
UNIT 24 IMPERIALIST RIVALRIES

Structure

- 24.0 Objectives
- 24.1 Introduction
- 24.2 Theories of Imperialism
- 24.3 Rivalries for the Domination of the Planet
- 24.4 Power Combinations as Background to World War I
- 24.5 Let Us Sum Up
- 24.6 Answers to Check Your Progress Exercises

24.0 OBJECTIVES

After reading this Unit you will be able to learn:

- about various theories of imperialism;
- about the emergence of many European powers which wanted their shares in the division of the earth; and
- about the background of the World War I.

24.1 INTRODUCTION

Until now we have been referring to colonialism and imperialism as it evolved in different parts of the world, especially in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. It is time now to go into some of the theoretical aspects and the way in which outstanding scholars have understood these concepts and formulated theories. In this Unit we will also discuss the rivalries between various powers in Europe and elsewhere in an attempt to gain supremacy at the world stage. Since no single country was powerful enough to emerge supreme, it led to the formation of alliances which ultimately resulted in the outbreak of the war in 1914.

24.2 THEORIES OF IMPERIALISM

Even as these rivalries were being waged, there were people, mostly economists and historians, who were trying to understand the phenomenon of imperialism. Given the influence of Marxist theory on many intellectuals at the turn of the century, it was but natural for them to look for an economic explanation for the development of imperialism. Karl Marx himself had not evolved any theory of imperialism, but there were sufficient pointers in his analysis of the capitalist mode of production to this direction. In **Capital**, Marx had shown that the capitalist mode of production was driven by the need to extract surplus value from a class of wage-labourers. This surplus value had to find a market for the commodities which it produced. J.A. Hobson in his work entitled **Imperialism** (1902) was one of the first to develop this theme. Hobson, a British economist, was not exactly a Marxist. In the politics of England, he stood at the point at which Liberal politics blended into that of Labour. His position on imperialism later became the official position of the Labour Party. He showed how, in countries which had seen the growth of capitalism, the distribution of national income was unequal. There was a large class of people with much less income than what they would have had, if there had been an equitable distribution of wealth (if the national income had been equally divided among the nation's population.) The capitalist would soon find that he could not sell his products in his home country due to low incomes. He would then look for markets to other European countries but as those countries became industrialised, he would face competition there. Consequently he would turn towards those countries which had no industries of their own and could not protect themselves. Another motivating factor for imperialism, according to Hobson, was the

constant desire of the capitalist to maximise his profits. After successive rounds of investment and reinvestment, the capitalist would find it no longer profitable to invest in his own country and he would therefore be compelled to seek avenues for investment elsewhere. Hobson concluded that it was in the nature of capitalism itself to create imperialism.

It was found that imperialism was a characteristic of advanced capitalism. There were many diagnoses of the phenomenon of advanced or late capitalism. Some analysts claimed that it was the last and most decadent stage of capitalism. With the coming of the epoch of imperialism, the progressive role of capitalism had come to an end.

The next major theorist of imperialism was R. Hilferding, a professional economist and banker from Vienna. His book **Das Finanzkapital** (Finance Capital) appeared in 1910. By this time both the United States and Germany had surpassed Britain in industrial production. Hilferding noticed that in both these countries banks (which represented finance capital) were taking the leading role in extending and controlling industrial capital. Though the British banks were not playing any such role, there was a growing tendency towards the merging of finance and industrial capitalism throughout the industrialised world. This created monopoly conditions. Imperial expansion, according to Hilferding, was preferred by monopoly capitalists because it would bring new areas under their control - areas in which they could develop raw material production, safeguard capital investment and guarantee markets for their output.

Finance capital, according to Hilferding, needed a state which was strong enough to carry out a policy of expansion and to gather in new colonies. This would also involve giving up the principle of free trade, first championed by Britain. In due course of time, conflicts between national monopolies would emerge. Though national monopolies may sign agreements among themselves for dividing up the world, these should not be taken as implying more than an uneasy truce, a temporary agreement which would be given up as soon as one monopoly saw the opportunity of advancing its position. The economic rivalry of the great nation states was thus seen as leading inevitably to war. While this was the negative side of the story, Hilferding also assigned a positive role to monopoly capital. As he put it :

In the newly opened landsThe old social relations are completely revolutionised, the agrarian thousand year old unity of the nations without history' is rent asunder....Capitalism itself gradually gives to the oppressed peoples the means and the method of achieving their own liberation.

This kind of understanding, which obviously emerged from Marx's own faulty understanding of the regenerative role of capitalism, has of course been vigorously challenged by those who have studied the negative impact of imperialism on the colonies (e.g. Dadabhai Naoroji for India, Andre Gunder Frank for Latin America).

The third great theorist of imperialism was Rosa Luxemburg,, whose work titled **Accumulation of Capital** appeared in 1913. She described the process by which advanced powers mopped up the markets of the still remaining non-capitalist world and left them poorer. She pointed out that export of capital to underdeveloped non-European lands did not lead to local industrial development. There was an artificial division of labour in the world whereby the underdeveloped lands were doomed to remain as primary producers forever. Rosa Luxemburg shared with Hilferding the fear of nationalist economic rivalries leading to war.

