutin Dimitrijevic, who was also Serbia’s chief of Army intelligence.

Who was to blame for the murder?
There is nothing to prove that the Serbian government was behind the assassination despite Colonel Dimitrijevic’s involvement. However, there is some reason to believe that the Austrian government hoped an incident might take place so that they could regain power over Serbia. For instance:

- the Austrian Crown Prince’s political views were unwelcome to the Serbs
- it was dangerous to visit Sarajevo on a Serbian commemorative day. The 28 June was the anniversary of the Battle of Kosovo when Serbia first lost its independence to Turkey in the fourteenth century.
- nationalistic feelings were running high.

For nearly a month nothing much seemed to come of the crime. The Austrians made investigations and public excitement cooled down. Behind the scenes Austrians prepared for war, as Austria–Hungary received powerful support from Germany in the form of Germany’s ‘blank cheque’, or permission to let them deal with Serbia as they pleased.

Ultimatum to Serbia
On 23 July, the Austro–Hungarian government sent an ultimatum to Serbia, which demanded unconditional acceptance within 48 hours. The ultimatum was the harshest ever delivered in diplomatic history and no self-respecting nation would accept it. In fact Austria put these terms because it hoped Serbia would refuse and this would give Austria an excuse to launch an all-out attack. However, Serbia accepted almost all of the demands but even this did not even satisfy the Austro–Hungarian government as its mind was set on war.

Terms of the Ultimatum

1. Serbian government to suppress all anti-Austrian activities
2. Dismiss all Serbian officials to whom Austria–Hungary objected.
3. Austrians to enter Serbia to investigate Serbian complicity in the murder and to supervise the suppression of the anti-Austrian societies.

War
On 28 July, Austria declared war on Serbia. The next day, the Austro–Hungarian army attacked Belgrade. On 30 July, the Tsar ordered the Russian armies to mobilise. Russia did not want to see a Slav country crushed by a big power such as Austria–
Hungary. Furthermore, Russia had Balkan ambitions of its own and this was the opportunity to pursue them. Germany reacted by issuing two ultimatums to Russia demanding that they halt mobilisation and to France demanding her neutrality should there be an Austro–Hungarian/Russian war. Both countries resisted the ultimatums and as a consequence, Germany declared war on Russia on 1 August and on France on 3 August.

It is now clear that the local dispute in the Balkans was because of nationalistic pressures of the ethnic groups on one hand, and imperialist motives of the great powers on the other hand. This turned the Balkan war into a European and Middle Eastern war (World War I).

Activity 1

Use your knowledge of this section and Resource A to complete the following activities.

1. Why was Turkey called the ‘sick man of Europe’?
2. What were the motives behind the actions of these nations in the Balkans? Use the table below to help you answer the question. Say whether they were motivated by imperialist or nationalistic aspirations and give examples of incidents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Imperialist</th>
<th>Nationalist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria–Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Referring to Resource A, which two provinces did Austria–Hungary annex in 1913?
4 What happened to Macedonia and Albania after the Second Balkan War in 1913?

5 Which country expanded its territory the most?

6 How and why was a new country created on Serbia's western border?

7 Explain how each of the following nations felt about the changed map of the Balkans in 1913.
   a Serbia  
   b Austria–Hungary  
   c Bulgaria  
   d Turkey

8 Who or what group masterminded the assassination of the Archduke, Franz Ferdinand? Why was the Archduke assassinated?

9 How did Austria–Hungary react to the assassination? Who was blamed?

10 The ultimatum issued to Serbia was very harsh, and one that no self-respecting country would accept. Why did Austria frame the ultimatum in this way?

11 Arrange the following in their right chronological order. Under each, give the dates and the reasons.

   - Germany declares war on Russia and France
   - Germany issues ultimatums to Russia and France
   - Austria-Hungary issues ultimatum to Serbia
   - Serbia accepts most of the terms of the Austrian ultimatum
   - Austria attacks Serbia
   - The Crown Prince and wife are assassinated
At the end of World War II there were two super powers: the United States of America (USA) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR). From 1945 to 1991, these two super powers engaged in the ‘Cold War’. It was not a war of battles but a war of ideology whereby the USA promoted Capitalism (free market and democracy) while the USSR expounded Communism. Expansion was done through diplomacy, foreign aid and sometimes armed conflict. The real threat was the deployment of nuclear weapons by both countries; however, nuclear war did not eventuate because both nations realised the disastrous impact such powerful weapons would have on themselves and on the rest of the world.

Several Eastern European countries that were once subjects of Turkey found themselves Soviet satellites (countries under the dominance and influence of the USSR). From March 1946, nation after nation in Eastern Europe had Soviet style governments installed. A few leaders of some nations willingly took up Communism while others were forced by violence and even assassination. Around the 1950s, some of these nations wanted to break away, but that was impossible because the Soviet army was stronger and tanks would roll in and crush any rebellion. Organised opposition within Russia itself was impossible because the Communist Party controlled every aspect of life. So rebellions against communist governments were crushed in East Germany (1953), Hungary (1956) and Czechoslovakia (1968).
Everyday Life Under Communism

The Soviet system of government promised that all would be equal – none poor, none rich. It promised to provide everyone with housing, jobs, pensions and medical care. These promises were never realised because most people lived in primitive housing, with almost no wages, little or no medical care and hardly any food while the Soviet elite enjoyed living in luxury. Millions of people died from starvation, the government introduced censorship and often printed lies in the government newspaper Pravda about how well the country was doing. When they had elections, only one party was allowed to be on the ballot paper – the Communist Party. The cost of living was very high. For instance, the cost of a pair of jeans was about 400 roubles – more than most people would earn in six months.

Not until the 1980s were most of the satellite states able to break away. This was not because of rebellions in oppressed satellite states but because of the leaders in the Soviet Union. Gorbachev, the General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, saw that communism was not working. So much money was spent on building up the Soviet military that other aspects of Russian life were neglected. The economy was poorly managed and trade was slipping behind that of the West. The supply of goods and services was getting poorer and poorer and many everyday goods were hard to find. Even strong Communists were criticising the way the country was run. Therefore Gorbachev introduced changes such as glasnost (openness) and perestroika (restructuring). This move unleashed Eastern European citizens’ resentment, longing for freedom and desire for a better life, which had been repressed for decades. The nationalistic feelings that people in Eastern Europe had once felt under Turkish and Austro–Hungarian leadership surfaced again.

The Russian Satellites Break Away/Independence

The USSR kept the satellites close to her in a union called the ‘Council for Mutual Economic Assistance’ (COMECON). The members were the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, East Germany, Albania, Mongolia, Cuba, North Vietnam and North Korea. While these satellites were under the domination of the USSR, individually they wanted to break away and form their own nation states with their own people leading their countries. Furthermore, their economies had not prospered under the communist form of government.

Yugoslavia

Marshal Tito was a Communist but at the end of World War II he was a popular hero with many South Slav people because he had led a successful guerrilla war against the Germans who tried to conquer them. Using this popularity and force, he was able to join several different ethnic groups into one nation, Yugoslavia. His Communism was oppressive but he allowed the Yugoslav people some freedoms. Yugoslavia was the first satellite to break free from Stalin’s control. In 1948, Tito, the leader of Yugoslavia, insisted that each communist country could pursue its own path. There were no Russian troops in Yugoslavia, and Tito was supported by local communists, so he was able to get away with defying Stalin. In June 1948, Stalin responded by expelling the Yugoslav Communist Party from the Communist Information Bureau (the old Comintern).
While Tito had power the ethnic groups (Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Bosnians, Montenegrins, Albanians, and Macedonians) lived in peace, but many still resented each other. When Marshal Tito died in 1980, Yugoslav ethnic wars broke out and some of the old fights started again with whole communities killing each other as nationalistic feelings began to emerge again. As a result, these ethnic groups broke away from Yugoslavia and formed their own nation states.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 June 1991</td>
<td>Croatia and Slovenia became independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1991</td>
<td>Macedonia became independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1992</td>
<td>Bosnia–Herzegovina declared independence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Serbia wanted to control all the other Slav states and either drive their people out or dominate them. After the civil wars, part of Serbia became a Serbian Republic in Bosnia–Herzegovina. The other and larger part of Serbia was joined voluntarily by Montenegro to become the ‘Federal Republic of Yugoslavia’ but this Yugoslavia is much smaller than Tito’s Yugoslavia.

**Hungary**

Hungary tried to follow the example of Tito in Yugoslavia but it was heavily crushed by the Soviets. They had wanted independence from the USSR but it was impossible as they were no match for the Russian war machine. At first when the Hungarians presented their list of reforms to the USSR, the Soviet government did little to suppress them. The Hungarians demanded general elections by universal secret ballot and also the right of workers to strike. They tore down statues of Stalin, cut the Soviet star out of the Hungarian flag, publicly burned portraits of Stalin and fought and killed Soviet secret police.

These actions alarmed the Soviets but nevertheless they withdrew their troops. However, after many arguments in the Soviet government, on November 1956 twenty-five hundred Soviet tanks attacked Budapest, the capital of Hungary. The Hungarian people fought back bravely, but they were no match for the Soviets. The Western Powers, including America, admired their courage but did nothing to help the Hungarians because they did not want to trigger a Third World War. As a result, two hundred thousand Hungarians fled to Austria and other Western countries, and at least two thousand were executed. The Russians let some Hungarians flee thinking ‘it would get rid of the trouble makers’.

It was not until 8 April 1990 that Hungary was able to free itself from the USSR. This was due not so much to the actions of the oppressed in Hungary but to the reforms in the USSR. By 1990, the leaders in Russia realised that communism was not working and that they were economically further behind the Western European countries. The Communist leaders either left the party or let their people form other parties and hold free elections.

**East Germany**

Following the defeat of Hitler in World War II, Germany was partitioned into four parts among the Allies: the USA, Great Britain and France. Eastern Germany went to the USSR. The idea was to divide up the people so that Germany could not be unified and become a strong nation again. The allies feared that a strong Germany might repeat what the dictator Hitler had done in World War II. The allies in the west made sure that no Nazis or Nazi sympathisers would be in the new Germany. Then the British, French and Americans handed their parts back to
the West Germans and encouraged them to form a democratic government. Despite the partition, Germans continued to move freely between East and West Berlin. Between 1949 and 1961, three million East Germans escaped communism. On some days as many as twenty thousand dissidents left.

**Berlin Wall**

It was not until August 1961 that the Soviets sealed off non-communist West Berlin with the Berlin Wall. Regardless of the Berlin Wall, people still tried to escape and about one hundred people died trying to escape. People wanted to escape because of the harsh conditions in the east and because they wanted to unite with the West.

![Figure 2.2.1 Trying to escape over the Berlin wall](image)

**East Germany Disappeared**

When the USSR was crumbling, many nations were formed. East Germany disappeared and reunited with Western Germany in October 1990. The reunited Germany was called the ‘Federal Republic of Germany’ and Berlin became again the capital of Germany.

**Other Satellites**

By 1989, most of the satellite states were undergoing reforms in their government and breaking away from the USSR. In 1989, nation after nation broke away from Soviet rule. Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Romania and Bulgaria all saw dreams of real independence come true. They were followed by the Baltic states of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia. By 1993 further satellite states had broken away from the USSR and declared independence: Georgia, Albania and Bulgaria. Also some of the Asian republics of the Soviet Union declared independence and are now independent nations: Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Armenia. When communism collapsed in Russia itself three larger republics, Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova became independent nations. Russia is now a federation with 21 smaller republics that have their own governments and representation in the Central Russian government.
Figure 2.2.2 Two maps showing Europe during and after the Cold war.

Legacy Of The Cold War

As the satellite states began to break away one by one, so ended the Cold War and the extension of communism. When people tasted freedom, the appetite for more freedom grew. Under the USSR, there were many ethnic groups and nationalities and they all felt that Soviet communism was the imposition of Russian authority. These satellite states were against this because they wanted to promote their own language and culture as well as deciding their own leaders. In the end, the Soviet leaders realised they lacked strength and there were growing rebellions from the satellite states, which could lead to more chaos. The solution was to grant independence to the satellite states.
Activity 1

Use your knowledge from the text and resources to answer these questions?

1 How was nationalism a factor behind the breaking away of Soviet satellite states? Explain using examples from the text.

2 How did the USSR government react to the rebellions by the satellite states? What action did they take to suppress the rebellions and uprisings?

3 What does ‘Cold War’ mean? Who were the major powers involved in the Cold War and what ideologies were they promoting?

4 When Soviet-like government was set up in Eastern European states after World War II, the British Prime Minister Winston Churchill made a speech announcing that an ‘Iron Curtain has descended over Eastern Europe’.
   a What did he mean by ‘Iron Curtain’?
   b How were the Eastern European states treated by the USSR?

5 The Hungarian revolt was a bloody one as many people were killed by the Soviet tanks. Why didn’t the Western countries and USA step in to help the Hungarians?

6 What was the main cause for the partition of Germany into four parts? What were they afraid of?

7 Was communism a form of colonialism?
   a You need to understand colonialism and its principles as well as the main aim behind the expansion of communism.
   b Organise your thoughts using the table below.
   c Write an essay of about 100 words to support your argument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is colonialism? Principles</th>
<th>Why did the USSR expand communism outside Russia?</th>
<th>What are the similarities and the differences of the two practices? Give examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Similarities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 Nationalistic feelings were strong in Hungary when ordinary Hungarian people fought against the Soviet army in 1956. At the end of this rebellion, the Hungarians did not get independence and it resulted in thousands of casualties as well as people fleeing to Austria. However, they continued the fight for independence until it was finally granted to them.

What are the underlying aspects of nationalism that lead people to go to extremes to achieve independence?

a Are nationalistic feelings restricted only to those who are suppressed? Do you agree or not? Give examples to support your answer.
Identify the colonial motives for annexation of colonies in selected Asian countries in the Nineteenth Century.

Imperialism in Asia in the nineteenth century was not a straightforward act. It was more difficult because the Asian countries such as Japan, China and Siam had very old and developed cultures and had been nations for many centuries. They were far more sophisticated, far more effectively governed and far more resilient than their African counterparts. Nevertheless, after much resistance some Asian countries became colonies of the European powers.

The motives for imperialism in Asian countries were the same as elsewhere. They were economic penetration (trade and trade routes), colonial administration and expansion of empire. In Asia, it was not always the government back in Europe who initiated the quest; rather it was the individuals (missionaries, traders, company and colonial administrators in neighbouring colonies). The industrial revolution in Europe in the nineteenth century was also another incentive because now European countries had the resources and weapons to conquer the powerful Asian states, which they had been unable to do prior to the nineteenth century.

Great Britain In Asia

Burma
Burma (now Myanmar) lay between Indochina and India. It was an independent state with a hereditary monarchy. Burma was annexed by Great Britain in 1852. The various stages of the annexation of Burma were not decided by the politicians in Britain, rather the British administrators of India were influenced by the different European traders, officials and missionaries in India. They wanted to turn Burma into a buffer state between themselves and French Indochina. So the annexation of Burma was purely driven by economic and security motives.

Malay States
The settlements of Penang, Singapore and Malacca, who had their own rulers called sultans, were annexed between 1786 and 1824 as strategic and commercial bases to help protect India and to serve the profitable China trade. The presence of Chinese miners causing local disputes as well as pirates in the China Seas made it impossible for the British not to interfere.
French Imperialism

Vietnam

The Vietnamese people have been at war for most of their history. Their small country is part of Indochina in South East Asia. Their neighbours to the north, the Chinese, conquered their homeland ruling it for a thousand years between 100BC and 900AD. The millennium-long occupation left the Vietnamese with a deep fear of Chinese domination. The arrival of Europeans in the sixteenth century led to further foreign interference, first by the Portuguese and then more effectively by the French.

The Vietnamese put up a fight against the French but they were finally defeated in 1885. In 1887, the French joined Vietnam with neighbouring Cambodia and Laos, although they had different languages and cultures, and called this colonial territory French Indochina.

The French were interested in Vietnam because of its sugar and rice, which they exported cheaply. The French benefited from the trade and the Vietnamese peasants remained poor and were excluded from the government.

Figure 2.3.1 Map of French Indochina
Strategies Used Against Colonial Rule

How effective were the strategies the former colonies used to oppose colonial rule?

How did the colonial powers respond to the strategies used by the former colonies?

This Unit will look at the strategies former colonies used to oppose colonial rule and become independent. Vietnam will be used as a case study because their fight against the imperial powers clearly showed the nationalistic feelings that were shared by the Vietnamese people.

After many years of colonisation (first by the Chinese, then the Portuguese, Japanese and lastly the French) the Vietnamese were determined to get their independence back. One man stood out. He was Ho Chi Minh and he inspired the nation to fight even when their weapons were inferior to the powerful weapons of the colonial powers.

During World War II (1939–1945), France was conquered by Germany, and was ruled by a Nazi-approved regime. Germany ceded French Indochina to its ally Japan, but the French continued to administer the country. When the war ended, the Vietnamese wanted the French and the Japanese to leave but France was not prepared to give up her colony without a fight. France began to re-invade Vietnam all over again. This war lasted for eight weeks with a Vietminh victory, thus ending the period of French colonisation in Vietnam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Dates</th>
<th>Vietnam in the Nineteenth Century</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1802</td>
<td>Vietnam united as a single country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>French capture the southern city of Saigon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>French gain control of central Vietnam (known as Annam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>French gain control of southern Vietnam (which they make part of Indo–China and call Cochin China)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>French invade northern Vietnam (known as Tonkin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>All Vietnam comes under French control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam are united under French rule as Indochina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Important Words

Peasant: a person who works on the land and has low social status

Guerrilla fighters: a group of people engaged in a war against a large force using irregular fighting

Ambush: a surprise attack

Vietminh: a secret force consisting of communists and nationalists aimed at defeating France

Invade: attack

Cede: to give up your right to something you own
The Strategies

The strategies adopted by the Vietnamese were (1) follow the mastermind behind the revolution: Ho Chi Minh (2) formation of a Communist and Nationalist movement called the Vietminh, (3) use tactics in war such as guerrilla warfare.

Ho Chi Minh

*I and others may be revolutionaries, but we are all disciples of Mahatma Gandhi, nothing more, nothing less.*

Ho Chi Minh was born in a rural village in Vietnam and was very poor. However, he was intelligent and was always hungry for knowledge. He kept changing his name to avoid arrest because his views challenged the French administration in Vietnam. He travelled widely to the USA, Africa, India, Russia, Great Britain, China and other Asian countries.

There he saw how the imperial powers were treating the people in their colonies as well as wasting food in the colonisers’ countries when there was poverty in the colonies. He also witnessed the racist attitude of the white Americans against the black Americans, and Europeans against Asians. Although there was paid employment, it was not much better than slavery. From here he learned that the Vietnamese did not have to be subject to such treatment. Vietnam should become independent and be able to run its own affairs.

### Key Dates Vietnam's War Against France

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>(end of World War II) Ho Chi Minh declares independence in Hanoi after the Vietminh forces take control of the former French colony.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1946 | January: Vietminh hold general elections, and a coalition government is proposed. (shared power between communists and nationalists)  
July: Conference with France on the future of Vietnam but nothing is achieved |
| 1947 | French troops re-invade Vietnam all over again and reoccupy Hanoi.  
Ho Chi Minh and his forces withdraw and launch guerrilla warfare against them all across the countryside. |
| 1950 | The French set up a new independent state in the South with Dao Bai as President.  
Although independent, it was firmly under French control. |
| 1950 | First American military advisors arrive in the southern state.  
They did not want South Vietnam to fall under communism.  
Believed in the ‘domino theory’, that is, if a country falls to communism the neighbouring countries will follow. |
| 1954 | Defeat of French troops at Dien Bien Phu. |
Vietminh
While in China, Ho Chi Minh and his followers began to set up a new secret force called the Vietminh. It was aimed at uniting Communists and nationalists – provided they were prepared to fight both the French and the Japanese. This new force consisted of peasant farmers, women, and even Chinese volunteers.

- Women smuggled gun parts through enemy territories
- Children smuggled food and water through enemy territory to the men
- So great was their determination that they even engaged in suicide attacks.

Guerrilla Warfare

‘Only when the root is firm can the tree live long, And a people is built with people as foundations’

Poem by Ho Chi Minh 1948

French troops began an active campaign against Ho’s Vietminh forces, driving them from the northern capital Hanoi, and other cities such as the port of Haiphong, where a French navy bombardment killed 6000 residents.

Ho’s military commander, a former Hanoi law student named Vo Nguyen Giap, quickly discovered that when his Vietminh forces fought the French in conventional battles he invariably suffered heavy casualties. So he changed tactics, and began a campaign called guerrilla warfare. His troops set ambushes, planted mines, carried out hit and run raids and sniper attacks and whittled away at the French forces, breaking both their morale and French public support for the war. In this way, the conflict dragged on for eight years.

Eventually, the French decided that they had to draw the Vietminh forces out into the open. In March 1954, they set up a major armed camp in a remote valley in the northwest of the country called Dien Bien Phu. 16,500 French soldiers dug themselves in and waited for the Vietminh to attack.

France Reacted
France had been humiliated by the German takeover in World War II. After World War II, they were not willing to give up Vietnam. They wanted to restore some of France’s prestige lost in World War II. They reacted to the Vietminh actions by:

- attacking the Vietminh forces
- declaring South Vietnam an independent state
- putting in a man they chose as leader to do whatever the French told him to.

French Attack
The Vietminh attacked, but not in the manner or place the French expected. Surrounding Dien Bien Phu was a ring of high hills. The Vietminh together with thousands of volunteers from Communist China hauled large artillery up the hills and hid them in the caves where they would be safe from air attack.

The USA set up a Military and Advisory Group in the southern Vietnamese state and provided 80% of the funding for the French war in the North. They shipped in
bombs to be dropped by French warplanes. By 1954, the French had committed 250 000 troops to the colonial war.

Sometimes, the Vietminh dug trenches in the ground all the way to where the French were stationed and burst out in a desperate suicide attack. Eventually the French lost the war and they gave up their colony. Seventy-five thousand French soldiers died in the fighting or from disease. More significantly, three hundred thousand Vietnamese died in their fight for independence. The Vietminh lacked the technology and economic power of the French, but they had drive and determination encouraged by their nationalistic feelings to rule their own nation.

You will lose . . .

‘You can kill ten of my men for every one I kill of yours, but even at those odds I will win and you will lose’

HO CHI MINH, warning the French in 1946

The Geneva Accords

The war ended with a conference in Geneva, Switzerland, and a settlement known as the Geneva Accords. In attendance were the Vietminh, who were communist leaders, and leaders of the non-communist Vietnamese, France, China, the Soviet Union, United States and Britain. Under this agreement Vietnam was divided into two: communist Vietnam in the north and the non-communist Vietnam in the south. France officially gave up its former colony.

Ho Chi Minh became the leader of the communist North Vietnam, which became known as the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. Bao Dai remained in control of the South.
Part 2 - Summary

Think through what you have learned in this chapter. Ask yourself if you can provide specific in-depth answers to each of the focusing questions.

1 I can understand these terms and how they relate to the chapter.
   a communism     b satellite     c trusteeship
   d independence   e capitalism    f democratic
   g guerrilla warfare h globalisation i colonialism
   j imperialism    k decolonisation l nationalism

2 I can describe the nature of the relationship of the states in the Balkans region in the period 1900 to 1914.

3 I can analyse the causes of the tension in the Balkan region as due to imperialistic and nationalistic motives.

4 I can account for the causes of the nationalistic feeling of the Slav people in the Balkans and their desire for the creation of a greater Serbia.

5 I can explain the imperialistic motives of the European countries in Asia in the nineteenth century.

6 I can analyse the strategies adopted by Vietnam to regain independence from France.
**Objective**

You will know and understand the causes and consequences of conflict and the role of foreign intervention.

**Focusing Questions**

- Why was European colonialism outside the Pacific region a major cause of conflict in the early twentieth century?
- What made nationalism emerge as a response to foreign influence?
- How can religious beliefs and practices influence conflict?
- What role did the foreign powers play in solving the problems?
- What are the long-term effects of colonialism on a former colony as shown in contemporary conflict?

This Part looks at the conflict between the colonial powers and the colonies. In the early twentieth to the mid twentieth century, there was an increase in the number of colonies that protested against the colonising countries. With the rise in nationalist movements, colonies everywhere were fighting for independence. Some colonising countries were, however, not willing to give up their colonies, especially if the colony was profitable.

India is a prime example of a colony that was hard to let go. The ‘India’ that we will look at is the former subcontinent under British rule. It is still a big country but when the British ruled it India was even bigger than it is today. We will see why and what brought some of the changes.

It was a British colony up until 1947 when it gained independence. However, the path to independence for India was one of bloodshed and suffering. These were either imposed upon India by the British or by fighting between the two rival religions: Hinduism and Islam.

The importance of this chapter is that it reveals the exploitative nature of British colonialism in India. Britain was only willing to let India go when it proved to be too expensive to maintain. So Britain left, and more fighting and violence broke out between the Hindus and the Muslims. Today, the conflict continues between these two religions through India and Pakistan over the disputed state of Kashmir.
Figure 3.0.1 Map of the Indian subcontinent
Discuss the nature of European colonialism outside of the Pacific Region as a major cause of conflict in the twentieth century.

The consequences of European colonialism outside the Pacific are the direct causes of the major conflicts in the twentieth century. The ongoing conflict in Palestine and Israel can be attributed to British colonialism and US foreign policy in the Middle East.

For this unit, we will look at India, and the conflict between the Indians and their colonial masters as the Indians were fighting to regain their independence. The incidents were in the form of violent attacks, and non-violence as championed by Gandhi.

India

For three centuries, India had been Britain’s most glorious economic asset. This vast territory, with its three hundred million inhabitants, was guarded by two hundred thousand Indian soldiers in the service of Britain and sixty thousand British soldiers. India had many ethnic groups and over a hundred languages.

At that time India was a collection of states ruled by mainly Muslim princes, called rajas or maharajas.

1600: William Hawkins, captain of the East India Company vessel the ‘Hector’, landed at Surat near Bombay, and started trading. The newcomer’s main aim was ‘commerce, not colonisation’, but the desire for conquest proved stronger and the British military governors who administered the East India Company (a trading company) gradually pushed further into each of India’s princely states in turn.

By the early nineteenth century, the company was no longer just concerned with trade. In effect it ruled over large areas of India. By intervening in disputes between rajas and maharajas it gained power for itself. By 1858 the East India Company ceased to exist, the Empire had come into being and Queen Victoria received the title of Empress of India and assumed sovereignty over India. The chief British administrator in India was called the viceroy (the person who ruled as the deputy of Queen Victoria).
India Under British Administration

For most of the time under British colonisation, Indians were treated badly. Britain’s main interest in India was economic. The political system and infrastructure were set up so that they could administer and control the country. Schools and hospitals were also set up but entry was selective. Only Europeans could enter certain schools. The officers in India had little regard for the Indian population; they were there to pursue their own interest.

For instance:

- Indian resources were exploited. Raw materials as well as labour were exploited to a large extent. Although slavery had been abolished, Britain introduced an indentured labour scheme that in many ways was no better than slavery.
  - Low wages for factory workers. Factory owners paid Indians very low wages to produce garments that were in turn sold back to the Indians at very high prices.
  - Farmers were forced to grow indigo (for dye) on their landlord’s lands and all the profits were given to the landlords. Indian materials were used to make clothes in British factories and the clothes were sold in India at high prices, which few Indians could afford.
  - Tax was introduced and Indians found it very expensive to buy even the basic necessities of life.

- Politically, Indians were not well represented in the local government.
  - The colonial government introduced laws to forbid the Indians to form a public gathering of more than five persons.
  - When Indians tried to protest against the British, they were always met with force.
  - Indians were forbidden by law to produce their own salt. They had to buy salt produced in British factories at very high prices.

- Poverty and refugees
  - There was widespread poverty in villages because workers became unemployed when factories were closed.
  - Refugee problems arose as Indians were forced to move from one part of India to another during periods of famine or when some of their traditional jobs were abolished by new technology or closing of the factories.

- British officials, who did not speak the language or embrace the culture of the population, and the troops were often insensitive towards the Hindu and Muslim religions.
How Did The Indians React To The Way Their Country Was Run?

The Indians reacted both violently, and non-violently. There were group demonstrations as well as terrorist attacks.

Sepoy Rebellion, 1857–1859

A sepoy is an Indian soldier serving under British or European orders. The rebellion was also called a mutiny because Indian soldiers rebelled. This was the first rebellion and nationalist movement by the Indians against their colonial ruler because of the continual annexation of the princely states by the British.

Undoubtedly, it was the culmination of increasing Indian resentment toward British economic and social policies over many decades. Until the rebellion, the British had succeeded in suppressing numerous riots and 'tribal' wars, or in accommodating them through concessions, but two events triggered the violent explosion of anger in 1857.

The first, was in 1856 when the British annexed Oudh, a wealthy Muslim princely state that generated huge revenue, which was the pride of Muslims. The second was the British mistake in using cartridges for the Pattern 1853 Enfield rifle that were allegedly greased with animal fat. This was offensive to the religious beliefs of Muslim and Hindu sepoys. To eat pork is offensive to Muslims, and to eat any meat, especially from cattle, which they regard as sacred, is offensive to Hindus.

On 10 May 1857 Indian soldiers of the British Indian Army, drawn mostly from Muslim units from Bengal, mutinied in Meerut, northeast of Delhi. The rebels marched to Delhi to offer their services to the Mogul emperor, and soon much of north and central India was plunged into a year-long fight against the British.

The rebellion soon spread from North India to Oudh and various areas once under the control of Maratha princes. Isolated mutinies also occurred at military posts in the centre of the subcontinent. Initially, the rebels, although divided and uncoordinated, gained the upper hand, while the unprepared British were terrified, and even paralysed, without replacements for the casualties. The civil war caused chaos for Indians and British, soldiers and civilians. Each community suffered humiliation and triumph in battle, although the final outcome was victory for the British because they had much superior weapons to the Indians, including artillery.

The last major sepoy rebels surrendered on 21 June 1858, at Gwalier (Madya Pradesh) one of the principal centres of the revolt. A final battle was fought at Sirwa Passon May 21, 1859, and the defeated rebels fled into Nepal.

Although the rebels failed, nationalistic feelings were stronger than ever, and this was the first attempt in their struggle to gain independence.

The uprising, which seriously threatened British rule in India, has been called many names by historians, including the Sepoy Rebellion, the Great Indian Mutiny, and the Revolt of 1857. Many Indian historians prefer to call it India's first war of independence.

The Amritsar Massacre, April 1919

The Amritsar Massacre, also known as the Jallian Bagh Massacre, was named after the place where the incident took place. The British soldiers opened fire on a peaceful political gathering, killing hundreds of Indians.
The Indians were protesting against the British Rowlatt Act in 1919, which gave wide coercive powers to the government. Thousands of Indians gathered in the Jallianwala Bagh in the heart of Amritsar city, one of the major towns of Punjab state. The occasion was Baisakhi Day, a traditional Hindu festival in which people celebrated the beginning of the harvesting season by congregating in community fairs. The gathering disobeyed the orders that banned a gathering of five or more persons in the city. The Bagh, or park, had brick walls on all sides and had a single narrow entrance/exit.

Accounts of the British motives vary. One account says that the massacre was a reprisal for the deaths of four Europeans, and the beating of a woman missionary. Another explanation is that it was to crush the gathering.

Troops marched to the park accompanied by an armoured vehicle with machine guns. The vehicle was unable to enter the narrow entrance to the park.

General Reginald Dyer, after a couple of warnings to the crowd, ordered his troops to open fire. Since there was no other exit but the one manned by the troops, people desperately tried to escape by climbing the walls of the park. Some people also jumped into a well to escape the bullets.

When the firing was over, hundreds of people were dead and thousands injured. Official estimates were three hundred and seventy-nine people killed and one thousand two hundred people injured, although the actual figure may have been much higher. Fearing a backlash, the British government imposed martial law (law by military forces).

Due to the press being censored, the news of the tragic events did not reach the rest of India for several weeks. It took six months before the British government made a formal enquiry into the incident, due to international outrage and pressure. The Hunter Commission of Inquiry reported unfavourably on Dyer’s action and in 1920 he was ordered to take early retirement.

In India, the massacre evoked feelings of deep anguish and anger. All around India, nationalist feelings were emerging. It paved the way for Gandhi’s non-violent movement against the British.

**Brigadier-General Dyer**

Reginald Dyer was born in India to English parents, where his father was a partner in a Brewery Company. He went to school in India and finished in a military school in England. In 1888 he was transferred to the Indian Army and served in many campaigns. He was commander of operations in Southeast Persia during World War I. On his return to India he was in command of the army in the Punjab State, which included Amritsar.

**Hartal**

A non-violent protest whereby Gandhi proposed a total suspension of activities throughout India. Gandhi politely informed the viceroy of the Hartal and on the prescribed day, 30 March, beginning in Delhi, all the shops and factories closed, children stayed away from school, and life came to a stop.

Gandhi returned his medals and other Congress members gave up their profession as barristers. Indian institutions took over the function of the universities, now deserted by their students, and villagers stopped paying taxes and drinking alcohol.
People would also strip off their British-made clothes, their trousers and their shirts and throw them onto a great pile to be burned.

Gandhi encouraged the Indians to spin cotton to make their own clothes instead of buying British clothes and to go back to wearing older traditional Indian clothing. For the rest of his life Gandhi wore only traditional Indian clothing. As a result, many British factories in India lost profits and some were forced to close down.

**Activity 1**

From your knowledge of the text, answer the following questions.

1. What does exploitation mean? How were the Indians exploited under British rule?
2. What were the main motives for British annexation of India in 1858?
3. Who had ruled India before 1858? When and why did they leave?
4. What nationalistic movements took place in India in the early twentieth century? How successful were they in achieving their aim?
5. What were the advantages and disadvantages of British colonialism in India?
6. What is nationalism and how do you think this emerged as a result of British colonisation?
7. Gandhi is often referred to as the father of ‘Modern India’. Explain this.
8. From your knowledge of other European colonisation write a brief paragraph explaining the differences and similarities in British colonisation of India and other countries.

   Consider the motives for colonisation and the nature and type of colonisation.
What made nationalism emerge as a response to foreign influence?

The emergence of nationalism in India was due to Indian dissatisfaction with the way the British colonial government was exploiting the Indians, and the unjust treatment of the people in all aspects – social, political and economic. For over ninety years, the Indians fought for their independence from the British. Their fight resulted in the forming of an independent India and Pakistan in 1947.

**Economic**

The Indian subcontinent was Britain’s most valuable colony in Asia because of trade, raw materials and cheap labour.

**Bihar**

The system of exploitation was evident in Bihar where indigo was grown to make dye. The farmers were obliged to plant three-twentieths of their land with indigo and give the entire profits to their British landlords. Mahatma Gandhi was asked to represent the farmers in court. A commission was set up by the lieutenant governor, and Gandhi, representing the peasants, demanded that the British planters repay fifty percent of the sums unjustly extracted from the farmers. The planters proposed twenty five and Gandhi accepted. The compromise, though not especially favourable financially, represented a crushing moral defeat for the planters, in terms of both their authority and more importantly, their sense of identity. The ‘stain of indigo’ had been wiped out.

**Ahmedabad**

In Ahmedabad, the textile workers demanded wage increases. Gandhi agreed to defend their cause, encouraged them to take strike action and extracted a promise from them that they would not return to work until they had achieved their objective. Day after day the workers assembled outside the factory but the wages still did not increase. It was not until Gandhi fasted and threatened to starve to death that the textile owners gave in.
Political

Indian National Congress

An important step in the growth of nationalism was the founding of the Indian National Congress. This was an organisation intended to bring together educated Indians from different parts of the country as well as from different religions with the aim of obtaining a greater share for them in the government of India. The Congress was initially very moderate in its demands, declaring their belief that British rule was ‘absolutely essential to the interests of our own National Development’. The Congress wanted two things to be introduced:

- Indians to be admitted into the Civil Service
- Elected provincial councils to be established, until such time as parliamentary government could be introduced.

However, Congress became more extreme as the Government of India failed to take the demands seriously. Congress began to demand self-government from the British and held numerous conferences with Britain. Congress members included many lawyers, and men like Jawaharlal Nehru and Gandhi. Congress employed methods of non-violence advocated by Gandhi.

Muslims in the Congress later broke away and formed a separate Muslim League in 1906 because they did not want a Hindu dominant party to rule an independent India.

Quit India Campaign (World War II)

During World War II, Gandhi drafted a resolution calling for the British to Quit India. They made it clear that they would not support the war effort unless India was granted independence. Many Indians were prepared to fight with the British forces against Japan, which wanted to conquer India and make it part of its Asian empire. Some feared that the Japanese would be even worse conquerors than the British. However, these Indians said that they would fight with the British on the understanding that when the Allies won the war the British would grant India independence.

On March 1942, Sir Richard Stafford Cripps arrived in Delhi with a mandate to grant India the status of dominion with its own constituent assembly, but not until after the war. A third of the assembly’s members were to be nominated by the maharajas, who were known to be under British rule. Muhammad Ali Jinnah, the leader of the Muslim League encouraged the Muslims to join the army. Sikhs, who have a warrior tradition, fought with the British Army. The Quit India campaign ended in cruel defeat for Gandhi and the Congress as the terms proposed by the British did not represent the interests of India. Violent terrorist attacks broke out such as sabotage, arson and murder. As a result, Gandhi, along with the members of Congress, was arrested and put into jail. Muhammad Ali Jinnah was not arrested because he had encouraged the Muslims to support the British war effort against the invading forces of Japan in World War II.
Activity 1

Write an essay of about 1000 words outlining the factors that contributed to the emergence of nationalistic movements in India. Use the table below to help you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Points (body of essay)</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduce the topic</td>
<td>Factors which led to nationalistic movement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does nationalism/nationalistic mean?</td>
<td>Nationalistic movement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was the movement violent or non-violent?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did it achieve its purpose?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the impacts of religious beliefs and practices on conflict?

The impact of religious beliefs and practices on conflict is evident in the form of the movements that were undertaken to protest against British colonisation in their fight for independence. India’s struggle for independence and the subsequent partition of India into a Hindu dominated India and a Muslim dominated Pakistan was greatly influenced by religious beliefs and practices. We will look at the satyagraha as advocated by Gandhi and the formation of a separate Muslim League.

Religion In India

The religions in India consist of Hinduism, Islam, Sikhism, Christianity, Buddhism and Jainism.

Hinduism is believed to be the oldest of major religions and it originated in northern India and was practised by early Aryans. According to some theories, later Aryans influenced/converted the Dravidians who lived in the southern regions. It is also believed to be the first religion of India. In 2001, there were about 820 million Hindus in India.

Islam arrived in India as early as the 700s AD, a hundred years after it was founded. During the following centuries significant numbers of Indians converted to Islam. In the 1500s, the Muslim (Mogul) Empire was formed. It gave India the Taj Mahal and countless other cultural treasures. In 2001, there were about 130 million Muslims in India.

Sikhism, a religion which combined some ideas from Hinduism and Islam, started about 300 years ago. As of 2001 there were 35 million Sikhs.

Some Christians came in very early times, others came when Portuguese traders came to India in the seventeenth century, and during the Dutch and British colonial periods. Christian missionaries arrived in the early 1800s along with the colonists.

Buddhism originated in northern India. Up to the ninth century AD, followers of this way of life amounted to several hundred million. Why Buddhism declined in India is disputed. Muslim invaders are supposed to have caused massive destruction of monasteries, statues, and libraries. Clashes with Islamic and Hindu fundamentalists may have left Indian Buddhists open to genocide and conversion. Many Indian Buddhists escaped to China, Sri Lanka (formally Ceylon), Tibet, and other Asian countries where Buddhism grew and became the dominant religion.
Satyagraha

Gandhi’s satyagraha and fast were in accordance with Hindu beliefs. These practices came to dominate India’s struggle for independence.

Satyagraha has served as a major tactic in the nationalistic movement in India in their fight against British colonisation. Satyagraha is the active refusal to obey certain laws, demands and commands of a government or of an occupying power without resorting to physical violence.

Followers of Satyagraha choose to deliberately break certain laws, such as by forming a peaceful blockade or occupying a facility illegally. Protesters do so knowing that they will be arrested, or even attacked or beaten by the authorities. Protesters undergo training in advance on how to react to arrest or attack, and not to retaliate or hit back. Gandhi outlined the following rules:

1. A satyagraha, i.e. a civil resister, will harbour no anger.
2. He will suffer the anger of the opponent.
3. In so doing he will put up with assaults from the opponent, never retaliate; but he will not submit, out of fear of punishment or the like, to any order given in anger.
4. If any person in authority seeks to arrest a civil resister, the person will voluntarily submit to the arrest and he will not resist the attachment or removal of his own property, if any, when it is sought to be confiscated by the authorities.
5. If the civil resister has any property in his possession as a trustee, he will refuse to surrender it, even though in defending it he might lose his life. He will however, never retaliate.
6. Non-retaliation includes swearing and cursing.
7. Therefore a civil resister will never insult his opponent, and therefore also not take part in many of the newly coined cries that are contrary to the spirit of ahimsa.
8. A civil resister will not salute the Union Jack.
9. In the course of the struggle if anyone insults an official or commits an assault upon him, a civil resister will protect such official from the insult or attack even at the risk of his life.

Examples of when Satyagraha was used

1. Dandi March, 12 March 1930
   The Salt March started on 12 March and ended on 5 April 1930. Gandhi led thousands of people to the sea to collect their own salt rather than pay the salt tax. The march started from Gandhi’s ashram in Ahmedabad through to Dandi.

   Gandhi maintained that he and his fellow marchers were walking in the name of God. There were 70 marchers at first, but several thousand by the time they reached the sea. When they arrived in Dandi, Gandhi bent down to the water’s edge and picked up a handful of salt.

   Thousands of peaceful demonstrators then gathered handfuls of salt – though to do so was totally illegal. Salt from the sea was sold in the villages and towns, and the arrests began. Soon there were 60 000 Indians in prison. Gandhi was arrested on the 5 May 1930.
Dharasana, 21 May 1930

Dharasana, where there was a British salt factory, became the target of the next satyagraha. Unarmed volunteers confronted the police who were guarding the factory. In the bloody scenes that followed the police killed two demonstrators and wounded hundreds, but as each row fell, a new one came up behind to replace it.

3 Khilafat Movement

This was another non-violent movement in the struggle against British colonisation and it united the Hindus and the Muslims. In November 1919, the movement was set up to support the Khilafat in Turkey.
Muslim League

The Muslim League, a political party in British India and later in Pakistan, was the driving force behind the creation of a Muslim state on the Indian sub-continent but failed to provide a stable government when that goal was achieved.

Muslims were about 20% of the population of British India, and were the majority of the population in Bengal, Kashmir, North West Frontier Province and Punjab.

In the late nineteenth century, because of the Indian nationalist movement, the Indian National Congress was founded in 1885. Although the Congress made genuine efforts to enlist the Muslim community in its struggle for Indian independence, it remained a Hindu-dominated organisation, and Muslims feared that an independent united India would inevitably be dominated by Hindus. Although some Muslims were active in the Congress, the majority of Muslim leaders did not trust the Hindu majority.

A turning point came in 1900 when the British administrators of the largest Indian state, the United Province, gave in to Hindu demands and made Hindi the official language, in place of Urdu, which had been the language of the Mogul emperors. This seemed to confirm Muslim fears that the Hindu majority would suppress Muslim culture and religion in an independent India.

The League’s moderate attitude toward Britain and its dislike for violence annoyed some Muslim radicals, who were made angry by what they saw as the dishonesty of British rule in India. The Indian National Congress had not supported the partition of Bengal, which would have allowed separate representation of Muslims and Hindus, but the Muslim League had supported it. When the Indian National Congress protested, the British withdrew the move to partition in 1911. This annoyed the Muslim League and made some members more opposed to the British and to the Indian National Congress.

In just a few years the League had become the only representative body of Indian Muslims. Jinnah became its president in 1916, and negotiated the Lucknow Pact with the Congress, in which the Congress agreed to the principles of separate electorates and weighted representation for the Muslim community. But Jinnah broke with Congress in 1919 when the Congress leader, Gandhi, started a non-co-operation campaign against the British, which Jinnah disapproved of. Jinnah also became convinced that the Congress would withdraw its support for separate electorates for Muslims.

Jinnah stayed away from politics after the failure of his attempt to form a Hindu–Muslim alliance, and he spent most of the 1920s in Britain. In 1930 the Muslim League first put forward the demand for a separate Muslim state in India, to be known as Pakistan. The name Pakistan was formed by taking letters from several place names; Punjab, Afghan Frontier, Kashmir, Baluchistan, parts of India where Muslims were the majority.

The ‘two-nation theory’, the belief that Hindus and Muslims were two different nations who could not live in one, gained popularity among Muslims. The two-state solution was rejected by the Congress leaders, who favoured a united, secular, democratic India.

In 1927, the British proposed a constitution for India as recommended by the Simon Commission, but they failed to get agreement from all parties. The British then turned the matter over to the League and the Congress, and in 1928, an All-Parties Congress was held in Delhi. The attempt failed, but two more conferences
were held. At the Bombay conference in May, it was agreed that a small committee should work on the constitution. The respected Congress leader Mortilal Nehru (father of Jawaharlal) headed the committee, which included two Muslims.

The League, however, rejected the proposal of the ‘Nehru Report’ because it gave too little representation (one quarter) to Muslims – the League had demanded at least one-third representation in the legislature. Jinnah reported a ‘parting of the ways’ after reading the report, and relations between the Congress and the League began to sour.

**Campaign for Pakistan**

At a League conference in Lahore in 1940 Jinnah said: ‘Hindus and Muslims belong to two different religions, philosophies, social customs and literature . . . It is quite clear that Hindus and Muslims derive their inspiration from different sources of history. They have different epics, different heroes and different episodes . . . To yoke together two such nations under a single state, one as a numerical minority and the other as a majority, must lead to growing discontent and final destruction of any fabric that may be so built up for the government of such a state.’

At Lahore the League formally recommitted itself to creating an independent Muslim state including Sindh, Punjab, the North West Frontier Province and Bengal that would be ‘wholly autonomous and sovereign.’ The resolution guaranteed protection for non-Muslim religions in those regions.

The principles of the Lahore Resolution formed the foundation for Pakistan’s first constitution. Talks between Jinnah and Gandhi in 1944 in Bombay failed to achieve agreement. These were the last attempt to reach a single-state solution.

In the 1940s Jinnah emerged as the recognised leader of the Indian Muslims and was popularly known as ‘Qaid-e-Azam’ (Great Leader).

In the Constituent Assembly elections of 1946 the League won 425 out of 496 seats reserved for Muslims on a policy of Pakistan, and an implied threat of secession if this was not granted. Gandhi and Nehru, who with the election of a Labour government in Britain in 1945 saw independence within reach, were totally opposed to dividing India. They knew that the Hindu masses, who saw Mother India as a holy and indivisible entity, could never agree to such a thing.

By 1946 the British had neither the will, nor the financial or military power, to hold India any longer, and the new British Prime Minister, Clement Attlee, wanted to keep the promises to all Indians that if they helped Britain in World War II, Britain would speed up the steps to independence. Jinnah knew that independence was near. He made it clear that he would plunge India into chaos if India was not partitioned to create a Muslim state, and the British could not resist this threat. Political deadlock followed in the Constituent Assembly, and Clement Attlee sent a special mission to India to mediate the situation.

When these talks broke down, Attlee sent Earl Mountbatten, India’s last viceroy, to negotiate the partition of India and immediate British withdrawal. Mountbatten told Gandhi and Nehru that if they did not accept partition there would be civil war, and they were reluctantly forced to agree.

When British troops and administrators left India civil war did break out in Punjab and other areas of mixed population and there were many riots when Hindus and Muslims killed each other.
The Muslim League survived as a minor party in India after partition, but later splintered into several groups, the most important of which was the Indian Union Muslim League.

After partition, a minority of Muslims became citizens of independent India, and a minority of Hindus became citizens of Pakistan.

**Muhammad Ali Jinnah**

Born in 1876 into a business family in Karachi. They were new converts to Islam.

The family moved to Bombay and Jinnah was sent to England to complete his law degree. Jinnah entered into politics as a moderate Congressman. He later joined the Muslim League but kept his membership in the Congress Party.

He was a wealthy man who dressed elegantly and did not like or support Gandhi’s political activities. In 1935 he became the leader of the Muslim League. In his negotiations with the British for home rule, Jinnah insisted on the creation of Pakistan. He was sworn in as Pakistan’s first Governor-General but his health was poor. He died 18 months later in 1948.

**Jawaharlal Nehru**

Born in 1889 into a respected and wealthy family in Kashmir. The family belonged to the highest caste. His father had a very successful legal business, so young Nehru was sent to England to get a good education. On his return to India in 1919, he was completely won over by Gandhi and his methods of satyagraha. Nehru became a devoted disciple of Gandhi, frequently jailed by the British.

After World War II, he became the leader of the Congress in its negotiations with the British. After independence in 1947 he was India’s first prime minister, remaining in office until his death in 1964.

**Activity 1**

Answer the following questions in a paragraph.

1. How many main religions are practised in India? Do you think that the different religions made it hard to achieve national unity?
2. Gandhi’s satyagrahas were in line with the principles of the Hindu religion. How successful was satyagraha? Give examples.
3. What was the significance of the Dandi March in 1930? What were the results?
4. When was the Muslim League set up?
5. Who was the popular leader of the Muslim League?
6. Why was the League set up? What role did religion play in the formation of the League?
7 How successful was Gandhi in trying to unify the Muslims and the Hindus? What actions did he undertake to try and bring this about?

8 Explain the role Mohammad Ali Jinnah played in the formation of the Muslim state called Pakistan.

Activity 2
Outline the steps taken by the Muslim League to achieve a separate nation. Arrange it in a chronological order, see example below.

1916: League formed and Jinnah was the first president.
1919:
1928:
1930:
1947:
What role did the foreign powers play in solving problems?

The foreign power that most influenced India was Britain itself. It set up conferences usually initiated by Gandhi and the Congress. The conferences were to discuss the future of India as an independent state. The biggest difficulty confronted by both the Indians and the British was the question of the partition as proposed by the Muslim League, whose president was Mohammed Ali Jinnah.

There were numerous conferences but the Simla conference in June 1945 was the one that paved the way for the partition of India.

**Simla Conference 1945**

At this conference, the British had agreed on a provincial government to be elected from the local Indian population. The problem was that Jinnah wanted the members of the Muslim league to be the Muslim representatives in the new provincial government. This would mean over-riding the Muslims in the National Congress. The National Congress was an all-Indian political organisation dedicated to the struggle for independence. As a result, the negotiations were deadlocked.

**Simla Conference 1946**

In March 1946, Sir Stafford Cripps headed another mission to India and the delegates and the discussions were deadlocked again because they could not agree on the issue under discussion. Jinnah again proposed partition, and the Cripps Mission concluded that a partition was impossible because Pakistan would be divided into two parts separated by more than a thousand kilometres and it would be ungovernable as a result.

The Cripps Mission decided that a provincial government was needed for a united India. Wavell put Nehru in charge of the new government, and Jinnah refused to have anything to do with it. Instead, he issued a warning that there would be ‘Direct Action’ on 16 August 1946 if a separate state for Muslims was not granted. Four days later, 5000 people were dead in Calcutta and 15 000 wounded. In Bengal, Muslims were slaughtering Hindus, forcing them to convert to Islam, and raping the women. In Bihar, the Hindu majority were killing thousands of Muslims. The new state of India did not yet exist and already it was tearing itself apart.
Last Viceroy To India

On 20 February 1947, India’s last viceroy announced that the British would leave India. Many Anglo-Indians (people who were part British and part Indian), who had experience and hoped for good jobs in the government of independent India, fled to Britain and other English-speaking countries. The British were willing to let go because they could not handle the colony any more and it was proving to be more expensive to run it due to the ongoing conflicts. The date of independence was June 1948.

Figure 3.4.1 Indian flag being raised in place of the Union Jack
Figure 3.4.2 Modern day India, Pakistan and Kashmir
What are the long-term effects of colonialism on a former colony as evident in contemporary conflict?

The long-term effects of British colonisation are evident in the ongoing conflict between India and Pakistan over Kashmir. The partition of the Indian subcontinent in 1947 not only promoted open hostility between the two religions but also destroyed the unity of the country. It also meant that what Sir Stafford Cripps warned about in 1946 came about. The Muslim state of Pakistan suffered from disunity, because it was two geographical regions, separated by 1000 kilometres of Indian territory. Because West Pakistan did not appreciate its problems, East Pakistan broke away to become a separate Muslim nation in 1971. West Pakistan became Pakistan and the former East Pakistan became Bangladesh.

**Important Words**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disputed territory:</td>
<td>a territory where two or more countries are fighting over it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceded:</td>
<td>to give up your right to a property or land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cease-fire:</td>
<td>an order to stop fighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disguise:</td>
<td>changing appearance so that the opponent may not recognise you</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kashmir**

![Figure 3.5.1 Map of Kashmir showing line of control and disputed areas](image)

Figure 3.5.1 Map of Kashmir showing line of control and disputed areas
Kashmir is a region in the northern part of the Indian subcontinent. The region is currently divided amongst three countries: Pakistan controls the northwest portion (Northern Area, Pakistan and Azad), India controls the central and southern portion (Jammu and Kashmir) and the People’s Republic of China controls the northeastern portion. Though these regions are in practice administered by their respective claimants, India has never formally recognized the accession of the areas claimed by Pakistan and China. Pakistan views the entire Kashmir region as disputed territory, and does not consider India’s claim to it to be valid.

The Events Of Partition After British Rule

In 1947, India gained independence from British rule. It was decided that two countries would be formed, Pakistan and India, where Pakistan would have a majority Muslim population, and India a majority Hindu population. It had been agreed that autonomous regions like Kashmir could decide to either join India or Pakistan.

Kashmir, which had a predominantly Muslim population, was one of these autonomous states, but it was ruled by a Hindu maharaja. After partition, he delayed his decision whether to join India or Pakistan, hoping to somehow keep his kingdom independent. Not long after partition, Pakistan invaded Kashmir using tribal guerrillas and Pakistani army regulars disguised as tribals. The reason for this invasion was perhaps Pakistan’s fears that Singh, the maharaja, would join India, or else a Pakistani desire to take Kashmir before India was able to reinforce it.

At this stage, the maharaja, realizing his dream of independent Kashmir was crushed, asked for the aid of the Indian army. India promised aid if the maharaja would sign the instrument of accession to India, which he did. This gave Kashmir to India.

The resulting war, the First Kashmir War, lasted until 1948 when India asked the United Nations to ask Pakistan to leave occupied Kashmir. Thus the United Nations negotiated a ceasefire, dividing Kashmir between Indian-held and Pakistani-held territory. The United Nations pressed for a plebiscite (a general vote among people to see what they want) among the entire Kashmiri population, which was denied by India for various reasons. However Pakistan still claimed a free plebiscite in Kashmir under the UN as the only solution.

In 1962 the People’s Republic of China attacked India in the Sino–Indian War. China took land that it continues to occupy and which it calls Aksai Chin.

In 1965 and 1971 heavy fighting again broke out between India and Pakistan. The Indo–Pakistani War of 1971 resulted in the defeat of Pakistan in East Pakistan (now Bangladesh), and the capture of many soldiers by India in that region. However, in Kashmir and West Pakistan, the nations fought to another draw. This led to the Simla Accord in 1972 between India and Pakistan. In this accord, both countries agreed to settle all issues by peaceful means and mutual discussions, and India returned captured Pakistani territory in Kashmir and 90 000 Pakistani prisoners of war as a gesture of good will.

Increased Terrorist Attacks

There were increased terrorist attacks by rebel groups as well as individuals who did not believe in negotiation. They had seen many conferences and negotiations with no real end results, so they decided to take matters into their own hands.
**Human Suffering**

Many Indians died during British colonisation and afterwards as a consequence of the partition. As we have already seen, Hindus were massacred by the Muslims as they tried to move away from the Muslim dominated area; this was also true of Muslims who tried to move away from Hindu dominated areas.

There were many homeless people and refugees as a result of the partition. Many did not die from the violence but from diseases due to poverty and bad sanitation and because some areas they lived in or moved to were not good for growing crops and other products.

**Activity 1**

Fill in the spaces in the table with either the *Cause* or the *Consequences*. The first is done for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal fat was used to grease the rifle bullets. Cow are sacred to the Hindu religion</td>
<td>1857–1859 Sepoy Rebellion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1928 Nehru Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dandi March 1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partition of India in 1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indo–Pakistani War</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 3 – Summary

Think through what you have learned in this chapter. Ask yourself if you can provide specific in-depth answers to each of the focusing questions.

1 I can understand the terms and how they relate to the chapter.
   a colonialism  
   d Hartal  
   g guerrilla warfare  
   j independence  
   b satyagraha  
   e nationalism  
   h globalisation  
   k dominion  
   c massacre  
   f non-violent  
   i partition  
   l Hindu

2 I can describe the nature of British colonialism in India as a major cause of conflict in the twentieth century.

3 I can analyse the factors behind the emergence of nationalism as a response to foreign influence in India.

4 I can discuss the impact of religious beliefs and practices on the movement undertaken by Gandhi in the fight for independence.

5 I can discuss and evaluate the role of foreign powers in solving conflict.

6 I can analyse the long-term effects of colonialism on India as evident in the ongoing India and Pakistan civil war and the feud over the disputed state of Kashmir.
Part 4

International Relations

Achievement Objective
You will know and understand different ideologies that have shaped international relations.

Focusing Questions
- What were the respective roles of countries that took part in World War I (1914–1918)?
- How important was the system of alliances in promoting diplomatic, political, economic and social relations during World War I?
- What were the respective roles of countries that participated in World War II (1939–1945)?
- What was the relationship between the major powers in the post World War II period?
- What were some of the major international organisations that were formed to uphold and preserve world peace and security? What role did they play?
- What has been the impact of international organisations on the member countries?

Key Concepts:
- International Relations
- Collective security
- Ideologies
- Balance of Power
- Alliances

Here are some of the important concepts that you will be learning in this unit. Think about them and look out for them as you learn about the relationships between some of the major countries in the world and how they have affected the world today.
Introduction

In this Part, we will look at the different ideologies that shaped international relations resulting in the outbreak of the First World War. The inter-war period will be looked at as well as the reasons why international relations failed to uphold and maintain peace and why a bigger world war broke out twenty-one years after the first one.

This Part will deal with international affairs, ‘great’ wars and international organisations. It will examine the internal development of certain states as well as their foreign relations with other foreign powers resulting in alliances being formed and broken.

Even though this Part will mainly look at events in Europe it is interesting to note that Sāmoa played a significant role in some of the major events of the world. Not only was Sāmoa the first German territory to be occupied by Allied troops (seized by New Zealand troops under the instructions of Great Britain) in World War I but it was also the first Pacific Island to demand the right for ‘self-determination’ and re-establish its independence at the end of World War II.
What were the respective roles of countries involved in World War I (1914–1918)?

How important was the system of alliances in promoting diplomatic, political, economic and social relations during World War I?

**Background: Roots Of The Conflict**

In order to understand the causes of both World Wars (World War I: 1914–1918) and (World War II: 1939–1945) it is important to start with the creation of modern day Germany.

Although German people had been in Europe for over a thousand years, it wasn’t until 1871 that Germany became a united and a powerful nation. Prior to 1871, Germany as a country did not exist. It was a loose collection of 39 states with German-speaking people. Prussia was the most powerful German state and its leaders wanted to unite all the smaller German states into one powerful country under the leadership of Prussia. This led to three wars in which Prussia was victorious and resulted in the unification of modern Germany.

1. 1864 – Austria, a German-speaking nation, sided with Prussia to seize the northern states of Schleswig and Holstein from Denmark.
2. 1866 – Prussia turned on Austria, and defeated it in a seven-week war. Austria had hoped to lead the German states.

The newly crowned King of Prussia, Wilhelm, was declared ruler of the new united Germany as Kaiser (Emperor) and Otto von Bismarck became the Chancellor (Prime Minister).

**Creation Of System Of Alliances**

In order for the newly unified country to survive, Bismarck had to keep France weak. The Chancellor then began creating a network of alliances. Bismarck knew that France would be keen to avenge the humiliation of 1870–71 and the loss of Alsace and Lorraine.
Bismarck’s first alliance was in 1873, which was a Treaty of Friendship called the **Dreikaiserbund** (League of the Three Emperors). However Austria–Hungary and Russia quarrelled over the area called the Balkans (see the map on page 31) and the League came to an end in 1878.

The very next year, in 1879 Germany signed the secret **Dual Alliance** with Austria in order to replace the *Dreikaiserbund*. The pact was a defensive alliance whereby Germany and Austria–Hungary agreed to help each other if attacked by Russia. Italy was to join in 1882, turning it into the **Triple Alliance**.

The crafty politician, Bismarck, however, worked hard to maintain friendly relationships with both Russia and Britain. In a separate alliance in 1887, Russia was bound to Germany in the **Reinsurance Treaty**. France was therefore isolated, with no alliances and feeling very powerless.

However, events in the late 1880s were to change the stability and the powerful position that Germany had worked so hard to create. In 1888 Wilhelm II was crowned Kaiser. Vain, arrogant and unpredictable, Wilhelm II desired power and prestige. Bismarck who was a realist pursued a foreign policy – **Realpolitik** in which Germany was to remain land-based in Europe. The new Kaiser, however, wanted a world policy or **Weltpolitik**, which would turn Germany into a world power with a large colonial empire just like Great Britain. Germany wanted to set up colonies in Africa, Asia and the South Pacific.

In 1890 Bismarck was forced to resign by the new Kaiser. The Reinsurance Treaty with Russia was not renewed, leaving Russia free to pursue friendly relations with Germany’s worst enemy – France. Russia then turned to France and the *Dual Entente* was signed in 1894. In it the two countries pledged to help each other if attacked by Germany. Bismarck’s worst fears became a reality. France’s isolation came to an end. Europe was now split into two rival camps.

---

**Major European Powers Split Into Two Armed Camps – The Triple Alliance And The Triple Entente**

**The System of Alliances**

The system of alliances became important and powerful when countries sought out other countries to become their allies. Europe was defined by rival systems of military and friendly alliances. These alliances became dangerous because they increased suspicion and fear. More importantly it meant that a war between two nations was likely to spread to include many more countries. Thus small and localised conflicts could expand to become major wars.

Britain had long pursued a ‘*policy of splendid isolation*’ in which it preferred to focus on looking after its huge empire of colonies. In the 1890s Britain was alarmed that its two closest colonial rivals, France and Russia, had come together in 1894 to form the *Dual Entente*.

Britain then turned to Japan in 1902 and signed the **Anglo Japanese Alliance**. In addition, Britain’s colonial differences with her traditional enemy France were patched up because Britain and France saw Germany as the new enemy and the *Entente Cordiale* was signed in 1904. It was a friendly understanding where France agreed to freely let Britain pursue interests in Egypt, and in return Britain agreed to let France do the same in Morocco.
Britain and Russia came to an understanding and signed the Anglo–Russian Entente of 1907 thereby creating the Triple Entente.

Europe was now divided into two camps, with the Triple Entente on one side and the Triple Alliance on the other.

After the Triple Entente was formed, Germany became concerned and complained that it was encircled by a ring of hostile nations whose aim was to prevent Germany having a share of world power.

The Moroccan Crisis, 1905

Determined to break up the Entente Cordiale, Kaiser Wilhelm II visited the Moroccan port of Tangier and declared that Morocco should be independent of France. The event was finally settled when a conference in Algeciras in 1906 was called. However, instead of breaking up France and Britain, the Kaiser’s actions actually pushed them closer together and public opinion in both countries turned against Germany.

In the section on the relationship among countries in the Balkans, you learned how the clash of the different ethnic groups wanting independence, in the then European powers of Austria–Hungary and Russia and the Balkans, led to World War I. Review this again to understand how Germany got involved in World War I.
Arms Race

Kaiser Wilhelm II’s policy of imperialism (empire building) meant that Germany needed to increase her arms spending particularly on its navy, because it needed a navy to ‘keep order’ in overseas colonies it had or hoped to gain. An arms race started as European powers increased their spending on arms. In Britain the First Sea Lord, Sir John Fisher, launched a new battleship called the HMS Dreadnought that could outgun and out-race any existing battleships.

The launching of the HMS Dreadnought turned British–German naval rivalry into a full-scale naval race. As Britain and Germany were heavily industrialised nations they could lead the world in producing large armour-plated battleships.

Germany felt it was being encircled by hostile powers and decided to launch its own fleet of ‘dreadnoughts’. Britain replied by speeding up her own shipbuilding programme. A full naval race had begun.

Figure 4.1.2 Bar Graph Spending on Armaments 1872–1912
Agadir 1911

In 1911 the Sultan (leader) of Morocco asked the French to help him crush a revolt by rebel tribesmen. Germany, still sour from the diplomatic defeat in the 1906 Algeciras Conference sent a gunboat to the Moroccan port of Agadir. The Germans were sure the French planned to take over Morocco.

The Germans used the gunboat as a threat to be compensated with territories in Central Africa before Germany would allow the French to take over Morocco.

The plan badly misfired when the British warned Germany that they would go to war with Germany unless Germany withdrew its threat to France. As a result Germany accepted as compensation two strips of territory in the French Congo that were much smaller than they originally wanted. For the Germans, this event was another disaster and more humiliating than the event in 1906.

Schlieffen Plan

In the few years before World War I, every European nation made detailed plans on what to do if war broke out. Fighting units with arms, clothing, food and other vital equipment had to be made ready. Then they had to be transported to the battlefront as quickly as possible. With the landmass of Russia, it would take a long time to transport thousands if not millions of troops to the battlefront.

Mobilisation

Getting an army ready for war is called mobilisation. Quick mobilisation was important to win a war. The army which mobilised first could strike and might even win the war before the enemy was ready. In Europe, the use of the railway became the key to high-speed mobilisation on land. The greatest disadvantage of using the railway was its rigid timetable. Once a plan was started, it was virtually impossible to change it without throwing the rest of the timetable into total confusion.

The Schlieffen Plan

The designer of the plan was Count Alfred von Schlieffen. The Germans believed that at some stage Germany would go to war with France. They knew the French had not forgotten the humiliation of the defeat in the 1870 Franco–Prussian War. As France was allied to Russia any future war would therefore be a two-front war with both France and Russia.

The designer, Schlieffen, believed that Germany was not strong enough to fight both sides at the same time, i.e. to divide the German army into two, and fight both Russia and France at the same time.

He had the answer to this problem. Russia being a massive country would take about six weeks to mobilise, therefore Schlieffen worked out a plan to defeat France first and then turn all of Germany’s fighting soldiers and resources to Russia. He believed that Germany could crush France in six weeks and still have time to move to the Eastern front to face the Russian armies who would still be organising.

Also Schlieffen knew that because Russia was not as industrialised as Germany it would rely on railways and horses to move troops and equipment. Germany also had many motor vehicles (trucks) to more rapidly move its troops and equipment.
Figure 4.1.3 Map and route of the Schlieffen attack

The plan had two major flaws. Firstly, there was no plan for a war with Russia only. It was incredible that a war with Russia meant that Germany had to first attack France. Secondly, to defeat France quickly, Germany had to avoid the heavily defended and fortified French-German border.

To solve the problem of avoiding the heavily fortified area along the Rhine, Germany would invade France from the North. This meant that German soldiers would go through Belgium. Belgium was a neutral country, small in area and population, Belgium’s right to stay neutral was guaranteed by a treaty signed by Britain that it would defend Belgium if another country attacked it. By planning to invade France through Belgium, Germany was now risking a war with Britain.

By 1914 all the major European powers had increased their rearmament programmes.
The Final Crisis And Road To War

The Sarajevo Assassination starts war
You will already have learned two events in the Balkans, which led to the situation where Austria–Hungary was determined to fight Serbia, and how Germany gave Austria a blank cheque.

The Kaiser also seemed to think that the Russians would not back Serbia. More significantly, the Germans thought that Russia was not quite ready for a war.

Russia Intervenes
Two days after Austria and Germany began war on Serbia on 30 July the Tsar ordered the Russian armies to mobilise (get ready for war). Encouraged by French assurances, the Russian military preparations had partially begun in secret five days before.

Germany Mobilises
The war plans of Germany meant that it had to strike as quickly as possible. Mobilisation for the German army meant war. Eleven thousand trains carrying troops, arms and supplies were now to be sent to the French frontier via Belgium.

If Belgium objected then plans for an immediate invasion would be actioned. Time was critical, Germany could not afford to delay the attack as the train timetables were very rigid.

They also had to defeat France in six weeks, before attacking Russia. Any longer and the Russians would have the time they needed to mobilise and attack Germany. Germany could not afford to have two wars at two fronts – the western border with France and her eastern border with Russia

So on 31 July 1914, Germany issued two ultimatums, the first was given to Russia to demobilise within 12 hours, and in the second, Germany gave France 18 hours to promise their neutrality if a Russo–German war did break out.

War Begins (August 1–4)
The German ultimatum to Russia expired on the 1 August 1914 and Germany began to mobilise. That same day the French rejected Germany’s ultimatum because they were allies with Russia and they did not trust Germany. France ordered full mobilisation.

On 2 August, the Germans invaded the small independent country of Luxembourg and presented an ultimatum to Belgium demanding the right to send troops through their territory.

On 3 August, Belgium rejected Germany’s ultimatum and appealed to the signatories of the 1839 treaty for help. That same day German troops crossed into Belgium.

On 4 August, the British sent an ultimatum to Berlin. They demanded that Germany call off its invasion of Belgium within five hours. At midnight on 4 August, the ultimatum expired. The Germans did not reply or call off their invasion of Belgium. Great Britain declared war on Germany.

In just five weeks, a Balkan dispute had escalated into a European war. Eventually nations from almost every part of the world would be involved. The First World War had indeed begun.
Countdown To War

23 July  Austria presents ultimatum to Serbia to be accepted within 48 hours.

28 July  Austria declares war on Serbia

30 July  Tsar of Russia begins mobilisation.

31 July  i  Germany sends ultimatum to Russia to demobilise within 12 hours.

           ii  Germany sends ultimatum to France to pledge their neutrality if Russia and Germany go to war.

1 August  Germany declares war on Russia and mobilises.

2 August  Germany invades Luxembourg and sends ultimatum to Belgium, demanding the right to send troops through their country.

3 August  Belgium rejects Germany’s ultimatum and seeks help from the signatories of the 1839 Treaty. German troops cross into Belgium.

4 August  Britain sends an ultimatum to Berlin to call off its invasion within 5 hours.

4 August  (midnight)  Ultimatum expires. Great Britain declares war on Germany.
Reasons And Roles Of Countries Involved In The First World War

The Major Powers

Britain
Britain did not want war. Rather it was concerned with the balance of power. It was important for Britain to maintain the status quo. Even though Britain was part of the Entente and was concerned with the naval rivalry with Germany, by 1912 the Anglo–German relations were actually improving. Britain therefore was pulled into World War I when the ultimatum of 4 August for Germany to stop the invasion of Belgium expired. Germany’s failure to pull out of Belgium led to Britain’s declaration of war on 4 August 1914.

France
France too did not want war. The loss of Alsace–Lorraine in the 1870–71 Franco–Prussian War was a bitter blow for the French, but it wasn’t a good enough reason for France to go to war with Germany at the time. France was not quite ready to wage a war in 1911, the army did not have sufficient numbers and Britain, the other Entente partner, was not committed militarily.

Russia
Russia had been humiliated over its loss of influence in the Balkans in 1908–1909 and was determined to ensure that it would never be in that situation again. A massive rearmament programme began. However, Russia did not plan to start a war with the Central Powers. When news of the assassination reached Russia it decided that if Austria invaded Serbia, Russia would order a partial mobilisation to frighten off Austria but not to provoke Germany. However, the Tsar of Russia, persuaded by his advisers, ordered general mobilisation on 30 July. Mobilisation did not mean war for Russia – but Germany reacted as if Russia had declared war on Germany by attacking Russia. Russia did not want war in 1914 as it wasn’t quite ready, but once Germany attacked Russia it had to defend itself.

The Triple Entente partners, Britain and France, and now Russia were all reacting to the events in the Balkans rather than making them.

Austria
Austria’s main concern was to keep her country intact. Austrian politicians argued that only through the use of the military could they prevent the force of nationalism and the disintegration of the Austrian empire. Austria firmly believed that the survival of its multi-ethnic empire (11 nationalities of which 47% of the people were Slavs) was under tremendous threat by Serbia and pan-Slavism (the ideology promoted by Russia that all Slav-speaking peoples should be united under the leadership of Russia). On 28 July 1914 when the heir to the Austro–Hungarian Empire was assassinated, many Austrian nationalists argued that this was now the time to ‘solve the Serbian question’. However, Austria was reluctant to go to war with Serbia if it meant fighting Russia without the backing of Germany. Once the ‘blank cheque’ was received from the Kaiser (firm commitment from Germany to Austria regardless of the consequences) Austria was ready for war with Serbia. Germany, however, was not particularly interested in supporting the Austro–Hungarian empire but was more interested in a war against France and Russia.
Germany
Germany under Otto von Bismarck had enjoyed tremendous influence in international affairs, but it changed with the crowning of the new Kaiser – Wilhelm II. By 1912 Germany's foreign policy 'Weltpolitik' was in such diplomatic and financial chaos that it was quietly dropped. Germany recognised that its fate should be in Europe. The leaders of Germany believed that it was better for Germany to go to war in 1914 as it was more prepared than her two enemies – Russia and France. They believed that it was the only solution to being encircled by hostile enemies. Germany seized Alsace and Lorraine in 1870 and started the naval race and sparked off the Moroccan crisis, resulting in the formation of the Triple Entente. While it was not responsible for the Bosnian Crisis of 1908, it did threaten Russia with war. In the Sarajevo crisis, Austria would never have declared war on Serbia, risking a war with Russia, if Germany had not backed them. Finally it was the Schlieffen Plan that escalated the war from a European conflict to a major world war.

For many years after World War I many thought the war was Germany's 'fault'. However, historians now agree that it was because Europe:

i  was divided by many alliances, and

ii  countries, particularly the big powers, mistrusted each other and a large war was bound to happen; the 'fault' was not just Germany's, but everybody's.
Table 4.1.1 By 1917, the Great War (World War I) had divided Europe into two camps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allies</th>
<th>Central Powers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Britain and its empire</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Austria–Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy (joined in 1915)</td>
<td>Turkey (Ottoman Empire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia (signed separate peace</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Germany in 1917)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States (joined in 1917)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1.4 War escalates
Local War
Austria vs. Serbia (28 July)

Continental War
Austria and Germany vs. Russia and France (1–3 August 1914)

World War
Britain declares war (4 August 1914)

Timeline

1879 Dual Alliance (signed between Austria and Germany)
1882 Triple Alliance (signed between Austria, Germany and Italy)
1890 Bismarck resigned from being Prime Minister of Germany
1894 Franco–Russian Alliance (signed between France and Russia)
1902 Anglo–Japanese Alliance (signed between Britain and Japan)
1903 Entente Cordiale: (signed between France and Britain)
1904 First Moroccan Crisis
1905 Schlieffen plan of invasion (via Belgium)
1906 Algeciras Conference
1907 Anglo–Russian agreement, Triple Entente
1908 Bosnia–Herzegovina annexed by Austria–Hungary
1911 Second Moroccan Crisis
1912 Outbreak of the First Balkan War
1913 Outbreak of the Second Balkan War
1914 Franz Ferdinand assassinated (28 June)
6 Jul Germany's famous 'blank cheque' given to Austria–Hungary
23 Jul Austrian ultimatum to Serbia
25 Jul Serbia replies to ultimatum
28 Jul Austria declared war on Serbia
30 Jul Russia calls for general mobilisation
   French troops sent within 10 kilometres of German border
31 Jul German mobilisation and ultimatum to Russia and France
1 Aug Germany declared war on Russia
   French ordered general mobilisation
2 Aug Germans advanced into Luxembourg and requested passage through
   Belgium
3 Aug Belgium rejected Germany's request. Italy declared neutrality
   Germany declared war on France
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Aug</td>
<td>Austria–Hungary declared war on Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japan joined Entente Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Turkey joined Entente Powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Italy joined Entente Powers (May)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>USA joined Entente Powers. Up until then the United States had stayed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>out of the war, but it came in after German submarines sank its ships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(April)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What were the respective roles of countries that took part in World War II (1939–1945)?

On the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month (November) 1918, (popularly remembered as the eleventh of the eleventh of the eleventh) the fighting ended. World War I was the most spread out and destructive war ever experienced by the world at that time. People, politicians and soldiers were determined that such a war of that scale should never happen again. Yet in just over 20 years later, the world was to experience another bigger catastrophe – World War II.

### Background To The Conflict: The Peace Settlement

The peacemakers met in Paris on 18 January 1919 with the terms of peace to be written by a ‘council of ten’ – two representatives from each of the five main Allied Powers – (Britain, France, the USA, Italy and Japan). But on difficult issues the ‘Big Three’ made the decisions. The big three were Woodrow Wilson, president of the United States of America; David Lloyd George, Prime Minister of Britain; and George Clemenceau, Prime Minister of France. Germany hoped that the Treaty would follow Woodrow Wilson’s 12 Points’ below.

#### The Twelve Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Article I</td>
<td>Abandonment of secret diplomacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article II</td>
<td>Freedom of the seas and navigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article III</td>
<td>Removal of economic barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article IV</td>
<td>General disarmament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article V</td>
<td>Settlement of colonial demands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article VI</td>
<td>Evacuation of Russia by Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article VII</td>
<td>Belgian independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article VIII</td>
<td>Evacuation of France by Germany and the return of Alsace Lorraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article IX</td>
<td>Readjustment of Italian frontiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article X</td>
<td>Autonomy of nationalities within the Austro–Hungarian Empire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Article XI  Evacuation of Serbia, Montenegro and Romania; autonomy for non-Turkish nationalities within the Ottoman Empire (Turkey)

Article XII  Establishment of a general association of nations

The Big Three

Georges Clemenceau of France (1841–1929)

- Experienced the humiliation of the French defeat by Germany in 1871.
- Elected to the Chamber of Deputies in 1876.
- Premier (Prime Minister) 1906–09 and 1917–20.
- A nationalist and a fighter. Clemenceau was determined to make Germany pay and to be made as weak as possible.
- He was nicknamed ‘The Tiger’ because he was fierce in a debate.

David Lloyd George of Britain (1863–1945)

- Elected Liberal Member of Parliament (MP) – 1890.
- Chancellor of the Exchequer (Finance) – 1908.
- Prime Minister in a coalition government – 1916–22.
- Adopted a conciliatory approach at Versailles, tried to moderate the harsh demands of the French – 1919.
- Leader of the Liberals, remained sympathetic to German grievances in the 1930s but opposed appeasement – 1926–31.

Woodrow Wilson of America (1856–1924)

- Professor of Law.
- Elected Governor of New Jersey – 1910.
- Elected twenty-eighth President of the United States – 1912.
- Re-elected on slogan ‘He kept us out of War’ – 1917.
- Published the Fourteen Points – 1918.
- League Covenant included in the eventual peace – 1919 (June).
- Wilson suffered a stroke that left him paralysed and an invalid – 1919 (September).
When the peace treaty was presented for the German leaders to sign, they were shocked at the toughness of the treaty. President Wilson had wanted to concentrate on establishing peace among nations. However, Clemenceau successfully set conditions that made things as hard as possible for Germany. There was no opportunity for negotiation as the Allies threatened to invade Germany if the treaty was not signed within a month. Many Germans called the treaty the 'Diktat' (dictated peace).

Figure 4.2.1 Europe before World War I

Figure 4.2.2 Europe after World War I
The Peace Treaty – ‘Treaty of Versailles’

Main terms

**Land:**
Germany lost 13.5% of its land, 12.5% of its population (7 million of its people were lost to neighbouring countries), 16% of its coal production, 15% of its farming production and 48% of its iron production.

The treaty took away all of Germany’s overseas colonies, which included Western Samoa.

**Arms:**
Germany’s army was reduced to 100,000 men and forbidden to have tanks, submarines, or an air force, and was permitted only six battleships. In addition no military activities or troops were allowed in the Rhineland.

**War Guilt and Reparations:**
Germany had to sign a statement saying that Germany alone was guilty of starting the First World War. As the guilty party, Germany then had to pay war debts or reparations of £6.6 billion to the Allied Powers.

In addition Germany was not allowed to unite with Austria. The Treaty also included Wilson’s 14th point (creation of the League of Nations).

*Figure 4.2.3 Map of the Treaty of Versailles 1919*
Other Peace Treaties

Other peace treaties were signed with the other defeated Central Powers.

- Treaty of St Germain with defeated Austria 1919
- Treaty of Neuilly with defeated Bulgaria 1919
- Treaty of Sèvres with defeated Turkey 1920
- Treaty of Trianon with defeated Hungary 1920

The old Austro–Hungarian empire was carved up into four new nations: Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (which later became Yugoslavia). Bulgaria lost land, paid reparations and her army was reduced. The Turkish Empire was broken up. Some territories gained their independence and some were placed under British and French rule. The Kaiser of Germany abdicated (gave up the throne) and lived abroad; Germany abolished the monarchy and became a republic. It was called the Weimar Republic because Weimar was the city where the new constitution was drawn up.

The Russian Empire

Throughout the peace settlement, Russia was still trying to end the civil war that began in 1917 – the communist revolution. Russia lost part of its empire in which four new nations were formed, Finland, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Russia also lost territory to Poland, Czechoslovakia and Romania.

The Search For Peace And Security In The 1920s

The League of Nations

President Wilson had masterminded the creation of the League of Nations in 1920, which was to promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace and security.

However, the greatest blow to the success of the League was the absence of his own country the United States. Wilson was unable to persuade the US Senate to ‘agree’ or give their consent for America to join the League of Nations.

Germany and Russia were already excluded, Germany for causing the war and Russia for its communist beliefs.

With three great powers already excluded, the League was weakened from the start.

The League had to rely on only two large powers – Britain and France – and a collection of smaller powers.

The Covenant of the League of Nations:

- All members were guaranteed their territorial integrity
- All disputes were to be settled peacefully through discussion
- An attack on a member state was regarded as an attack on all
- All trade and financial ties would be sanctioned (cut) with any aggressor
- Members of the League would make up an army to defeat the aggressor
Attitudes towards the League:

- Britain was not fully committed to the League because of financial restraints and was concerned with its overseas empire.
- France regarded the League as a way to take revenge and control Germany, to keep it weak.
- Germany believed that the League’s main purpose was to enforce the Treaty of Versailles.
- Russia saw the League as a capitalist conspiracy to undermine the Communist revolution in Russia.

The League of Nations, however, had many early successes. It helped many refugees, and it mediated in border disputes between some of the new powers in Eastern Europe such as Poland and Lithuania, Greece and Bulgaria.

![The League of Nations](image)

**Figure 4.2.4 The League of Nations**

**Crisis in the Ruhr**

The reparation (fine for starting World War I) that Germany had to pay to the Allies was fixed at £6.6 billion (pounds sterling) in 1921. Two years later in 1923, Germany was in a financial crisis. Germany declared it could not make any further payments. The French then decided to invade (send an army to) the industrial region of the Ruhr in Germany to demand payment. The French plans backfired as the German workers were more determined than ever to go on strike in protest at the invasion.

The German government went bankrupt and the German currency, the ‘mark’, became worthless. The end result was runaway inflation. Prices became ridiculous when in 1918 the cost of a loaf of bread in Berlin was 0.63 marks but rose to 201 000 000 000 marks in November 1923.

Two events solved the crisis of 1923. Firstly, the appointment of a new German Chancellor (Prime Minister) in Gustav Stresemann and the work of an American general in the Dawes Plan.

Stresemann called off the strikes in the Rhineland, issued a new currency – the ‘rentenmark’ and agreed to carry on with reparations. France withdrew her troops and a spirit of reconciliation began.

In 1924 General Dawes gave practical help to the reparations deadlock. It paved the way for economic prosperity and stability.
The plan provided American loans to Germany from which Germany would be able to pay reparations to France and Britain. The two countries would then use the money to pay their war debts to the USA. This was called the ‘money-go-round’.

![Diagram of the money-go-round](image)

**Figure 4.2.5 Money-go-round/The Dawes Plan**

**Locarno Pact, 1925**

The following year, a pact between Germany, France, Belgium, Great Britain and Italy was signed at Locarno. The agreement was to settle Germany’s western frontier with France and Belgium as final and settled. Germany agreed.

The next year in 1926 Germany was invited and agreed to join the League of Nations.

**Kellogg–Briand Pact, 1928**

The French foreign minister, Briand, and the American secretary of state, Kellogg, devised an agreement for France and Germany to sign, promising to renounce (give up) war. Sixty-five countries signed. Countries were only allowed to fight in self-defence. Japan, Russia and America also signed.

**The Young Plan, 1929**

An international committee headed by an American banker, Owen Young, reduced Germany’s reparations from £6.6 billion to GBP£2 billion to be paid off by 1988.

**World Financial Crisis: Depression Of The 1930s**

The Great Depression was a period – 1929 to 1933 – when world trade, industrial production and employment took a huge dive. It reduced the volume of world trade by about 70% and had a huge impact on the economies of the rest of the world.

The Great Depression started in 1929 in the USA, where shares on the American stock market were already over-valued. Bankers and businessmen who had money tied up in stocks and shares became bankrupt. Many companies had to close down and unemployment rose to enormously high levels. With many countries, companies and people in financial ruin, some Germans were desperate enough to listen to any party or government that offered a way out of this crisis.

**The Depression Impacted on the Leadership in Japan and Germany**

**Japan**

The effect of the depression on the Japanese economy was devastating. Export prices for its vital silk crop fell by 50% and by 1931 half of Japan’s factories were
shut down. People became restless and unrest soon spread to the army. The military thought the answer was for a new Asian and Pacific empire controlled by Japan.

The overseas target for Japan was China. Japan had owned industries in the northern province of Manchuria, so in 1931, Japanese troops deliberately set off explosives at the Japanese-owned railway near Mukden. They then blamed the Chinese for the explosion and used this as an excuse to invade Manchuria.

China protested to the League of Nations, which sent Lord Lytton to investigate. The League of Nations declared Japan was the aggressor but was unable to take effective measures or sanctions to stop Japan. The League of Nation’s reputation and prestige was destroyed and the Japanese withdrew from it in 1933. By 1937 the Japanese were invading all of China.

Germany
The world depression had a huge effect in Germany. Political life became increasingly violent and disorderly. In 1932 it was difficult to form a stable government to cope with the problems that threatened to destroy her economy. In desperation many Germans turned to Adolf Hitler and the Nazis for leadership. So successful was Hitler in exploiting the wave of nationalist emotion and the art of propaganda that by mid 1933, Hitler had set up a one-party totalitarian state. Hitler’s simple promise of bread and work for the ordinary Germans gave people hope. He also knew that most Germans thought the Treaty of Versailles was unfair to Germany and promised to abolish it and make Germany strong again.

Over the next six years, Hitler solved the unemployment problem through his rearmament and public works policy. His foreign policy of _lebensraum_, abolition of the Treaty of Versailles and making Germany great brought most German people behind his regime. Also many Germans thought the Weimar Republic was weak and many soldiers who fought in World War I were dissatisfied with Germany’s defeat. They formed armed paramilitary groups who fought among themselves. Hitler promised to bring law and order and get rid of the threat of Communism.

The Spread of Fascism
Hitler’s ideas came from the leader of Italy – Benito Mussolini – whose Fascist Party had ruled Italy since 1923. Hitler’s Nazi party had great similarities to the Italian Fascist party.

Main ideas of Fascism:
- The state is supreme.
- A strong leader is needed to rule like a dictator.
- Democracies cannot survive because their system is too weak.
- Communism is the enemy of Fascism.
- The duty of a nation is to acquire an empire. Mussolini wanted to acquire an empire of Mediterranean countries near Italy and in Northern Africa.
- Inferior people cannot survive alongside the racially superior.

The Nazi slogan sums up fascism: ‘Ein Reich! Ein Volk! Ein Fuehrer!’  
(‘One Empire! One People! One Leader!’)
**Adolf Hitler**

1889–1909 Hitler was born in Braunau (1889), a small town in Austria. He left school at sixteen, and three years later he left home for Vienna.

1909–1913 Rejected by the Vienna Art Academy, Hitler became a labourer and painted postcards to sell in the streets. He became interested in politics and supported nationalist parties who wanted to make Austria more powerful. He hated socialist parties, foreign races, especially Jewish people.

1913–1918 Hitler left for Munich in Germany in 1913. Joined the German army and was twice wounded. He won six medals for bravery, including the Iron Cross First Class, the highest award for doing the dangerous job of taking messages between the trenches. He was bitter and angry when Germany signed the armistice in 1918. He blamed the Jews for Germany's defeat.

1918–23 Hitler worked as a spy for the army, reporting on dangerous political parties. One party he became interested in was the German Workers Party. Hitler liked it and joined in 1919. He became leader and renamed it the National Socialist German Workers Party – Nazi Party for short. He made the swastika, the crooked cross, the symbol of the party. He organised his private troops known as 'Storm Troopers' in brown uniforms to beat up people who disagreed with him – especially Socialists and Communists.

1923–34 Hitler organised a putsch (forceful takeover) in Munich in 1923. This failed and Hitler ended up in prison for high treason. While in prison he wrote about his life and his ideas in a book called *Mein Kampf* – 'My Struggle'. In 1929 with the onset of the world depression, unemployment was an all time high of six million and people began to listen to Hitler's ideas. More and more people voted for the Nazis in elections and in 1933 Hitler became Chancellor (Prime Minister). The next year Hitler appointed himself as Fuehrer (leader) and Dictator of Germany.
Hitler’s key Ideas

**Fuehrer principle**  
Germany must be ruled by a strong leader — a ‘Fuehrer’

**Lebensraum (Living Space)**  
Germany must have more land to live and work in. The ethnic German regions in countries east of Germany must be taken over for living space for the superior German race.

**Race**  
People belong to different races. Some races are better than others. The Germans belong to the ‘Aryan’ race and must keep themselves pure to become the ‘master race’.

**Anti-Semitism**  
Jews are a threat to the purity of the German race. They are in a great conspiracy to take over the world. Jews must be destroyed.

**Communism**  
Communism is dangerous and must also be destroyed.

**The Treaty of Versailles**  
The shameful treaty must be made void. The land taken away from Germany must be returned and France must be destroyed.

To fulfil one of his political promises, Hitler began his rearmament programme and withdrew from the League of Nations and the Disarmament Conference in 1933. With the failure of the Conference, Germany began to rearm at great speed. In 1935 he announced that Germany had a new Luftwaffe (air force) and an army of 500 000 men. This confirmed that Hitler felt that Germany was powerful enough to challenge the Treaty of Versailles that had reduced its military activities.

Aggression And The Fall of Collective Security

**Abyssinian Crisis 1935**  
Mussolini tried to divert Italian attention from the depression by invading Abyssinia (present day Ethiopia) — a weak African country.

The forces of the Abyssinian emperor, Haile Selassie, were no match for the well equipped Italian army. Selassie appealed to the League of Nations for help. The League quickly condemned Italy as the aggressor and applied limited economic sanctions. The sanction was limited because Mussolini commented that ‘if the League had extended sanctions to oil I would have had to withdraw from Abyssinia’.

France and Britain had the opportunity to stop Italy by cutting off supplies with a naval blockade, but the two powers had no wish to upset Mussolini. They feared upsetting the Italian leader in case he teamed up with Hitler and because public opinion in Britain and France strongly opposed getting involved in any other war. Instead the foreign ministers of Britain and France, Hoare and Laval, met secretly in Paris and proposed the Hoare–Laval Pact, to give Italy most of Abyssinia. The pact however, was accidentally leaked to the press and the huge public outcry resulted in the pact being dropped.

Mussolini responded by withdrawing Italy from the League of Nations.
Benito Mussolini (1883–1945)

1902 Fled to escape conscription.
1904 Joined Italian Socialist Party (SP).
1915 Left the Socialist Party. Fought in World War I and was seriously injured in 1917.
1921 He formed the Fascist Party.
1922 Appointed Prime Minister. Although Mussolini did not get rid of the king of Italy, he made himself dictator of Italy with the title ‘Il Duce’ (the leader). The king became a puppet who did what Mussolini told him to.
1935 Led the invasion of Abyssinia.
1945 Shot by anti-Fascist Italians while attempting to escape to Switzerland.

The End of the League of Nations

Because of the sanctions placed on Italy during the Abyssinian crisis, Mussolini became closer to Hitler. Both leaders became aware that the League of Nations and its collective security were ineffective and would not work. The road was now open for both leaders to pursue more aggressive policies.

The Saar

The Saar had been placed under the League of Nations by the terms of the Treaty of Versailles.

This rich coal-mining industrial area was taken off Germany for 15 years. In 1935 a plebiscite (vote) was held and it asked the people of the Saar to choose between union with Germany, union with France or to remain under the League control. Over 90% voted to return to Germany. Hitler got his wish. The unification of German speaking peoples had begun.

Dismantling the Treaty of Versailles – ‘Reoccupation of the Rhineland’

Hitler made his move to reoccupy the Rhineland when Italy diverted attention over the Abyssinian crisis. The invasion was against the Treaties of Locarno and Versailles. The invasion was free from any opposition. Over 98% of people living in the Rhineland voted in favour of the German reoccupation.

Hitler’s gamble had worked. The French and the British were both reluctant to fight. This event was a clear message to Hitler that he could, if he wanted to, take over more territories.

The Spanish Civil War 1936–1939

The war occurred when a group of army officers led by General Franco rebelled against the left-wing republican government. Both sides appealed for outside help. Italy and Germany poured in troops, aircraft and weapons of war to help the rebels. The Soviet Union sent assistance to the Republicans. Britain encouraged a non-interventionist policy.
However Britain and the United States turned a blind eye when volunteer brigades of Communist and left-wing sympathisers from their countries fought on the side of the left-wing republican forces.

Finally in 1939 Spain fell under Franco’s rule. Italy and Germany drew closer and formed the Rome–Berlin Axis. In May 1939 the Axis became a formal alliance for military support known as the ‘Pact of Steel’.

Many historians now regard the Spanish Civil War as a ‘practice’ for World War II. It was where the armies of Germany, Italy and Russia got experience of fighting in real battles.

The Anti-Comintern Pact
A few months later after the Spanish Civil War, Hitler signed a treaty with Japan, the Anti-Comintern (communist) Pact 1936. In 1937 Mussolini joined the Anti-Comintern Pact thereby making the Axis into a Rome–Tokyo–Berlin Axis.

Appeasement
Appeasement is a foreign policy, which seeks to satisfy those states with grievances or claims by making concessions, thus avoiding war. It often means giving into the demands of the aggressor or stronger country in order to avoid war.

Until mid 1939, both Britain and France adopted the policy of appeasement. Neville Chamberlain, the British Prime Minister, believed some German grievances were just.

The allies also feared that communist Russia was more of a threat than Nazism or Fascism.

People in Britain also wanted to avoid war and France was unable to follow an independent policy.

Hitler achieved enormous success due to this policy of appeasement.

Union with Austria (Anschluss)
In order for Hitler to achieve his policy of Lebensraum (getting living space for the superior German race by taking countries where Germans lived), the first target was Austria in 1938. Hitler was Austrian by birth and 96% of Austrians were German-speaking. The obstacle, however, was that the Anschluss (union) with Austria was forbidden under the Treaty of Versailles. Hitler was determined that the second attempt would be a success as the 1934 Nazi plot to take over Austria had failed. In 1938 there would be no opposition as Mussolini was now an ally of Germany.

Hitler ordered the Austrian Chancellor, Schuschnigg, to include Nazi members in his government. Austrian Nazis staged mass parades and bombed public buildings. The Chancellor quickly called a plebiscite to be held, where Austrians would vote to stay independent or unite with Germany.

Hitler responded by forcing the Chancellor to resign and cancelled the plebiscite. On 11 March German troops marched into Austria without a shot being fired and Austria was declared a province of ‘Germany’ and called ‘Ostmark’.

The Collapse of Czechoslovakia
Hitler’s new target was to include all of Czechoslovakia within the Third Reich. At first he pretended to want only the Sudetenland where three million Germans were living.
Hitler then instructed the German Sudeten leader, Henlein, to hold demonstrations and riots, which would give Germany the excuse to invade. Again Hitler took over with no resistance a country that could not defend itself. Public opinion in France and Britain began to change as people realised that Hitler was becoming an increasing threat.

The Munich Agreement

Britain and France intervened to avoid war at all costs. Britain was sure that Czechoslovakia had to be sacrificed to save European peace. France was happy for Chamberlain to deal with the problem. The Czechs were urged to make drastic concessions. The Sudetenland was to be given to Germany as set out in the Munich Agreement signed by Hitler, Chamberlain, Mussolini and Daladier (the French Premier). The Czech leader whose country was about to be cut up was not consulted and was not present.

On 1 October 1938 German troops moved into the Sudetenland. Hitler, according to Chamberlain, had promised that he would ‘make no further demands’ and that ‘Germany and Britain would never go to war with one another again’. Hitler despised Britain and France as weak countries and had no intention of keeping his promises.

The peace only lasted six months. In March 1939 German troops invaded the rest of Czechoslovakia.

Steps towards World War II

After the fall of Czechoslovakia, Britain and France realised that they had to stand by their pledge to support Poland. This pledge took place on 31 March 1939. However, Stalin, the leader of the USSR, surprised Europe with the news that he had signed the German–Soviet Non-Aggression Pact 1939, which guaranteed the USSR would not help Poland if Germany attacked it and in return Stalin could have parts of Eastern Poland.

On 24 August 1939 Britain and France repeated their guarantee to Poland, but on 1 September Hitler ignored the pledge and invaded Poland. Two days later on 3 September 1939 Britain and France both declared war on Germany. When Britain declared war, the rest of the British Empire followed. British Commonwealth countries like Canada, South Africa and New Zealand also declared war on Germany. World War II had indeed begun.
## Timeline Of The Early Years Of World War II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939 (April)</td>
<td>Italy invades Albania.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 (November)</td>
<td>Soviet Union invades Finland and annexes Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania saying the territories are important for its security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 (May)</td>
<td>Hitler invades Denmark and Norway (April).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 (26 May–June 4)</td>
<td>Dunkirk – evacuation of over 300 000 British and French troops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 (10 June)</td>
<td>Italy enters World War II against the Allies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 (17 June)</td>
<td>Fall of France – surrenders to Germany.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 (July–Oct)</td>
<td>The ‘Battle of Britain’ – the German airforce attacks fail to defeat Britain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 (October)</td>
<td>Mussolini launches an attack on Greece – rescued by German forces. German forces led by Rommel help Italian forces in Libya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941 (March)</td>
<td>Germany has drawn Hungary, Romania, Slovakia and Bulgaria into an alliance. US Lend-Lease Act allows Roosevelt (US president) to supply huge quantities of arms to Allies although at this stage the US is neutral (not fighting in the war).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941 (June)</td>
<td>Operation Barbarossa – Hitler invades Russia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By November, Leningrad and Moscow under threat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An early winter prevents the capture of either city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In July 1942, the Russians launch a counter-attack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941 (7 December)</td>
<td>Japan bombs the US naval base at Pearl Harbour (Hawaii). By declaring war on Japan, the US is also at war with Germany and Italy, the Axis allies of Japan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941 (8 December)</td>
<td>The US and Britain declare war on Japan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941 (11 December)</td>
<td>Germany and Italy declare war on the US. The Second World War is now a truly global conflict.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour ensured that all the major countries were to join in this major conflict. The formation of the League of Nations was to safeguard the world through collective security. However, international relations in the interwar period were plagued by outbreaks of conflict. At first the wars were localised but the advent of Hitler and the Japanese militarists accelerated the focus to a global war.
Countries In Post World War II Period

What Were The Relationships Between Countries In The Post World War II Period?

The Cold War 1946–60

At the end of the war in 1945, the victorious nations worked together, but only for a short time. They co-operated to set up the United Nations Organisation. Between 1945 and 1946, British, American, Russian and French judges sat together in a special court in Nuremberg to try the twenty-one leading Nazis who had survived the war. They were tried for the crimes of mass killings of Jews and others in concentration camps, killing and ill-treatment of prisoners of war, and destruction of civilian populations.

There was agreement over the group of peace treaties with enemy countries in 1947. Beyond this, no united effort seemed any longer possible. There was disagreement about how Germany should be governed, or where the boundaries of Poland should be. But above all there was great fear of the spread of communism in Eastern Europe. As Churchill said in 1946 ‘an iron curtain’ now divided eastern and western Europe.

The ‘Cold War’ was the name given to what was not a war of armed conflict but the increasing distrust between communist Eastern Europe, and Western Europe looking to the United States for support. It was a distrust that has led to civil wars on a few occasions like the North Korea versus South Korea and North Vietnam versus South Vietnam wars.

The Partition Of Germany 1949

The major Western countries including the United States could not come to a satisfactory agreement with the Soviet Union over the future of Germany. So in 1949 they agreed to divide Germany into two parts. West Germany became known as the Federal Republic of West Germany where a democratic government was elected and each of the eleven states in the federation had its own government that was responsible to the central government.

Stalin’s reply was the setting up of the German Democratic Republic. It was not democratic. As in all communist countries there was only one party and all the state governments were abolished.

In 1961 the East Germans built a concrete wall along the border that divided the
Democratic Republic from the rest of Berlin. All underground trains were stopped and roads to West Berlin were blocked.

Once again Europe was forced into two rival camps as before during World War I and World War II. This time the enemy was not Germany. The competition to be the top super power or world power was between Capitalist America and Communist Russia.
Impact Of International Organisations

What organisations were formed to maintain world peace and security?
What impact have these international organisations had on member countries?

United Nations Replaces League Of Nations

After World War II, the world’s leaders were determined to create another international organisation in order to prevent future wars. It had to be more effective and stronger than the League of Nations. Second time round, the Allies knew they had to have all the major powers joining and that member forces should make available armed forces to serve as peace-makers or stop aggressors.

President Roosevelt of America coined the term ‘United Nations’. In 1944 at a special conference at Dumbarton Oaks, in a house in Washington, D.C. the representatives of Britain, the US, the Soviet Union and China came to an agreement on the form that a United Nations Organisation should take. Finally, between April and June 1945, the representatives of 51 states met at San Francisco, and the Charter (document) was signed.

One reason why the UN has survived longer than the League of Nations is because, not just European countries, but most countries of the world are among its members. In the 1960s when African, Asian, Arab and Pacific countries became independent, they joined the UN. The UN has not been able to stop many wars or conflicts. However, it is useful for being an assembly where nations can debate. It is also a place where larger nations can hear the views and policies of smaller nations. It has also been helpful for getting international help to work in war damaged countries, countries with famine and environmental disasters, or countries that need help with agriculture.

The UN is made up of:
- The Secretariat
- The General Assembly
- The Security Council
- The Economic and Social Council
- The Trusteeship Council
- The International Court of Justice.
Aims And Responsibilities Of The UN

Aims

- to create a world free from war
- to bring justice and equality
- to help the poor people of the world
- to encourage friendly relations between states.

The aims of the United Nations (UN) are listed on the UN Charter. The Charter also states how these aims should be carried out, and outlines the responsibilities of UN members, their rights and their duties. In the Charter, the governments promise to live together in peace as good neighbours.

The UN does not have any power over its member states. It relies on its members to follow the aims and the principles in the Charter and the decisions and guidelines adopted by the UN. Ultimately, it is up to each member nation to decide if it wishes to co-operate.

The UN has tried to set basic standards for the world to follow. In 1948, it created a document called the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This document outlines that people should be free from slavery, and have the right to a fair trial, the right to marry and to own property, the right to work, the right to education, and many basic rights.

Problem

Since the UN was created in 1945:

- Over 30 million people have been killed in war, most of them unarmed civilians.
- Over 100 million people have fled their homes because of conflict.
- Governments have invested more money in preparing for war than in strengthening peace.
- Sometimes, the UN’s member states have failed to provide sufficient resources for peacekeeping.
- All member states are obliged to pay their share of the UN’s peacekeeping costs. But as of May 2000, member states owed the UN more than US$2.9 billion in peacekeeping payments.

Impact of the UN Peacekeeping Force

- In Namibia, the UN helped the people to freely and democratically elect their own government and create a new and independent nation. The same thing happened in East Timor.
- In Mozambique, the UN helped organise free and fair elections.
- In El Salvador, the UN helped to reform a corrupt government and monitor the end of ten years of civil war.
- In Guatemala, the UN helped to establish a new human rights procedure to make sure people were no longer afraid because of violence and killing.
- The peacekeepers of the UN received the Nobel Peace Prize for their work in 1988.
**The Rival Power Blocks: (NATO Versus Warsaw)**

In 1948 the Brussels Treaty group (Britain, France, Belgium, Holland and Luxembourg), agreed on a joint scheme of defence to check the possible advance of communism.

It was clear that they would need American military and financial support. In April 1949 at a conference in Washington, the countries that had signed the Brussels Treaty were joined in the Atlantic Pact by the United States, Canada, Iceland, Denmark, Norway, Portugal and Italy. Thus the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) was formed to ensure an effective common defence against any attack on one or more of its members.

**The Warsaw Pact**

The Russian reply to NATO was the Warsaw Treaty Organisation formed in 1955. The Soviet Union, Romania, Poland, Hungary, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Albania signed an agreement, which made the uniting of their armed forces possible. The Warsaw Pact only made formal what had long existed.

**Other Organisations**

**Organisation for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC)**
- Purpose was to ensure that the millions of dollars which the US was pouring into Western Europe were spent to the best advantage.

**European Economic Community (EEC, also known as the Common Market)**
- Formed in 1957 by Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands. Their plan was to remove all trade barriers and operate a free trade partnership.

There are numerous other international organisations that exist today with the main aim of improving international relations and working towards fostering international co-operation and world peace.
Think through what you have learned in Part 4. Ask yourself if you can provide specific, in depth answers to each of the focusing questions that had guided each unit.

1. I can explain the roles of the major countries involved in World War I as well as describe the different systems of alliances that were agreed upon during the war.

2. I have discussed and can assess the respective roles of countries that participated in World War I as well as evaluate the contribution of each major country in the outbreak of World War I.

3. I have examined the relationships between some countries in the post-World War II period.

4. I can explain why some international organisations were formed as well as discuss the impact of the organisations on member countries.
Economic Transformations

Achievement Objective

At the end of this unit you will be able to demonstrate your knowledge and understanding of the emergence of different countries as world powers.

Focusing Questions

For a case study nation such as the United States:

- What is the difference between the role of the economy in a capitalist state and in a communist state?
- What is the relationship between economic aid and assurance of security?
- What are some of the important economic changes in metropolitan countries (such as the United States) since the 1900s?
- How has economic change led to the emergence of superpowers (such as the United States)?

There are a number of very important concepts that you will be ‘meeting’ in this chapter, perhaps for the first time. Be alert to the following key concepts in the text – look out for them! Most of them will be very familiar to you. Your teacher will help you and your classmates to revise your understanding of these concepts. Remember – key concepts are important ideas that are specific to the study of history.

Key Concepts:

- The American Dream
- Globalisation
- Cold War
Introduction

Political philosophies and ideologies shape the way a country organises and structures its economic system. We have looked at different types of economic systems in Year 12 History textbook, in the part of the textbook that focuses on the Economic Transformations. *It may be helpful for your class to review the introduction and the first unit of that part of the textbook.* The first unit of this part of the Year 13 textbook builds on that knowledge by comparing and contrasting the two most influential political and economic systems of the twentieth century – capitalism and communism.

You may already be familiar with social and political events of the post-World War II period and the role of the United States in Europe. You may already be familiar with the role of the United States in different parts of the world in the years after World War II, through to the end of the 1980s. The term ‘superpower’ may already be familiar to you – and you may already know that after Word War II, until the end of the 1980s at least, there were essentially two opposing superpower nations – and these were the United States and the Soviet Union.

*As stated in the Year 12 History textbook:*

‘As historians, we are very interested in the decisions that people have made in the past, and the roles that governments have taken, to meet the needs and wants of the people in their countries.’

We are also interested, as historians, in how governments have developed and used economic strategies to become more powerful globally and to protect themselves and those nations that support them. So while the context or the historical events of the case study may already be familiar to you, the following chapters focus on the role of economic development and change in international relations.
What are the differences between the role of the economy in a capitalist state and in a communist state?

Revision Time!

**Capitalism**

Wealthy people (capitalists) invest their money in land and industry. They employ the workers and keep all the profits that are made. A democratic system is followed with a number of political parties.

**Communism**

There is a classless society with no individual profit making. Land and industry are owned by the state and profits used for the good of all. There is only one political party.

*Figure 5.1.1 Capitalism versus Communism*
Capitalism

An economic and political system in which property, business and industry are owned by private individuals and not by the state. An example of a capitalist nation: the United States.

People pay for what they need with their wages. Some people get more wages and so they can pay for more things to meet their needs and their wants. The differences between those who have more and those who have less are very obvious.

Communism

A political and economic system in which everyone is supposed to be equal, and in which workers control industry and business. Examples of communist nations are – China, North Korea, Cuba and the former Soviet Union.

The state or government owns everything – and people generally get the same wages or amount of money. The government provides people with everything they need – free housing, health care, education, retirement benefits and employment.

The United States: Example of a Capitalist (Democratic) Economic and Political System

- industry and agriculture were in the hands of private individuals. Their major aim – to run their companies to make a personal profit.
- this created jobs for individuals
- wealth for the country is obtained through taxation – of companies and income earners
- one of the main attractions (pull factors) for people emigrating to the USA in the early twentieth century was that the USA was seen as a ‘land of opportunity’ – a place where there was a chance of ‘working your way to the top’ or making a lot of money and becoming wealthy (more wealthy at least, compared to the limited opportunities they had where they came from in Europe)
- in the USA, people had the right to make money and in addition, had much more personal freedom than places such as the Soviet Union
- the USA had free elections, with a number of political parties (giving individuals not only the right to vote but choice about who to vote for)
- the media was not controlled – freedom of speech and the expression of views were very important to many migrants, and was a basic right in this country. This was seen as yet another positive feature of the capitalist system of the United States.
The Soviet Union: Example of a Communist, Economic and Political System

- the Soviet Union was a communist state from 1917
- Communist beliefs were based on the ideas of Karl Marx who believed that the government should control all aspects of citizens’ lives and that individual rights were less important than what was good for the nation as a whole
- industry and agriculture were owned by the state with any profits to be used for the good of all the people (and not just a few).
- in the Soviet Union, there were no wealthy business people, investing their capital, and taking their own risks and making personal fortunes
- no private profit
- no political freedom and little or no religious freedom. The Soviet Union tried to get people to give up religion
- only one political party (the Communist Party) was allowed. When there were elections, people chose only from candidates chosen by the Communist Party
- there were restrictions on freedom of speech. Newspapers, radio, television and other media were strictly controlled by the government
- citizens of the Soviet Union had to be very careful not to criticise the government – with leaders such as Joseph Stalin, to publicly give criticism could mean death.

The United States and the Soviet Union were complete opposites in terms of their economic and political systems.

*Source: Adapted from Modern World History for OCR Specification by N. Kelly, G. Lacy (2001) Heinemann*

Activity 1

Copy the following chart into your notebooks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capitalism</th>
<th>Communism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advantages</td>
<td>Disadvantages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Work in pairs. Discuss and share your views about the advantages and disadvantages of each system. List these in the chart in your workbooks.

b Review your chart. Which of the advantages and disadvantages, for each type of system, are economic ones? Write your answers out in your workbooks. Give reasons for your answers.
What is the relationship between economic aid and assurance of security?

Interestingly enough, despite these national differences, the Soviet Union and the USA became allies in the Second World War. But towards the end of this war, with Germany close to defeat, the relationship between this communist nation and the United States and its other allies in the west (e.g. Great Britain, France) began to deteriorate.

As you have already learned the Cold War began and East and West Europe formed two alliances (Check the previous section on the Cold War).

The Cold War was not a physical, military confrontation. It was a war of words and propaganda. For almost forty years, these two opposing sides worked to achieve diplomatic and tactical victories over one another. The two sides were very suspicious and distrustful of one another. Why did the USA and the Soviet Union distrust one another?

1. They had vastly different, opposing political systems.
2. Before the war, they had a history of mistrust.
3. At the end of the war, there were several key events – but the USA (and its allies in the west) and the Soviet Union (and other communist countries in the east) had different interpretations of these events.

The key events were:

The Yalta Conference

15 February – President Franklin Roosevelt of the USA, Joseph Stalin of the Soviet Union and Winston Churchill of Great Britain met in Yalta, in the Soviet Union. The meeting was to make decisions about how Europe should be organised after the war. It was difficult for the Allies to agree.

The Potsdam Conference

In July 1945 a second meeting was held, this time in Potsdam Germany. The divisions between the two sides (the USA and Britain against the Soviet Union) were even more obvious – especially along social/political lines. For example, by this time, the Soviet Union had liberated the whole of eastern Europe from Nazi control. But instead of supporting free elections to set up democratic governments in these countries, the Soviet Union stayed and undermined democratic parties and installed many people from those countries who had trained in Russia before or during World War II to be communist leaders.
The race to develop the atomic bomb
The USA had developed an atomic bomb and by using it on the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in Japan the US had hastened Japan’s surrender at the end of World War II. Stalin was concerned that such a weapon in the hands of the USA could be used against the Soviet Union. Soviet scientists were pressured to develop one too. Some British and American scientists, who were communist sympathisers or communist spies, secretly passed on details about the atomic bomb to Soviet scientists, which enabled them to catch up. When the Soviet Union started testing their atomic bomb, the USA began to worry about such a weapon in Soviet hands – it worried that that the Soviet Union would be a threat to world peace.

Disagreement amongst the Allies
Disagreements developed amongst the Allies about what should happen to Germany in terms of its economic development and recovery, and the type of political system that should be encouraged there.

The Soviet Union was accused of taking too much reparation payment from Germany after World War II – they felt that paying such high amounts would prevent Germany from being able to rebuild itself.

Control And The Soviet Union
Between 1945 and 1948, the Soviet Union was able to ensure that each eastern European nation had a government that was communist and supportive of the Soviet Union. For Stalin, this was a defensive measure. A buffer zone was created between the Soviet Union and the democratic nations of the west.

This meant that from 1945 to 1990 (45 years) the US and Britain had forces stationed in Europe. They were mainly in West Germany. They did not take any part in war during that time.

The nations of the West (e.g. the USA and Great Britain) saw the Soviet buffer not as a defensive measure but rather as a step towards world domination. The nations of the west saw this as a threat to ‘the free world’, or to democracy and capitalism. The growth and spread of the influence of the Soviet Union caused the United States to react very strongly and decisively. But the USA did not respond with military action. Rather, it responded with a plan that would attack the roots of communism. According to President Truman, the root of communism was ‘misery and want’.

President Truman believed that the USA should use its wealth to provide economic aid to Europe. In nations with economies and populations that were crippled by the war, resources would build up both the economies and morale of the people. The belief was that restored economies would be less likely to be influenced by communism, and that eventually those countries with strong economies would be good trading partners for companies in the United States.

President Truman made a speech that outlined these beliefs on 12 March 1947. The speech has since become known as the Truman Doctrine.
Figure 5.2.1 The Communist ‘Buffer’ Zone 1945–1989
The Truman Doctrine

Extract One:

‘At the present moment in world history nearly every nation must choose between alternative ways of life. The choice is too often not a free one. One way of life is based upon the will of the majority, and is distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, and guarantees of individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from political oppression. The second way of life is based upon the will of a minority forcibly imposed upon the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio, fixed elections, and the suppression of personal freedoms. I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures. I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way. I believe that our help should be primarily through economic stability and orderly political process.’

President Harry S. Truman, 12 March 1947 in an address recommending aid to Greece and Turkey.

Activity 1

1. Who do you think President Truman is talking to?
2. What is President Truman asking for?
3. What do you think are the first and second ‘ways of life’ that he refers to?
4. Give an example of a country that lives by the first ‘way of life’.
5. Give an example of a country that lives by the second ‘way of life’.

Extract Two:

‘We weren’t concerned about markets; we were concerned about preventing Soviet control of larger areas of the world than they already controlled. When the Second World War ended, France was decimated. England was almost brought to its knees, you’ll remember, and if Hitler had moved at one time, he could have probably brought them to their knees. The Soviet Union had gone through the most traumatic experience of its career. I read that in the Second World War it’s estimated that the Soviet Union lost between twenty-five and thirty million men. So I think they were just determined that it was never going to happen to them again. But an enormous vacuum had been left in the free world by the end of World War II, and the Soviet Union was determined to move into that vacuum.

Now, that was the basis of the Marshall plan when we were thinking about reviving Europe. At the time the Soviets were pressing and searching and trying to find every soft spot where they could insert themselves. That was the reason for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; it was the reason for the Truman Doctrine.’

From an oral history interview with Clark M. Clifford, assistant to White House Naval Aide, 1945–46; Special Counsel to the President, 1946–50. Washington, D. C. 16 March 1972. by Jerry N Hess
Activity 2

1 What does Clifford mean when he says, ‘an enormous vacuum had been left in the free world by the end of World War II?’

2 Why would the Soviet Union be determined to avoid another conflict as devastating as World War II?

3 What does Clifford say was the main reason for NATO and the Truman Doctrine?

4 What does NATO stand for?

5 Compare President Truman’s address with Clifford’s statements in his oral history. Make a list of similarities and differences between the two sources of information. What can you conclude from this comparison?

The Marshall Plan

The plan to provide economic aid and support to European countries was announced in a speech by American Secretary of State, former army general, George Marshall in June 1947. He said in his speech that this new policy was aimed at ending hunger and poverty in war-torn Europe. However, this is not the way the Soviet Union took the news. They feared that the plan (called the Marshall Plan) was part of an overall plan by the USA to ‘enslave Europe’. From 1948–1952, the USA provided US$13 billion to 16 different western European countries. The support would have been available for eastern European countries too but the Soviet Union would not allow them to apply for the financial support. The Soviet Union also feared that if countries they dominated received US aid and enjoyed a better standard of living they would lose their commitment to Communism; they would break with the Soviet Union.

![Figure 5.2.2 The main recipients of the Marshall Plan](image-url)
The tension between the USA and the Soviet Union was not confined to events in Europe. The USA believed that its duty was to resist the spread of communism around the world. Other means were used to 'fight' communism – over and above economic aid. For example:

- When Japanese soldiers left Korea in 1945, the Soviet Union became responsible for Northern Korea, and the USA for Southern Korea. In 1950, the United Nations attempted to reunify the two Koreas by holding all-Korea elections – the Soviet Union would not agree to elections. The Korean War lasted from 1950–1953. The main reason for US involvement was to stop the spread of communism. At the conclusion of the war neither Korea had gained. There are two divided Koreas – North and South – to this day.

- After World War II, a North Vietnamese Leader named Ho Chi Minh declared that Vietnam was independent – but the colonial French forces fought against the independence movement. The end result was that the country was divided in two (like Korea was) – the north was communist and the south was not. The USA became involved in order to help South Vietnamese fight against the communist North Vietnamese.

Activity 3

1 Summarise the events leading up to the economic assistance that the USA provided to Europe, and its strategies after World War II to protect the world from the spread of communism, in a graphic timeline.

2 Carefully study the following essay questions. Select one to answer.

- ‘The Marshall Plan was an economic aid package offered with the intention of helping struggling countries to become strong again’. Do you agree or disagree with this statement? Explain your answer.

- ‘The most important cause of the Cold War was the Soviet Union’s fear of the West’. Do you agree or disagree with this statement? Explain your answer.

Perhaps to understand this commitment to 'fight' communism, you need to carefully read through the speech delivered by President Franklin D Roosevelt in 1941, even before the USA became involved in World War II. It might help you to understand why the USA gave so much money in economic aid to 'protect' the free world from communism – and why it was later prepared to go to war, in far away places, against countries that did not directly attack or harm the USA itself. This speech can be found on pages 19–24.
What are some of the important economic changes in metropolitan countries (such as the United States) since the 1900s?

Points To Ponder

- The USA has become the world’s wealthiest nation and perhaps the only real super power left on the world’s stage (since the fall of the Soviet Union in 1989). Because the US has developed information technology (computers, the internet) it still dominates world trade in some areas.

- It has come a long way from the terrible Depression of the 1930s, and the Wall Street crash.

- Now, the US president has taken the nation out again onto the world stage in its war against terrorism – firstly the war in Afghanistan and then in Iraq.

- US companies (operating in the private sector) have effectively spread around the world and successfully accessed resources including cheap labour (to keep costs of production down and profit margins wide).

- US military power has developed.

- Other important changes include: globalisation; membership in OECD; getting over the Depression; careful investment. Information technology (computers and space technology satellites) were originally developed for the US armed forces.
Activity 1

Write a brief newspaper article to describe how and why the USA became so powerful economically.
How has economic change led to the emergence of superpowers (such as the United States)?

It can be argued that economic change and development in the United States has made a significant contribution to the ability of the USA to become a superpower. However, economic strength alone is not the reason. It is the combination of wealth and ideology that is important.

Before the USA entered into World War II, its government expressed the belief that it was in the national interests of the nation to become involved in threats to democracy in other parts of the world.

The ‘Four Essential Human Freedoms’

The ‘Four Freedoms’ were outlined by President Franklin D. Roosevelt at the end of his State of the Union Address to the US Congress on 6 January 1941. The US was not yet involved in World War II. The attack on Pearl Harbour came 11 months later.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the 77th Congress:

I address you, the Members of the 77th Congress, at a moment unprecedented in the history of the Union. I use the word ‘unprecedented’ because at no previous time has American security been as seriously threatened from without as it is today.

Since the permanent formation of our government under the Constitution, in 1789, most of the periods of crisis in our history have related to our domestic affairs. Fortunately, only one of these - the four-year War Between the States [the American Civil War 1861-1865] - ever threatened our national unity. Today, thank God, 130 million Americans, in 48 states, have forgotten points of the compass in our national unity.

It is true that prior to 1914 the United States often had been disturbed by events in other continents. We had even engaged in two wars with European nations...
and in a number of undeclared wars in the West Indies, in the Mediterranean and in the Pacific for the maintenance of American rights and for the principles of peaceful commerce. But in no case had a serious threat been raised against our national safety or our continued independence.

What I seek to convey is the historic truth that the United States as a nation has at all times maintained clear, definite opposition to any attempt to lock us in behind an ancient Chinese wall while the procession of civilization went past. Today, thinking of our children and of their children, we oppose enforced isolation for ourselves or for any other part of the Americas.

That determination of ours, extending over all these years, was proved, for example, during the quarter-century of wars following the French Revolution.

While the Napoleonic struggles did threaten interests of the United States because of the French foothold in the West Indies and in Louisiana, and while we engaged in the War of 1812 to vindicate our right to peaceful trade, it is nevertheless clear that neither France nor Great Britain, nor any other nation, was aiming at domination of the whole world.

In like fashion from 1815 to 1914 – 99 years – no single war in Europe or in Asia constituted a real threat against our future or against the future of any other American Nation.

Except in the Maximilian interlude in Mexico, no foreign power sought to establish itself in this hemisphere; and the strength of the British fleet in the Atlantic has been a friendly strength. It is still a friendly strength.

Even when the World War broke out in 1914, it seemed to contain only small threat of danger to our own American future. But, as time went on, the American people began to visualize what the downfall of democratic nations might mean to our own democracy.

We need not overemphasize imperfections in the Peace of Versailles. We need not harp on failure of the democracies to deal with problems of world reconstruction. We should remember that the Peace of 1919 was far less unjust than the kind of ‘pacification’ which began even before Munich, and which is being carried on under the new order of tyranny that seeks to spread over every continent today. The American people have unalterably set their faces against that tyranny.

Every realist knows that the democratic way of life is at this moment being directly assailed in every part of the world – assailed either by arms or by secret spreading of poisonous propaganda by those who seek to destroy unity and promote discord in nations that are still at peace.

During 16 long months, this assault has blotted out the whole pattern of democratic life in an appalling number of independent nations, great and small. The assailants are still on the march, threatening other nations, great and small.

Therefore, as your president, performing my Constitutional duty to ‘give to the Congress information of the state of the Union,’ I find it, unhappily, necessary to report that the future and the safety of our country and of our democracy are overwhelmingly involved in events far beyond our borders.

Armed defence of democratic existence is now being gallantly waged in four continents. If that defence fails, all the population and all the resources of Europe, Asia, Africa and Australasia will be dominated by the conquerors. Let us remember that the total of those populations and their resources in those
four continents greatly exceeds the sum total of the population and the resources of the whole of the Western Hemisphere many times over.

In times like these it is immature – and incidentally, untrue – for anybody to brag that an unprepared America, single-handed and with one hand tied behind its back, can hold off the whole world.

No realistic American can expect from a dictator’s peace international generosity or return of true independence or world disarmament or freedom of expression or freedom of religion or even good business.

Such a peace would bring no security for us or for our neighbours. ‘Those, who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety.’ [Benjamin Franklin]

As a nation, we may take pride in the fact that we are soft-hearted; but we cannot afford to be soft-headed.

We must always be wary of those who with sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal preach the ‘ism’ of appeasement.

We must especially beware of that small group of selfish men who would clip the wings of the American eagle in order to feather their own nests.

I have recently pointed out how quickly the tempo of modern warfare could bring into our very midst the physical attack which we must eventually expect if the dictator nations win this war.

There is much loose talk of our immunity from immediate and direct invasion from across the seas. Obviously, as long as the British Navy retains its power, no such danger exists. Even if there were no British Navy, it is not probable that any enemy would be stupid enough to attack us by landing troops in the United States from across thousands of miles of ocean, until it had acquired strategic bases from which to operate.

But we learn much from the lessons of the past years in Europe, particularly the lesson of Norway, whose essential seaports were captured by treachery and surprise built up over a series of years.

The first phase of the invasion of this hemisphere would not be the landing of regular troops. The necessary strategic points would be occupied by secret agents and their dupes – and great numbers of them are already here and in Latin America.

As long as the aggressor nations maintain the offensive, they - not we - will choose the time and the place and the method of their attack.

That is why the future of all the American republics is today in serious danger.

That is why this annual message to the Congress is unique in our history.

That is why every member of the executive branch of the government and every member of the Congress faces great responsibility and great accountability.

The need of the moment is that our actions and our policy should be devoted primarily - almost exclusively - to meeting this foreign peril. For all our domestic problems we are now a part of the great emergency.

Just as our national policy in internal affairs has been based upon a decent respect for the rights and the dignity of all our fellow men within our gates, so
our national policy in foreign affairs has been based on a decent respect for the
rights and dignity of all nations, large and small. And the justice of morality
must and will win in the end.

**Our national policy is this:**

First, by an impressive expression of the public will and without regard to
partisanship, we are committed to all-inclusive national defence.

Second, by an impressive expression of the public will and without regard to
partisanship, we are committed to full support of all those resolute peoples
everywhere who are resisting aggression and are thereby keeping war away
from our hemisphere. By this support, we express our determination that the
democratic cause shall prevail; and we strengthen the defence and the security
of our own nation.

Third, by an impressive expression of the public will and without regard to
partisanship, we are committed to the proposition that principles of morality
and considerations for our own security will never permit us to acquiesce in a
peace dictated by aggressors and sponsored by appeasers. We know that
enduring peace cannot be bought at the cost of other people's freedom.

In the recent national election there was no substantial difference between the
two great parties in respect to that national policy. No issue was fought out on
this line before the American electorate. Today it is abundantly evident that
American citizens everywhere are demanding and supporting speedy and
complete action in recognition of obvious danger.

Therefore, the immediate need is a swift and driving increase in our armament
production.

Leaders of industry and labour have responded to our summons. Goals of speed
have been set. In some cases, these goals are being reached ahead of time; in
some cases we are on schedule; in other cases there are slight but not serious
delays; and in some cases – and I am sorry to say very important cases – we
are all concerned by the slowness of the accomplishment of our plans.

The Army and Navy, however, have made substantial progress during the past
year. Actual experience is improving and speeding up our methods of production
with every passing day. And today's best is not good enough for tomorrow.

I am not satisfied with the progress thus far made. The men in charge of the
program represent the best in training, in ability and in patriotism. They are
not satisfied with the progress thus far made. None of us will be satisfied until
the job is done.

No matter whether the original goal was set too high or too low, our objective is
quicker and better results. To give you two illustrations:

We are behind schedule in turning out finished airplanes; we are working day
and night to solve the innumerable problems and to catch up.

We are ahead of schedule in building warships, but we are working to get even
further ahead of that schedule.

To change a whole nation from a basis of peacetime production of implements
of peace to a basis of wartime production of implements of war is no small task.
And the greatest difficulty comes at the beginning of the program, when new
tools, new plant facilities, new assembly lines and new ship ways must first be
constructed before the actual materiel begins to flow steadily and speedily from them.

The Congress, of course, must rightly keep itself informed at all times of the progress of the program. However, there is certain information, as the Congress itself will readily recognize, which, in the interests of our own security and those of the nations that we are supporting, must of needs be kept in confidence.

New circumstances are constantly begetting new needs for our safety. I shall ask this Congress for greatly increased new appropriations and authorizations to carry on what we have begun.

I also ask this Congress for authority and for funds sufficient to manufacture additional munitions and war supplies of many kinds, to be turned over to those nations that are now in actual war with aggressor nations.

Our most useful and immediate role is to act as an arsenal for them as well as for us. They do not need manpower, but they do need billions of dollars worth of the weapons of defence.

The time is near when they will not be able to pay for them all in ready cash. We cannot, and we will not, tell them that they must surrender, merely because of present inability to pay for the weapons which we know they must have.

I do not recommend that we make them a loan of dollars with which to pay for these weapons - a loan to be repaid in dollars.

I recommend that we make it possible for those nations to continue to obtain war materials in the United States, fitting their orders into our own program. Nearly all their material would, if the time ever came, be useful for our own defence.

Taking counsel of expert military and naval authorities, considering what is best for our own security, we are free to decide how much should be kept here and how much should be sent abroad to our friends who by their determined and heroic resistance are giving us time in which to make ready our own defence.

For what we send abroad, we shall be repaid within a reasonable time following the close of hostilities, in similar materials or, at our option, in other goods of many kinds, which they can produce and which we need.

Let us say to the democracies: We Americans are vitally concerned in your defence of freedom. We are putting forth our energies, our resources and our organizing powers to give you the strength to regain and maintain a free world. We shall send you, in ever-increasing numbers, ships, planes, tanks, and guns. This is our purpose and our pledge.

In fulfilment of this purpose we will not be intimidated by the threats of dictators that they will regard as a breach of international law or as an act of war our aid to the democracies which dare to resist their aggression. Such aid is not an act of war, even if a dictator should unilaterally proclaim it so to be.

When the dictators, if the dictators, are ready to make war upon us, they will not wait for an act of war on our part. They did not wait for Norway or Belgium or the Netherlands to commit an act of war.

Their only interest is in a new one-way international law, which lacks mutuality in its observance and, therefore, becomes an instrument of oppression.
The happiness of future generations of Americans may well depend upon how effective and how immediate we can make our aid felt. No one can tell the exact character of the emergency situations that we may be called upon to meet. The nation's hands must not be tied when the nation's life is in danger.

We must all prepare to make the sacrifices that the emergency – almost as serious as war itself – demands. Whatever stands in the way of speed and efficiency in defence preparations must give way to the national need.

A free nation has the right to expect full cooperation from all groups. A free nation has the right to look to the leaders of business, of labour and of agriculture to take the lead in stimulating effort, not among other groups but within their own groups.

The best way of dealing with the few slackers or troublemakers in our midst is, first, to shame them by patriotic example and, if that fails, to use the sovereignty of government to save government.

As men do not live by bread alone, they do not fight by armaments alone. Those who man our defences, and those behind them who build our defences, must have the stamina and the courage which come from unshakable belief in the manner of life which they are defending. The mighty action that we are calling for cannot be based on a disregard of all things worth fighting for.

The nation takes great satisfaction and much strength from the things that have been done to make its people conscious of their individual stake in the preservation of democratic life in America. Those things have toughened the fibre of our people, have renewed their faith and strengthened their devotion to the institutions we make ready to protect.

Certainly this is no time for any of us to stop thinking about the social and economic problems that are the root cause of the social revolution that is today a supreme factor in the world.

For there is nothing mysterious about the foundations of a healthy and strong democracy. The basic things expected by our people of their political and economic systems are simple. They are: equality of opportunity for youth and for others; jobs for those who can work; security for those who need it; the ending of special privilege for the few; the preservation of civil liberties for all; the enjoyment of the fruits of scientific progress in a wider and constantly rising standard of living.

These are the simple, basic things that must never be lost sight of in the turmoil and unbelievable complexity of our modern world. The inner and abiding strength of our economic and political systems is dependent upon the degree to which they fulfil these expectations.

Many subjects connected with our social economy call for immediate improvement.

As examples:

- We should bring more citizens under the coverage of old-age pensions and unemployment insurance.
- We should widen the opportunities for adequate medical care.
- We should plan a better system by which persons deserving or needing gainful employment may obtain it.
I have called for personal sacrifice. I am assured of the willingness of almost all Americans to respond to that call.

A part of the sacrifice means the payment of more money in taxes. In my Budget Message, I shall recommend that a greater portion of this great defence program be paid for from taxation than we are paying today. No person should try, or be allowed, to get rich out of this program; and the principle of tax payments in accordance with ability to pay should be constantly before our eyes to guide our legislation.

If the Congress maintains these principles, the voters, putting patriotism ahead of pocketbooks, will give you their applause.

In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms.

The first is freedom of speech and expression – everywhere in the world.

The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way – everywhere in the world.

The third is freedom from want – which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings that will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants – everywhere in the world.

The fourth is freedom from fear – which, translated into world terms, means a worldwide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbour – anywhere in the world.

That is no vision of a distant millennium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation. That kind of world is the very antithesis of the so-called new order of tyranny that the dictators seek to create with the crash of a bomb.

To that new order we oppose the greater conception – the moral order. A good society is able to face schemes of world domination and foreign revolutions alike without fear.

Since the beginning of our American history, we have been engaged in change – in a perpetual peaceful revolution – a revolution that goes on steadily, quietly adjusting itself to changing conditions – without the concentration camp or the quick-lime in the ditch. The world order, which we seek, is the cooperation of free countries, working together in a friendly, civilized society.

This nation has placed its destiny in the hands and heads and hearts of its millions of free men and women; and its faith in freedom under the guidance of God. Freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere. Our support goes to those who struggle to gain those rights or keep them. Our strength is our unity of purpose. To that high concept there can be no end save victory.
Activity 1

1 The ‘Four Freedoms’ was read during the memorial services on September 11, 2002, for the victims of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001.

Why do you think this speech was relevant and important so many years later?

Part 5 – Summary

Think through what you have learned in this chapter. Ask yourself if you can do each of the following skilfully, and with in-depth knowledge and understanding.

1 I can distinguish between the role of the economy in a capitalist state and in a communist state. ☐

2 I can discuss the relationship between economic aid and assurance of security. ☐

3 I can examine some of the important economic changes in metropolitan countries such as the USA since the early 1900s. ☐

4 I can analyse the contribution of economic change to the emergence of superpowers such as the USA. ☐
Achievement Objective
You will know and understand the contribution of leadership to political and socio-economic stability within selected countries.

Focusing Questions
- How did Stalin and Gandhi come to power? How did they consolidate their leadership?
- What actions did Stalin and Gandhi take to promote socio-economic and political stability within their own countries?
- How critical were the strategies pursued by Stalin and Gandhi in maintaining stability?
- What were some of the important qualities that Josef Stalin and Mahatma Gandhi possessed? How effective were they, as leaders of their own countries?
- How have the policies and actions adopted by Stalin and Gandhi impacted on the USSR and India?
- What foreign influences have the two countries had, which directly or indirectly affected the leadership styles of Stalin and Gandhi?

There are a number of important concepts that you will be cover in Part 6. Some of the concepts you would have already come across in previous work and reading. Look out for the new concepts and try to remember how they relate to your topic of study.
Introduction

Systems of Power – What are they?
Countries are controlled or run by different systems of power. For example here in Sāmoa, we have our matai system. Each matai has certain privileges and power over his aiga. In the United States their system of power is different again. They have a President who has enormous power but not absolute power because he has to answer to Congress and the American people.

The systems of power and authority we will be studying in Part 6 are those in Russia (Soviet Union) and India.

The systems of power in the Soviet Union were very different to the systems of power in India. In fact they were the opposite.

In India the people were struggling to free themselves from imperialist Britain. The people had very limited power and rights as the British controlled the country and were in government. We can draw similarities between the occupation of India by the British and the time when New Zealand administered Sāmoa.

Just as Sāmoa was the first Pacific Island nation to regain her independence, India was the first colony of the British Empire to become an independent nation.

It took one small, determined man by the name of Mohandas Gandhi to lead a nation in their struggle for freedom. They gained that freedom in 1947.

In the Soviet Union, the systems of power were rather complicated. Their government was very different from that of the rest of the world. It was a communist system that had one leader and one party – the Communist Party. The leader we will focus on in this part is Joseph Stalin, who ruled with an iron fist to transform the Soviet Union from a backward country to a super power. Stalin was not his original name, but he took it because it means ‘man of steel’.
How did Stalin come to power? How did he consolidate his leadership?

On 1 January 1924 at the age of 54, Lenin the Bolshevik leader died. A will was left behind when he died. In it he set out his hopes and fears for the new Russia that was to be renamed the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) or Soviet Union in 1922. Lenin was very ill after a major stroke caused by an assassination attempt in which he was shot in the head, and he knew that he did not have long to live. Lenin wrote down what he thought about Stalin and Trotsky. This will is called Lenin’s ‘Political Testament’:

Comrade Stalin, having become General Secretary, had concentrated enormous power in his hands; and I am not sure that he has always known how to use that power with sufficient caution. On the other hand Comrade Trotsky is, to be sure, the most able man in the present Central Committee – but is also too self-confident.

From Lenin’s Political Testament written in late 1922

Two years before his death, Lenin had been warned about the ruthless and ambitious Stalin. During the 1918 civil war, Stalin, who followed Lenin, was sent to Tsaritsyn (later renamed Stalingrad) to organise food supplies. It wasn’t long before Stalin ran the whole area as a political dictator, even changing Trotsky’s orders. After the revolution, a rebellion took place in his home country of Georgia and Stalin used his power to crush the revolt with enormous violence. Lenin ordered him to stop using so much force, but Stalin ignored his orders.

Key People and Groups

**Lenin:** (Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov) First leader of communist Russia

**Trotsky:** Leading opponent of Stalin in the power struggle.

**Zinoviev:** Leader of Leningrad Communists.

**Kamenev:** Leader of the communists.

**Stalin:** Leader of the USSR 1923–1953.

**Karl Marx:** German socialist – his ideas became the basis of socialist and communist theory.
In 1922 Stalin became Secretary-General of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. It wasn’t an important post while Lenin was leader. But the death of Lenin in 1924 brought into the open the problem of who was going to take over and lead the nation. For a time leadership was collective: the five members of the Moscow Politburo – Trotsky, Zinoviev, Bukharin, Kamenev and Stalin ruled. However, they all disagreed and had opposing views regarding the country’s future.

The Power Struggle

**Leon Trotsky (1879–1940)**

Trotsky was the son of a prosperous Ukrainian Jew. An early follower of Marx, Trotsky believed in world revolution. He was first arrested by the Tsar’s secret police for his political views when he was 19, spent three months in jail and was banished to Siberia. He escaped and joined Lenin in London. On his return to Russia, he suffered further arrests and fled to Europe. He became the First Commissar for Foreign Affairs and when the civil war broke out, Commissar for War. He created the Red Army and led them to victory. He was regarded as Lenin’s most likely successor. Trotsky was a powerful speaker and an outstanding military leader. He and Stalin did not like each other.

**Stalin – ‘Man Of Steel’ (1879–1953)**

Joseph Stalin, born as Iosif Dzhugashvili, was the only surviving child of a poor family in Gori, southern Georgia. He had a hard life as a child, caught smallpox at the age of six and was often beaten by his father. At eight, his mother sent him to a church school in Gori where he learned Russian. He also went to a seminary in 1894 where he studied to become an Orthodox Christian priest. Stalin, however, became more fascinated with the works of **Karl Marx** and was expelled from the seminary in 1899 for missing his exam. In any case he had turned against all religion. After reading some of Lenin’s articles he joined the Russian Social Democratic Workers’ Party. He was arrested by the secret police and sent to Siberia. When he escaped he married Yekaterina Svanidze but she died soon after giving birth to their son, Yakov. At the funeral of his wife in 1907 he confessed, pointing to the coffin: ‘She was the only creature who softened my heart of stone. She is dead, and with her have died my last warm feelings for humanity’. Between 1904 and 1912 he spent most of his time in prison or in exile. In 1913 Dzhugashvili changed his name to Stalin, which means ‘man of steel’. Lenin noticed the loyal Bolshevik’s Georgian background and ability, and appointed him First Commissar for the Nationalities after the revolution. While in this post Stalin acquired influence in the non-Russian areas of the Soviet Union and filled regional posts with people loyal to him. In 1918 Stalin remarried and had a second son, Vasili, and a daughter Svetlana. In 1922 he was made General Secretary of the Communist Party. He used this position to acquire considerable power.
Stalin the ‘Strategist’
Stalin seized power quietly. He won power by carrying out the following:

A ‘cult of Leninism’
He deliberately fostered the image of a moderate, reasonable man whose only wish was to serve the USSR by following in Lenin’s footsteps. Stalin then set up places of pilgrimage (Lenin’s tomb and Lenin museums), ‘religious’ holidays, and sacred texts (Lenin’s writings). Petrograd was renamed Leningrad. Stalin played a key role at the funeral, with the aim that he would be seen as the natural heir to the throne.

The ‘Lenin Enrolment’
Stalin used his role as Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party to consolidate his position. The post gave Stalin the power to select the local Party officials who controlled the membership of the Party throughout Russia.

Stalin had the power not only to promote members but also to expel them. A purge (killing) of unsuitable recruits cut members to about 350,000 in 1923. Then, in early 1924 Stalin announced the ‘Lenin enrolment’ of 240,000 new members. Simultaneously, he purged the old party once more, so that by 1924 there were more members recruited by Stalin than there were old Bolsheviks. In 1925, only a few thousand had joined before 1917. The new members owed everything to Stalin and were not likely to oppose him. Figure 6.1.1 illustrates the enormous power that Stalin was able to exert over the ordinary members of the Party.

Stalin built up the secret police and made sure they were loyal only to him. Their job was to not only get rid of non-Communists but to terrorise Communists whom Stalin thought were critical of him or opposed him.

Trotsky is out
To Stalin, Trotsky was the biggest threat. Trotsky urged a policy of building up factories. But Stalin believed technology would be wasted on Russia’s peasant majority. While Trotsky was speaking out about some of the revolution’s failures – for instance, peasants had to pay three times as much for manufactured goods in 1923 as in 1917 and there were many shortages – Stalin was deliberately having Trotsky’s friends and allies sent to posts abroad or having them purged (killed).

Gradually, Trotsky was being isolated as he lacked support in the Politburo where he most needed it. In October 1924 Trotsky fell out with Zinoviev and Kamenev, the respective heads of the Party in Leningrad and Moscow. After Trotsky’s resignation as Commissar for Military and Naval Affairs (in 1925) and expulsion from the Politburo (1927), he ceased to be a major political influence.

Unfortunately for Zinoviev and Kamenev, once they had helped remove Trotsky from the Politburo they were no longer of any value to Stalin. In 1927 they were expelled from the Party and were shot in 1936. After several failed assassinations (though his children all died mysteriously) Trotsky fled in 1940 to exile in Mexico. A Mexican Communist, under orders from Stalin, killed Trotsky with an ice axe.
Figure 6.1.1 Stalin’s rise to power was due to a number of events. It had many causes. Above are some of the most important
How did Stalin promote socio-economic and political stability in the USSR?

By December 1929, when Stalin celebrated his fiftieth birthday, it was clear that the USSR had only one leader. The Stalinist era had begun.

Stalin controlled the Politburo and the Party but the problems facing Russian agriculture and industry had to be resolved.

The Soviet Union was largely a peasant society with few industries and poor communications. Stalin knew it was a weakness. He listed the foreign countries that had invaded Russia in the past by saying:

> ‘The history of the old Russia has consisted in being beaten again and again . . . because of her . . . backwardness, military backwardness, industrial backwardness, agricultural backwardness. She was beaten because to beat her has paid off and because people have been able to get away with it. If you are backward and weak then you are in the wrong and may be beaten and enslaved. But if you are powerful . . . people must beware of you. We are fifty to a hundred years behind the advanced countries. We must make up this gap in ten years. Either we do this or they crush us.’

Stalin’s speech 1931

Stalin’s speech proved remarkably prophetic. Ten years after he said the above words, Nazi Germany invaded the Soviet Union.

Stalin’s Five-Year plans helped Russian industry to make some weapons to put up a good fight in World War II though they also had to rely on weapons and equipment from the United States. There were two Five-Year plans before World War II, October 1928–December 1932 and 1933–1937. The third Five-Year plan 1938–1942 was disrupted by the outbreak of war in 1941.

A well-armed and equipped military was needed to secure the USSR from further invasions. The answer to prosperity lay in industrialisation and modern agriculture. See Figure 6.1.2.
Stalin realised that he had to take more extreme measures than what Lenin had started with his NEP policy.

‘The New Economic Policy’ (NEP) was a departure from socialism because it encouraged some, but limited, private ownership of land and industry. In practice it had not got rid of richer peasant farmers, the *kulaks*, who had surplus grain and sold it for profits in the markets.

**Stalin’s ‘Second Revolution’**

Stalin’s new aim was to lead the country to new achievements, which would be as important to the Soviet Union as the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. It was going to be an economic revolution where the USSR would be transformed to become a true Socialist state. To achieve this, he announced a series of targets to be reached in five years for the modernisation of agriculture and industry.

**‘Gosplan’ – State Planning Commission**

Set up in 1921, ‘Gosplan’ was a committee established to study conditions and have set plans to improve the economy. The many planning agencies of each republic within the USSR would be told what figures had to be produced from each industry in each town with a population of 20 000 or more. It aimed to build state factories, dams and buildings, extend electricity, develop natural resources, turn inefficient peasant farmers into efficient collective farmers, improve farming methods and add communists to the Party. In 1927 Gosplan announced the plan to take effect the next year.

**Important Words**

- **Kulak**: Richer peasant who employed other peasants.
- **NEP**: Lenin’s New Economic Policy
- **Kolkhoz**: Collective farm
- **Capitalist**: a person who supports private ownership and control in an economy
1928 – ‘The Five Year Plan’

The plan set high targets. Industrial production was to rise by 180%, concentrating on iron, steel and tractors. Consumer goods production would rise 70%, agricultural output by 55%. To meet these targets, all peasant lands would be reorganised into collective farms (kolkhoz). Heavy industry would be controlled more closely by government officials and be vigorously pushed ahead. All private trade and production would come to an end.

The doctrine of ‘Socialism in one country’ was meant to give a new direction and a new purpose to the communists. Russia needed to be transformed into a great power as quickly as possible. This meant that they needed a firm industrial base. The Communist government had to obtain finance from somewhere as Stalin did not want to borrow from his enemies ‘the capitalist West’, so he felt the Soviet Union had to solve the problem on its own, internally and the answer was agriculture. Improved agriculture and revenue from exports would pay for the increase in industries.

Industrialisation

In the 1920s Russia’s industries were very backward and limited because the country was mainly agricultural. Production figures did not even match the levels of pre-1914.

The reason why the communist party wanted rapid industrialisation was because of what it saw as the need:

i for Russia to become a powerful industrial and military nation

ii to create a socialist society based on the dictatorship of the proletariat (working class or wage earners in general). This meant the destruction of private enterprises encouraged under the NEP.

iii to get rid of fierce opposition from within the Communist Party itself over lack of action.

According to Stalin there were only two choices. Either the industries could develop slowly and steadily, or development would be quick without concern for human suffering.

The full force of the State and Party machine was mobilised to ensure that the Plans succeeded. Production targets were set high and workers were encouraged to reach almost unrealistic levels of activity. The Communist Party often said a factory had to produce so much, yet if the workers were unskilled or the factory had few materials to work with it was often impossible for factories to reach their goals. Also because the State expected them to work hastily the goods were often of bad quality.

Hundreds of thousands of people were forced to migrate from the countryside to the new towns where they were quickly trained into new skills. The work force was tightly controlled. By 1939, disorderly behaviour resulted in workers being jailed and those who missed a day’s work got dismissed. Theft of state property was made punishable by death.

By the time the Second Plan was in operation the government had begun to shift its emphasis from force to persuasion. Piecework (work paid for according to the quantity produced) and wage differentials (different rates of pay for different types of work) were introduced. Medals, such as the Order of Lenin, were awarded to
outstanding workers. The most famous achievement was that of Alexander Stakhanov, who mined 102 tonnes of coal in six hours – fourteen times more than the given target.

A Communist State sponsored movement grew called ‘Stakhanovites’ and their workers were paid more money and earned extra privileges. The movement however, caused jealousies and was unpopular with large numbers of workers. Many Stakhanovites became targets of violence by the rest of the workers.

The government tried creating trade unions. However the Unions were not free associations as in the West because all officials had to be Communist Party members. Communist Party officials placed in key positions stifled criticism by workers. They very quickly stopped industrial unrest. Although strikes remained legal, it was impossible for a communist member to support a strike, so no strikes took place.

Communist members were forbidden to interfere with the managers of the factories. They were forced to take the side of the bosses even if they agreed with the workers’ demands. To stop workers from disrupting production the government in 1931 passed a law that workers could not change their jobs without the permission of their boss.

**Collectivisation**

Stalin hoped that collectives:

- using modern methods and machines would produce more output than the thousands of small inefficient farms
- which had surplus workers, would send them to work in the new industries
- would be easier for the Communist Party to supervise and control.

The Five-Year Plans set targets for agriculture as well as industries. They also drastically changed the way Soviet farming was organised. The State took land that individual peasants or peasant villages owned privately. It combined the land of several areas to form collective farms (kolkhozy) or state farms (sovkhzy).

**Kolkhozy**

Peasants were supposed to hand over all their land in return for a share of the profits.

**Sovkhozy**

The State owned all land and goods and labourers worked for wages.

Some poor peasants who owned nothing did not mind collectivisation. Those who did object were the peasants (kulaks) who had their own farms or whose land had belonged to their family or villages for many years and had prospered under Lenin’s NEP.

By 1934, 90 percent of peasants had joined collectives, but this figure was achieved only after tremendous struggle.

The kulaks that refused to give up their private farms were in the end forced out by the army and OGPU (secret police). The kulaks replied by not planting crops or hiding what they produced, destroying animals, grain and tools and barns, rather than hand them over to the state. Stalin sent many kulaks to labour camps or remote parts of Siberia. Riots broke out in some villages and the army went in with
machine guns. People were forced to surrender or be killed. Between 1929 and 1934 more than 5 million Russian peasants died as a result of Stalin’s policies, half by starvation because collectivisation was not producing enough food to feed them and what food there was, was sent to workers in the cities.

Figure 6.1.3 Effects of Collectivism
How did the policies and actions adopted by Stalin impact on the USSR?

How critical were the strategies pursued by Stalin in maintaining stability?

It was now Stalin’s time to eliminate or get rid of his enemies and those who were possible threats to his leadership.

One such threat was Sergei Kirov, Leningrad’s party secretary, who was also popular in Moscow. Kirov was shot dead outside his Leningrad office in 1934 on Stalin’s orders. Stalin publicly mourned his friend at the funeral and named many places in Kirov’s honour, but he had got rid of a dangerous rival. Kirov’s death sparked off four years of terror. Some were put on trial and shot. Others were sent to labour camps. Others just disappeared and were never heard of again. It wasn’t just important people in the government, civil service and army who suffered. Millions of people from the countryside and towns became victims of the purges.

The slightest opposition, a chance remark, even mere bad luck could be enough to earn long jail sentences. There were mass murders. Prominent victims were tried at big ‘show trials’. Show trials were where the accused had been tortured so that they would confess in court that they were ‘guilty’ and they ‘deserved punishment’. Party members were not spared. More than 150 members of the Leningrad Communist Party were shot; they were accused of plotting Kirov’s murder.

For some people the ‘crime’ was to be the wife or the child of a ‘criminal’ so they too were sentenced. The terrifying ‘great purges’ reigned until 1938.

By executing or sending to forced-labour camps seventy-five percent of his colleagues on the Politburo and an even larger proportion of the military high command, Stalin strengthened his power as a totalitarian leader. The only people he trusted were the leaders of his secret police, and he even purged some of them.

Features of a **Totalitarian** regime:

- state controls the economy
- one political party allowed
- state controls the media
- ruthless secret police
- a strong god-like leader
an official ideology, which takes priority over the law, religion and individual conscience.

It was obvious at this time that the USSR became a totalitarian state under Stalin.

**Stalin The Dictator**

Constant propaganda taught people to hail Stalin as the father of the country. Propaganda showed Stalin to be responsible for the success of the country. People were told Stalin was the ‘the greatest genius in history and shining sun of the human race’

An intense programme of indoctrination was carried out. The Communist Party did exactly what the Nazi Party did under Hitler. Most school children were made to join the ‘Young Pioneers’, the junior branch of the Communist Party. By 1928 over 40 000 party schools and 19 party universities existed. Art and literature had to serve Communism. The dictator had no time for modern painting. Stalin demanded the style called ‘socialist realism’ so that many paintings were of steel works or coal mining or workers happy in work, or pictures of Stalin surrounded by people made to look happy to see him.

Stalin also encouraged women to become equal to men in the work place and receive the same as wages as men. Women were paid four months’ maternity leave.
and crèches were set up in the factories. The Communist Party saw the commitment to the family as a threat and dangerous.

Attempts were made to weaken the family so as to change people’s loyalty to the Soviet State instead of their family. Divorce was reduced to a postcard registration.

The Communists also saw religion as a threat because it would tell people that what the Communists were doing was wrong. Most Russians were Christians but the Communists wanted to stop them believing in God. Belief in God and loyalty and respect for the priests and ministers needed to be replaced by a belief in Stalin and communism. Stalin ordered campaigns against the churches, priests were persecuted and imprisoned and church property was confiscated. Some churches were converted into museums. Religious education in school was banned, replaced by lessons in Marxist beliefs.

Sunday was abolished as a day of rest and people were expected to work seven days a week so as not to disrupt production. Despite the strict control on religion, the church became more important for people.

In 1939, as war with Germany was more than likely, Stalin began to relax the persecution. He needed the support of all Soviet citizens and he thought if he let some churches open as cultural centres the people would build up their national pride. He realised that he needed the national pride and loyalty of the people if the USSR was to fight Hitler. However, up to his death Stalin was against religion. Up to the fall of Communism in the 1990s the Soviet leaders allowed some religion but on the whole they opposed it and tried to discourage it in the USSR.

The Great Patriotic War 1939–1945

On 22 June 1941 a three million-strong German force invaded the Soviet Union. Hitler called the invasion of the USSR ‘Operation Barbarossa’. By the end of 1941 Hitler had occupied the Ukraine and much of Western Russia.

Stalin knew that he had to appeal to the people, not to Communism but to Russian pride, tradition and history. So in the USSR the Communists called World War II ‘The Great Patriotic War’.

Stalin was now an ally with Britain, France and the United States – working tirelessly to defeat Hitler. Although they hated and feared Stalin, many Soviet people loved their country and were prepared to make a big defence against Hitler. So they fought fiercely and bravely.

Germany was defeated in 1945 and Stalin came away from the war as a hero, not only with his own people in the Soviet Union but also with his enemies – the Capitalist West.

The Post War Years

The war had taken Russia backward again. Stalin was determined to rebuild Russia’s strength as fast as possible. During the post-war years he cut the Soviet Union off from the rest of the world. As the ‘Cold War’ tensions began Stalin set up a wall of censorship, not only in the Soviet Union but in the whole of Eastern Europe. Behind this curtain of terror another great wave of purges was about to begin, but luckily for the people Stalin died of a stroke in March 1953. His body was put to rest at the Kremlin alongside Lenin in the mausoleum in Red Square.
De-Stalinisation

The person who succeeded Stalin was Nikita Khrushchev. His policies were very different from those of Stalin. Although Communism was still not democratic, Khrushchev and other Communists did not approve of the crimes of Stalin.

In February 1956, Khrushchev startled the world with a savage and comprehensive attack on Stalin’s memory at the Twentieth Party Congress.

Under Stalin, Khrushchev said, ‘Soviet citizens came to fear their own shadows’. He argued that the purges of party members and the mass murder of ordinary people were unnecessary. The achievements of the USSR since 1917, said Khrushchev, were not due to Stalin.

Khrushchev however, did admit that Stalin had done some good. He had been correct to rid the country of the followers of Trotsky before 1934. The Five-Year Plans were also right because they made the USSR strong and victorious in World War II.

Pictures and statues of Stalin were removed and destroyed. His name became an embarrassment and a dirty word. Stalin’s body was removed, cremated and his ashes buried below the Kremlin wall.

Khrushchev realised that even if he was opposed to the West he and the Communist Party needed contacts with the outside world. He wanted to encourage Communism in countries outside Europe. He wanted to make foreign visits and to personally address the United Nations Assembly to let other countries know the views of the USSR.
How effective was Stalin as the leader of the USSR?

In assessing the qualities of Stalin and his effectiveness as a leader, it is clear that there were good and bad points in Stalin’s rule over the Soviet Union.

Exactly how many people Stalin had killed during his reign, we will never know. It has been estimated that between 15 and 20 million people died during the policy of collectivisation, forced industrialisation and the great purge of 1929–38. Some died of starvation, some from ill treatment and some were killed, but they all died as a direct or indirect result of Stalin’s policies.

People tend to think that Adolf Hitler was the greatest murderer of all time – killing six million Jews. Josef Stalin can be placed alongside Hitler, or worse, as one of the greatest criminals in history because he killed so many of his own people.

The horror of the purges would be strong in people’s minds; on the other hand Stalin may have been worried about the threat of a takeover by the Red Army.

The Soviet people may have suffered many hardships because of the great shortage and scarcity of consumer goods (ordinary goods like clothes, books and cars).

From another point of view you could argue that by concentrating on heavy industry, Stalin laid the foundations of Soviet strength that enabled the USSR to withstand ‘Operation Barbarossa’ and to finally defeat Germany in 1945.

This was at least something in the Soviet Union to show for the sacrifice. Fifty years of industrialisation were forced into ten years, and the growth was vital at the time.

Stalin repressed many ethnic minorities within the Soviet Union at a time when nationalism was very strong. He also extended Russia’s influence further west than it had ever been before. When Stalin died, millions of people lived under Communist governments.

The standard of living of ordinary people in the Soviet Union improved, in health and education. However the greatest achievement of all was that under the leadership of Josef Stalin the USSR became a superpower.

‘The life of the wise leader and teacher of the Communist Party and Soviet people, Lenin’s comrade, and brilliant disciple, J.V. Stalin is over.’

announced on Moscow radio, 6 March 1953

Without a doubt, Stalin was an effective leader, but it was at an appalling cost to the life, liberty, well-being and happiness of many people.
Mahatma Gandhi

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi was born on 2 October 1869 in Porbander, Gujarat, in India and was assassinated on the 30 January 1948. He was popularly known as Mahatma Gandhi. Mahatma means great soul. He was one of the founding fathers of modern India and an advocate of satyagraha (non-violent protest).

He helped bring about India’s independence from British rule, inspired other colonial peoples to work for their own independence and ultimately dismantled the British Empire in India. Gandhi’s principle of satyagraha means ‘way of truth’; and ‘pursuit of truth’ and has inspired generations of democratic and anti-racist activists including Martin Luther King (in the struggle for Black Civil Rights in the USA) and Nelson Mandela in his fight against apartheid in South Africa. Gandhi’s values were drawn from the traditional Hindu beliefs: truth (satya) and non-violence (ahimsa).

Gandhi was educated at the University of London as a lawyer. He went to Durban, South Africa to practise law in 1893 and it was there that he started his political career by lobbying against laws discriminating against Indians in South Africa.

In India, using his satyagraha principle, he led movements to protest against British rule.

These were:

- Dandi March (1930) also known as the Salt March.
- Quit India Campaign.
- Hartals whereby Indians boycotted British goods, education and other institutions.
- Advocated the use of the spinning wheel. Indians spun their own cotton to make their clothes instead of buying British-made clothes.
- Fasting. This was Gandhi’s way to protest against the British and as a tool to bring together the Muslims and the Hindus.
- Khilafat movement whereby he encouraged the Hindus to support the Muslims’ fight to reinstate the sultan as the Khilafat.

Important Words

- Bania: A caste of shopkeepers or small traders
- Vaishya: The third caste of farmers and merchants
- Hindu: Person born in India or one who has Indian parents and who practises the religion Hinduism.
The family was well off and Gandhi highly respected his father and he regarded his mother with great affection. Mohandas grew up in an extended family sharing the house with his brothers, sisters, cousins, uncles and aunts.

The Gandhi family belonged to the Modh Bania sub-caste of Vaishyas (farmers and merchants), which rank third in the original four divisions of the Hindu caste system.

The Banias are well known for being clever businessmen and they are generally Vaishnavas and vegetarian. So Gandhi was brought up in a strict religious atmosphere with a strong emphasis on honesty and truth.

Even though Gandhi was brought up a strict Hindu, later on in life many different religions played an influential role in his outlook. As the youngest son, he was closer to his mother and it was she who most influenced his childhood. Gandhi would later on admit that he carried with him throughout his life an impression of her saintliness, and it was from her that he learnt about love and sacrifice.

![Figure 6.3.1 The Varna Caste Hierarchy](image)

- The caste diagram is a simplified one. In practice the caste system is far more complex with many different local hierarchies.
- A person’s caste decides whom that person is allowed to marry. Parents, according to the caste rule, usually arrange marriages for their children.
- The attitude towards untouchables has not changed. The terms Outcaste and Untouchable are not commonly used. Gandhi preferred the term Harijan (people of God). The Untouchables prefer to be called Dalits (oppressed).
At the age of thirteen, Gandhi followed the Indian tradition of an arranged marriage to Kasturbai, a girl of the same age, chosen for him by the elders of the family.

In 1887 Gandhi finished his secondary education and went to England to complete a Law degree. While living in London, Gandhi became a leading member of the London Vegetarian Society. After three years of studying in England, Gandhi passed his examination and enrolled at the High Court before sailing for India on 12 June 1891.

Gandhi’s Rise To Prominence – South Africa

Gandhi arrived back to his family home with high hopes of getting a job. This was not the case as there were plenty of lawyers with more experience. His first court case even ended in disaster; he froze in front of the judge and his client, unable to say anything, because he was afraid that his English was not good enough.

Finally in 1893 an opportunity arose in Durban, South Africa where Gandhi was asked to sort out a legal claim. Although the contract was only for a year, Gandhi lived in South Africa for more than twenty years, returning with a reputation for skilful leadership.

Gandhi attributed his long stay to a racist experience shortly after his arrival. When he was travelling in a first class railway compartment to Pretoria, a white person who strongly objected to an Indian in the same carriage ordered Ghandi to transfer to a lower class carriage. When Gandhi refused, a police officer forced him off the train. He spent the night on the station platform in the cold considering whether to return to India or stay.

Indians had suffered daily – 90 000 Indians lived and worked in South Africa under white British rule. For many the conditions were bad and some were treated almost as slaves.

Only a few hundred Indians enjoyed special treatment like the right to vote if they owned a large amount of land.
Indian Franchise Bill

As Gandhi was preparing to leave South Africa for India, he learnt of the Natal government’s intention to introduce a bill to take away from all eligible Indians the right to vote.

The majority of the Indians living in Natal were not allowed to vote anyway, as they were illiterate labourers who had been shipped from India to work as indentured labour on sugar plantations or in mines. There were, however, 250 Indians on the voting roll. Britain had just granted self-government to Natal and the Indian Franchise Bill was one of the new government’s first proposals.

Gandhi began a vigorous campaign to stop the Bill, as it was wrong to deprive Indians of their political rights.

Gandhi’s First Campaign

Gandhi founded the Natal Indian Congress and began collecting signatures for a substantial petition opposing the Bill to be presented to parliament.

Despite the protest, the Natal government passed the Bill in 1896. Gandhi then redirected his protest to the Colonial Office in London, which had the right to veto the new law.

Gandhi was partly successful in his protest. The Secretary of the London colonial office vetoed the law on the grounds that the Bill was discriminating against another country that belonged to the British empire. India was also part of the British empire. Gandhi’s faith in the general fairness of British rule was restored.
The Natal government then amended the wording to leave out the word ‘Indians’ and successfully passed the bill to still deprive Indians of their right to vote.

When the **Boer War** broke out in 1899 Gandhi organised an Indian ambulance corps to support the British troops against the Boers.

At the end of the war in 1902, Gandhi started up an **ashram** (Hindu community for spiritual improvement) called the Phoenix Settlement consisting of several families living together under strict discipline, which Gandhi established.

He also started up his own newspaper *Indian Opinion*.

### Satyagraha

In 1906 some members of the Indian community required his legal advice in Johannesburg. The colonial government of the Transvaal had published the ‘Black Ordinance’ which required every Indian to carry a certificate at all times. Gandhi called a meeting in Johannesburg. Hundreds of angry Indians turned up at the meeting. Gandhi’s response was to reject the certificates by adopting a campaign of **satyagraha**. In the end every single person vowed to reject the certificates in a non-violent way. Satyagraha was to be applied to all of Gandhi’s later campaigns, both in South Africa and in India.

In 1907 the Transvaal was granted self-government by the British government and the ideas of the ‘Black Ordinance’ were passed into law. Gandhi began his campaign against registering to receive a certificate, and very few Indians registered.

Acting on behalf of the Transvaal government, General Smuts (later Prime Minister of South Africa) offered to withdraw the ordinance if Indians registered voluntarily. Gandhi agreed, only to burn his certificate later when Smuts failed to keep his word.

Gandhi had to deal with two more racist laws before returning to India. One was a tax placed on all **indentured labourers**. Smuts promised to repeal the tax when Gandhi protested but went back on his word again.

The other issue was when the South African Supreme Court judged that marriages performed according to either Hindu or Muslim traditions were invalid. This meant Indian couples were not legally married and their children would be illegitimate. Naturally many Indians were angry and upset by this ruling that did not respect their religions.

The battle went on for years marked by terms of imprisonment for Gandhi and his followers. He also conducted a famous march of Indian coal miners from Natal into the Transvaal in which the government resorted to violence to stop the marchers. Good publicity came to Gandhi and the problems in South Africa so that many non-Indian people too felt Gandhi’s protests were just and eventually Smuts gave way on the issues. When Gandhi finally left for India in 1914 Smuts remarked: ‘The saint has left our shores, I sincerely hope for ever’. Smuts had found Gandhi a nuisance. However he admired Gandhi’s courage, honesty and integrity and that he was willing to make big sacrifices.

By the time Gandhi returned home, he had the qualities of leadership. He had developed personal courage, skills in communication and the principles of satyagraha.
Return To India

News of Gandhi’s work in South Africa had reached India and huge crowds waited in Bombay to greet him. Gandhi descended from the ship dressed in a simple cloak, a turban and a dhoti when he returned home in January 1915 and announced in a press interview, ‘I propose to remain in India and serve the motherland for the rest of my days’.

Figure 6.3.4 Gandhi and Kasturbai
The Actions Of Gandhi

What actions did Mahatma Gandhi take to promote socio-economic and political stability within India?

During the early years of his campaigns in India, Gandhi travelled around the country to Kanpu, Gujarat, Champaran, Kaira, Ahmedabad and Calcutta, where he was involved in campaigns of 'Satyagraha' to solve the various problems presented to him.

He became known by the masses of India, where people related to him because he dressed simply in traditional Indian clothes and talked to them in their language and shared their way of life. Before Gandhi no Indian politician had done this.

Gandhi’s first campaign

Champaran

Peasants complained of being cheated by the British planters. The peasants had put in the hard work while the planters kept all the extra profits. Gandhi was ordered to leave by the magistrate. In satyagraha style Gandhi instead invited the magistrate to imprison him since he refused to leave.

Champaran proved an ideal test case in which Gandhi introduced satyagraha to India and ended in victory for the Indian planters.

Another of Gandhi’s early campaigns was in Gandhi’s home area of Gujarat.

Gandhi’s second campaign:

Kaira

The people of Kaira complained of increased taxation especially during poor harvests when they could hardly put food on the table. Gandhi advised the peasants not to pay tax on the grounds that the harvest had been poor.

The government replied by instructing the tax collectors to seize possessions and crops.

Gandhi called off the satyagraha when the government agreed not to force payment from the poorest peasants.

During the Kaira campaign, Gandhi acquired new important followers, such as Valabhbhai Patel who later became the deputy prime minister of India.
Valabhbhai (Sardar) Patel
Born into a peasant family in 1875 he became a successful lawyer in Ahmedabad. He followed Gandhi, which led him to abandon his law practice in 1922 to devote his time completely to Ghandian politics. During the Salt march, Patel suffered lengthy imprisonment and again during the Quit India campaign of 1942. Released from jail he became one of Congress’ principal negotiators with the British. After independence was gained in 1947, Sardar was elected Deputy Prime Minister.
He died on 15 December 1950.

Gandhi’s third campaign
Ahmedabad
The third satyagraha was against the Indian cotton mill in Ahmedabad. In 1918 the mill owners locked out their workers when they refused to accept the withdrawal of a bonus previously paid to them in the past. Gandhi conducted satyagraha against the mill owners by going on a fast. The mill owners, frightened he would die, gave in and the workers got their increased wages.

World War I – Gandhi’s recruitment campaign
Gandhi felt it was his duty to help the British empire. He became a recruiter for the Indian army, and went around India to enlist Indians to fight with the British against the Germans. Some people criticised him for the inconsistencies in his thinking, because he preached non-violence yet recruited people to fight.

Gandhi’s Satyagraha At A National Level
Rowlatt and Khilafat 1918–1920
As a result of World War I, the government of India enjoyed special powers under the Defence of India Act, to prevent any possibility of terrorist violence by the enemies of British rule. These powers suspended many activities including the freedom of the Indian press.

After the war however, Mr Justice Rowlatt and his committee wanted to extend the emergency powers to impose military law in any area where people were troublesome.

Indian politicians opposed the proposals of the ‘Rowlatt Bills’ but felt powerless to do anything. Gandhi took up the cause as he maintained that the Bills would deprive the people of the right that God gave all people of free expression and so break the law of God.

The cause thus became a religious one. Congress leaders were not sure as there was no national support for his satyagraha campaign, but he had nothing to lose.

Gandhi’s method of satyagraha was to call a hartal – closing of shops and businesses.

Despite some limited success of the hartal, the escalating violence that resulted was of great concern to Gandhi. Gandhi was arrested but released on the condition that he not leave Bombay.
Jallianwala Bagh – Amritsar

The Amritsar event was the one of the most well-known and tragic events that involved Satyagraha.

You will already have learned about these events. Go to page 50 to revise this section.

The events of 1919 showed that the people of India wanted changes. The Rowlatt Bills may have been a failure but Gandhi and satyagraha were an alternative to the mainstream politics.

The brutality of the Amritsar shooting was a turning point for many Indians. Many asked why the British remained in their country.

The government of British-ruled India then introduced new reforms where some aspects of government were given to elected provincial assemblies. India was made up of several states with their own governments. Many were formerly ruled by mainly Muslim rajas or maharajas (princes). The British let them govern themselves to a limited extent but gave no independence to India as a whole. This was limited Home Rule, and an advance in the Indian constitution.

However the power was still with the government under the control of the Viceroy. The Viceroy had the power of veto and in reality the British government made few political concessions to the people of India.

Another major concern to the people but especially Muslims was the Khilafat issue.

It was this issue that put Gandhi in the limelight and at the forefront of national politics in India.

Khilafat – (Hindu and Muslim)

Muslims of India were outraged by the loss of their holy places at the end of World War I. Defeated by the Allies, the Sultan of Turkey who sided with Germany in the war was stripped of his empire. The Sultan as Khalif lost control of Islam’s three holy places – the cities of Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem. Muslims regarded the Sultan as the spiritual protector of Islam’s holy places. Muslims believed that his responsibility to protect and extend the boundaries of Islam, the Khilafat, was directly from God.

Gandhi believed that the Khilafat issue was a rare and significant issue for all Indians regardless of religion to take up the cause and for the sake of Indian unity. It was to be a national political movement uniting all Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs and Christians.

They would call on the British rulers to leave India. Gandhi linked the Khilafat issue and the Hunter Report over Amritsar to achieve a Hindu–Muslim political unity. It was these two ‘wrongs’ the British had committed that were the reasons for the Non-Co-operation Movement of 1920–22 that was to follow.
Non-Co-operation 1920–22

‘Call for Independence’

Gandhi’s next target was the British Raj. He proposed a different form of satyagraha in which Indians would simply refuse to co-operate with the British rulers. He argued that if all the civil servants and other Indians who worked for the Raj did not serve, the British would be put in a hopeless situation.

If non-co-operation was carried out properly, the whole system of the Raj would grind to a halt and the British would have to leave India.

The Muslims accepted Gandhi’s non-co-operation campaign and regarded him at this time as the Khilafat leader. Gandhi was the most important leader during this period. The campaign was to be an all India effort.

Gandhi began the non-co-operation satyagraha by symbolically returning the medals the British Government had awarded him for his services in South Africa.

The Features of Non-Co-operation

- All titles and honours presented to Indians by the British were to be given up.
- There was to be no participation in the election after the Montagu–Chelmsford Reforms.
- All foreign goods were to be boycotted (swadeshi). The wearing of khadi or khaddar became the symbols of swadeshi.

The wearing of the khaddar was to become a truly powerful symbol. The spinning wheel began to be of great significance not only for Gandhi but also for people all over India.

Indians had neglected Indian homespun cotton, as cheaper cotton cloth was manufactured by the British both in India and England. Gandhi saw it as a chance for people all over India to become self-sufficient. Ghandi said that people in thousands of villages with little training could easily produce the cloth for their own clothes. To prove it Ghandi taught himself to spin and made all his own traditional clothes.

As the emphasis on khadi became popular the imports of cotton textiles greatly declined. Indians began to take up the protest by burning any clothes of foreign origin.

With Congress committing itself to the policy of non-co-operation, Gandhi emerged in 1921 as the leader of the nationalist movement for Indian independence.

Effects of Non-Co-operation

- many Indians gave up their British titles and medals
- thousands of lawyers, including Motilal Nehru, C. R. Das and Valabhbhai Patel abandoned their legal practices as well as the British court system for good
- many students and teachers left the cities, not only to teach literacy to the villagers but also to educate them on non-co-operation
thousands took up the spinning wheels, foreign cloth was boycotted and khadi became common

at an annual meeting of Congress, 6000 delegates were dressed in khadi except M.A Jinnah who wore a suit

twenty thousand Indians were imprisoned.

Non-Co-operation Ends

Gandhi had always said that satyagraha must be non-violent no matter what. But as the movement increased so did the violence. It was difficult enough to merge three different groups into the movement – the Congress leaders who were not convinced with his methods, the newcomers and the Khilafat movement.

The end of the campaign came when a mob attacked a police station at Chauri Chauri, killing and burning twenty-two Indian policemen employed by the British.

The Salt Satyagraha/Civil Disobedience

Gandhi's next satyagraha was to get rid of the salt tax. Because salt was a vital ingredient to the diet of all Indians and the British controlled the making of salt in India, Gandhi decided to attack the salt law.

The salt march was to be from Ahmedabad to Dandi beach, 385 kilometres away. On 12 March 1930, followed by 78 trained satyagrahis, Gandhi began his long and dusty march.

Eventually on the 6 April, followed by thousands of marchers, Gandhi reached the seashore of Dandi. Bending to pick up a lump of salt, Gandhi had committed an illegal act. Tens of thousands joined in the protest and as many as 100 000 satyagrahis may have been jailed. Gandhi was arrested and jailed.

Independence

In 1931 Gandhi was invited to participate in a government conference in London, to discuss the possible independence of India. But the talking ended in stalemate. India was still part of the British Empire. Together with his struggle for independence, Gandhi fought to improve the status of the lowest caste of society, the casteless Untouchables (people in India did not regard them as belonging to the caste system).

Early in World War II Gandhi demanded immediate independence as India’s prize for helping Britain in the war. Gandhi was imprisoned for the last time in 1942 to 1944, after he had demanded total withdrawal of the British (the Quit India movement). Gandhi worked tirelessly in his attempts to form a close relationship between the Hindu (majority) and the numerous minorities of India, particularly the Muslims. When India and Pakistan became independent on 15 August 1947, Gandhi spent the day spinning, praying and fasting. His greatest failure, in fact, was his inability to persuade the leader of the Muslim League, Jinnah, to remain united and reject the partition of India.

The subcontinent split into two countries (India and Pakistan) and brought Hindu–Muslim riots. Gandhi once again turned to non-violence, fasting until Delhi rioters pledged peace to him. On 30 January 1948, while on his way to prayer in Delhi, Gandhi was killed by a Hindu extremist who was angry that Gandhi accepted partition. He also rejected Gandhi’s satyagraha.
News of the assassination of the Mahatma shocked the world. Messages of condolence poured in from people such as the Pope, the King and Queen of England, the President of the United States, the President of France and hundreds more. Gandhi’s funeral was one of the biggest in the world.
Strategies And Qualities of Gandhi

How critical were the strategies pursued by Gandhi in maintaining stability?

What Effects Did Gandhi’s Actions Have On India?

Gandhi’s unique and successful form of revolution ‘satyagraha’ brought about the early independence of India from the tight hold of the British government. India was the first colony of the British Empire to be independent.

The strategies pursued by Gandhi were quite critical in holding the many millions of the population of India together to unite in a common drive. The strategies he devised for India were quite revolutionary in freeing a country from the might of the British Empire.

Through satyagraha Gandhi led his people by example. He not only planned but also led every single demonstration. Thousands followed because the strategies were quite simple to follow. His insistence on non-violence was a crucial instrument as the British army found it difficult to fight back. Certainly the British Raj was at a loss in dealing with such a tactic.

However, he may also be regarded as a failure. His teachings have not carried on. India today is a nation with different paths. The caste system, which Gandhi disapproved of has survived today.

Relations between Hindus and Muslims in India and India’s relations with Pakistan are not that of brotherhood. Simple living, village industries, self-suffering and above all ahimsa or non-violence are practices that find few dedicated followers in India today.

However, Gandhi has remained as an ideal, all the more believable and acceptable because he was human. Gandhi did not claim to be perfect without any failings. He was inconsistent at times but his commitment and belief in non-violence are examples for many to follow.

Gandhi also left a special gift not only for India but also to the whole world – that of satyagraha!
What were the important qualities that Gandhi possessed? How effective was he as a leader of India?

Mahatma Gandhi could have been a very rich lawyer. He could have lived the life of an ordinary person in India. But he devoted his life to his country and to freedom. Through sheer determination and convictions Gandhi led India to independence to national and international acclaim.

Gandhi, elevated to the position of ‘father of the nation’, never lost his humility, his dedication and his spirit of sacrifice – important qualities for leading a country.

Gandhi was responsible for a unique and generally successful form of revolution called satyagraha. By using it against the colonial rulers of both South Africa and India, he gave his followers and the world beyond a peaceful revolutionary method. It was neither pacifism nor simple non-violence. It was satyagraha.

Gandhi’s principle of satyagraha, often roughly translated as ‘way of truth’ or ‘pursuit of truth’ inspired generations of democratic and anti-racist activists such as Martin Luther King and Nelson Mandela. He often stated his values were simple, drawn from traditional Hindu beliefs: truth (satya) and non-violence (ahimsa). Satyagraha was peaceful yet not passive. It was provocative and powerful.

Gandhi ended British rule over his native India peacefully. Gandhi was one of the greatest of men, a devout and almost mystical Hindu, with an iron core of determination. Nothing could change his convictions.

These traits made him an effective leader of India’s nationalist movement. Some observers called him a master politician. Others believed him to be a saint. To millions of Hindus he was their beloved Mahatma (great soul). A frail man, he devoted his entire life to peace and tolerance in order to achieve social and political progress.

Gandhi helped bring about India’s independence from British rule, inspiring other colonial peoples to work for their own independence and ultimately dismantle the British empire and replace it with the Commonwealth.

Today, his portrait hangs in government offices wreathed in flowers as is the Indian custom. He is called the ‘Father of modern India’.

Albert Einstein famously said of Gandhi: ‘Generations to come, it may be, will scarcely believe that such a one as this ever in flesh and blood walked upon this earth’.
Think through what you have learned in Part 6. Ask yourself if you can provide specific, in depth answers to each of the focusing questions that have guided the units.

1 I can discuss and identify the main reasons for Stalin’s rise to power and how he consolidated his leadership.

2 I can describe and explain Joseph Stalin’s impact on the Soviet Union. I can also critically discuss the different strategies pursued by Stalin in order to maintain stability within the Soviet Union.

3 I can identify and analyse the factors which led to the rise to power of Mohandas Gandhi who is known as ‘Mahatma’.

4 I can describe and explain the actions Gandhi took in order to promote socioeconomic and political stability within India.

5 I can assess and evaluate the strategies pursued by Gandhi in maintaining stability in India.
# Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word/phrase</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>A deliberate act of war.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance</td>
<td>A binding agreement between countries to support one another if required, usually a military pact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annexation</td>
<td>The seizure of power by one nation of foreign territory without the consent of the other state involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anschluss</td>
<td>Forced union of Germany and Austria in 1938, abolished in 1946.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Semitism</td>
<td>Hatred of Jews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of power</td>
<td>A fair, equal and just distribution of power among the European states.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bania</td>
<td>A caste of shopkeepers or small traders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolsheviks</td>
<td>Russian communists who followed Lenin in the Russian revolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalist</td>
<td>Person who supports private ownership and control in an economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective security</td>
<td>A method of defence by co-operating with neighbouring nations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivisation</td>
<td>Bringing together small landholdings to form one large unit or farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonies</td>
<td>Territories taken over and governed by another nation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communism</td>
<td>A system where the resources of a country are owned by the community and the production of goods and services are directly run by the government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalits</td>
<td>Oppressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>A time of high unemployment, bankruptcy and economic and social hardship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demilitarisation</td>
<td>Taking away the means of making war or providing defence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diktat</td>
<td>A decision forced on a group or country without consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomacy</td>
<td>Co-operation and negotiations between the representatives of countries as part of the process of international relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disarmament</td>
<td>Getting rid of military weapons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entente</td>
<td>A friendly understanding between countries but does not commit any nation to act in a crisis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fascist</td>
<td>Person believing in dictatorship, racist nationalism and the use of violence to get their aims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harijans</td>
<td>Children of God. Gandhi’s term for the Untouchables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperialism</td>
<td>Where a nation carries out a deliberate policy of territorial expansion by building a colonial empire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrialisation</td>
<td>Economic activity – making of goods like construction or steel work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td>A rise in prices which makes money and savings worth less than before.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolkhozy</td>
<td>Collective farms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebensraum</td>
<td>Living space or territorial expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Militarism</td>
<td>Belief in use of excessive military power to rule a country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilisation</td>
<td>The process adopted by countries whereby their armed forces were called up and readied for war. Prior to World War I this act was a virtual declaration of war.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalism</td>
<td>The desire of people with similar language, customs or history to rule themselves in their own country. It can also mean a nation's promotion of its might and power at the expense of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGPU</td>
<td>United State Political Administration – or secret police that Lenin set up in 1924 and Stalin reorganised in 1934 as the NKVD. Later it was the KGB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proletariat</td>
<td>A term first used by Karl Marx and later used by communists. It means working class or wage-earners in general. The Communists applied it to mean people who worked in factories, but not people who worked on the land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realpolitik</td>
<td>Bismarck’s foreign policy for Germany was realism, opportunism and war.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reparations</td>
<td>Payments Germans were forced to make at the Treaty of Versailles as punishment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanction</td>
<td>A restriction on trade like arms, oil etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satyagraha</td>
<td>Gandhi’s technique of non-violent protest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sovkhozy</td>
<td>Farms belonging to or owned by the State.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimatum</td>
<td>The final terms or conditions offered or demanded by a country, towards another, before a formal declaration of war.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word/phrase</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vaishya</td>
<td>The third caste of farmers and merchants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weltpolitik</td>
<td>The name given to Germany’s foreign policy when Kaiser Wilhelm II assumed power in 1890. It concerned Germany adopting a worldview and striving to become a major world power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Derivations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accuse</td>
<td>accusation, the accused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adequate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjust</td>
<td>readjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affair, affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aid</td>
<td>ambitious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apply (for)</td>
<td>application, applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assume</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitude</td>
<td>authorise, authorisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authority</td>
<td>binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bind, bound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cease</td>
<td>a ceasefire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commit</td>
<td>committed, commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complain</td>
<td>constantly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constitute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrate</td>
<td>demonstration, demonstrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design</td>
<td>designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desire</td>
<td>(un)desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>determine</td>
<td>determined, determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dismiss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frontier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fundamental</td>
<td>fundamentalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genuine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guard</td>
<td>safeguard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hardly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Key Vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Derivations</th>
<th>Collocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ideal</td>
<td>ideal test case</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illustrate</td>
<td>illustration ( = example)</td>
<td>I will give two illustrations of this point to impose military law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impose</td>
<td>imposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inferior</td>
<td>initially</td>
<td>their weapons were inferior the initial excitement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initial</td>
<td>intention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intend</td>
<td></td>
<td>he had no intention of keeping his promise the plan was intended to . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invest</td>
<td>investment</td>
<td>an intense programme of indoctrination the benefits of American investment in . . . unjust treatment, justice and equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just</td>
<td>unjust, justice</td>
<td>manufactured goods, the manufacturing sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacture</td>
<td></td>
<td>raw materials, war materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>means</td>
<td>morality</td>
<td>the means of making war, by other means a moral defeat, the principles of morality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moral</td>
<td>necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessity</td>
<td></td>
<td>the necessities of life, necessary strategic points other aspects of life were neglected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neglect</td>
<td>neutrality</td>
<td>Belgium was a neutral country, Italy declared neutrality they were obliged to pay their share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oblige</td>
<td>obligation</td>
<td>an occupying power, reoccupy the territory each country operated as an individual entity, the Second Plan was in operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occupy</td>
<td>occupation, reoccupy</td>
<td>perform my duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operate</td>
<td>operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perform</td>
<td>unpredictable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predict</td>
<td></td>
<td>his behaviour was unpredictable the right to own property, theft of state property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rate</td>
<td>reaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>react</td>
<td></td>
<td>different rates of pay, low birth rates Germany reacted strongly by issuing ultimatums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rebel (against)</td>
<td>a rebel, rebellion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>report (to)</td>
<td>a report</td>
<td>the defeated rebels fled, they crushed rebellions and uprisings the Commission of Enquiry reported favourably, they presented a report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resource</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respond</td>
<td>response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>risk</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mussoloni responded by withdrawing to risk a war with Britain, at the risk of his life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sacrifice</td>
<td></td>
<td>trade routes, a railway goes on set routes Czechoslovakia was sacrificed to save peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scale</td>
<td>full-scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td>on that scale, war was scaled down a joint scheme of defence a shrinking market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shrink</td>
<td>shrank, shrunk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single</td>
<td>single-handed</td>
<td>a single state, every single person slight delays, the slightest opposition the source country, from two sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Key Vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Derivations</th>
<th>Collocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>split</td>
<td></td>
<td>split into two rival camps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standard</td>
<td></td>
<td>the U.N. set basic standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>struggle</td>
<td></td>
<td>power struggle, the struggle for independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>substantial</td>
<td>self-sufficient</td>
<td>a substantial difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sufficient</td>
<td>symbolically</td>
<td>with sufficient caution, sufficient funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>symbol</td>
<td>sympathetically</td>
<td>the symbol of the party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sympathise</td>
<td>temporarily</td>
<td>the Russians sympathised with the Serbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporary</td>
<td>temporarily</td>
<td>temporary migrant workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tend</td>
<td></td>
<td>people tended to think . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theory</td>
<td>underwent, undergone</td>
<td>the domino theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undergo</td>
<td></td>
<td>to undergo training, undergo reforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underlie</td>
<td></td>
<td>the underlying cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>union</td>
<td></td>
<td>trade unions, union with Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upset</td>
<td></td>
<td>they were upset by the ruling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>victory</td>
<td></td>
<td>a Vietminh victory, he led the army to victory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>view</td>
<td></td>
<td>point of view, the views of smaller countries, Pakistan views this region as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>disputed territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warn</td>
<td>a warning</td>
<td>the British warned Germany (that . . .), he issued a warning to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wide</td>
<td>widely, widen,</td>
<td>this gave wide powers to the government, widened opportunities, travel widely,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>worldwide, widespread</td>
<td>widespread poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>willing</td>
<td>willingly</td>
<td>to go willingly, they were not willing to give up Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worth</td>
<td>worthless</td>
<td>things worth fighting for, German currency became worthless</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Topic specific vocabulary

### Part 1 Migration

- local
- national
- global
- periphery
- core
- cumulative
- catalyst
- collapse

### Unit 1 Effects on Migration of WWI and II

- turmoil
- propaganda
- persecution
- bilateral
- recruitment
- reparation/s

### Unit 2 Migration during the Cold War

- recession
- reunite/reunification
- asylum
- coalition
- progressive
- restrictive

### Part 2 Imperialism Nationalism and Decolonisation

- satellite
- annex
- strategy
- suppress
- exploit
### Topic Specific Vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 1 The Balkan Region</th>
<th>Unit 4 Role of the foreign powers in solving problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disintegrate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assassinate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mobilise/mobilisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspiration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2 Attempts by satellite states to gain independence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3 Annexation of Colonies in Asian countries</td>
<td>Unit 5 Long term effects of colonialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exclude</td>
<td>autonomous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>predominantly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 4 Strategies used against colonial rule</td>
<td>Part 4 International Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>casualties</td>
<td>respective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambush</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sniper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drive (to drive the invaders out)</td>
<td>Unit 1 Roles of countries in WWI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drive (drive and determination)</td>
<td>escalate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3 Conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intervention/intervene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bloodshed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reveal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exploitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1 European colonialism outside the Pacific region</td>
<td>Unit 2 Roles of countries in WWII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infrastructure</td>
<td>reconciliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indentured labour</td>
<td>aggregator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abolish</td>
<td>self defence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mutiny</td>
<td>paramilitary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open fire</td>
<td>conspiracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>troops</td>
<td>pact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2 The emergence of nationalism</td>
<td>Unit 3 Countries in post-WWII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emerge/emergence</td>
<td>survive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3 Impact of religious beliefs</td>
<td>Unit 4 Impact of international organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confront</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deadlock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Useful structures

*Acting on behalf of the Transvaal government, General Smuts offered to withdraw the ordinance.*

*Born into a peasant family in 1875, Patel became a successful lawyer in Ahmedabad.*

*Set up in 1921, it was a committee established to study conditions and make plans to improve the economy.*