This line of thought was developed with greater clarity by V.I. Lenin, the leader of the Russian Bolshevik Party. His work **Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism** was written in Zurich in 1916. He too, like Hobson, explained the reasons for the export of capital :

As long as capitalism remains capitalism, surplus capital will never be used for the purpose of raising the standard of living of the masses, for this would mean a decrease in profits for the capitalists; instead it will be used to increase profits by exporting the capital abroad, to backward countries.....The necessity for exporting capital arises from the fact that in a few countries capitalism has become over ripe' and, owing to the backward stage of agriculture and the impoverishment of the masses, capital lacks opportunities for profitable' investment.

Lenin's work was intended to show that the First World War was basically an imperialist war for the partition of the world and for the distribution and redistribution of colonies, of "spheres of influence", of finance capital etc.

These were the basic issues that the theorists of imperialism in the early twentieth century emphasised. However, the notion of the export of capital to the underdeveloped world to maximise profits was challenged later by those who found that, in actual fact, the industrialised nations were exporting most of their surplus capital not to the underdeveloped world but to the more industrialised areas. This was particularly true of Britain. Only about 20 per cent of British capital exported before 1914 was invested in the British colonies including India and another 20 per cent in South America. The main investment was in other capitalist countries, mainly Europe and North America. At least three quarters of British capital exports before 1914 and again between the two world wars went as loans to governments and government guaranteed public utilities. Further, Hilferding's findings about growing monopoly tendencies may have been accurate for Germany but in the case of Britain, monopolistic firms were slow to emerge before the 1920s. And yet, at least until 1914, most of the foreign capital in the world was British. And finally, it was found that deindustrialisation in the colonies was in the long run disadvantageous for the imperialist power. The impoverishment of the colonial peoples finally resulted in a cutting back of production in Britain's industries, leading to an increase in unemployment in Britain. In fact, there were greater benefits from capital export to European lands and European-settled lands in North America, where there were expanding markets for British goods.

After the Great Depression of 1929, a new trend in writings on imperialism emerged. In 1931, Joseph Schumpeter's **Imperialism and the Social Classes** was published. Schumpeter lived and wrote in Germany during his early years and then moved on to the United States, following which he started writing in English. He was deeply impressed by the German Junker class - a class of feudal landlords which had played an important role in the political and economic life of Germany in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. He also pointed out that the acquisition of empire in North America by Britain was the work of the feudal aristocracy. From all this he concluded that capitalism and imperialism were two separate phenomena. Imperialism, as he put it, was generated by pre-capitalist social and political forces. It was a throwback to an earlier age, an atavism. Capitalism, on the other hand, developed through innovation, through the combination of different factors of production in different ways. The logic of capitalism was the productive engagement of manpower. War, on the other hand, implied the withdrawal of manpower for unproductive activities. Moreover, for capitalism it was not necessary to acquire territory - economic development could be achieved without the acquisition of territories.

Thirty years later, the Cambridge historians Jack Gallagher and R.E. Robinson came up with their *Africa and the Victorians* which also contested the notion that capitalism led to imperialism. Imperialism, as they put it, was the consequence of European power politics, which was reflected in a policy of mutual deterrence followed in the countries of Asia and Africa. Sometimes they would mutually agree not to occupy a territory but to share it among themselves - as in China. The European powers, while fighting among themselves, would occupy all vacant spaces in a preemptive manner so that the rival power would not come in or get an unfair advantage. (It is obvious that the experience of the Cold War greatly influenced these writers.) Gallagher and Robinson also took considerable pains to try and prove that the economic interests of capitalism did not play a role in empire building. They argued that the British cabinet at no point of time had a businessman as its member. It was the aristocracy which ruled England, and that aristocracy had a contempt for business. The Gallagher-Robinson position is obviously a clever polemical exercise. To point out that there was never a businessman in the British cabinet is to prove nothing. Business interests have always functioned in a far more subtle fashion and business pressures were and continue to be exercised through groups which indirectly influence policy. Besides, this kind of analysis only looks at the process of imperialism, not its causes.

24.3 RIVALRIES FOR THE DOMINATION OF THE PLANET

We shall now look at the rivalries between the Great Powers in Europe that ultimately culminated in the First World War. The period we are dealing with begins with 1870 and ends with the outbreak of the Second World War in 1914. This is one of the most significant periods in the history of Europe, not only because it saw the diplomacy of Bismarck working itself out most clearly, but because of the peculiar system of defensive alliances that all the

major European powers entered into, in order to contain each other and to prevent the outbreak of an open war.

The defeat of France in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870 and the subsequent Peace of Frankfurt in 1871 set the pace for the developments that were to follow in this period. Under the Peace of Frankfurt, France had to pay an indemnity of 200 million pounds and thirty thousand German troops would remain in Paris until the amount had been paid.

No one had expected France to be defeated in this war. The outcome of the war was to enhance the prestige of Germany under Bismarck considerably. Indeed, this war was to inaugurate the period of Prussian diplomacy which would hold all Europe in its thrall for the next twenty years. As Agatha Ramm has explained, Bismarck evolved the "system of the great European alliances":

"This remarkable arrangement of international checks and balances for a long time preserved peace among the peoples, but by the very fact of its existence ultimately engendered strife. For the system was one of competing alliances, not a universal league. It was a Balance, not a Concert, of Power. As one combination strengthened or developed, its growth alarmed other states outside its orbit and mechanically produced a counter-combination. Competing alliances produced competing armaments and the rivalry of hatred and of fear ended in the two opposed groups carrying their competition to the battlefield."

What were these 'combinations' and 'counter-combinations'? Which were the 'competing alliances' and how did they ultimately lead to conflict?

If we look at the economies of the European countries in this period, we find the following picture. The German economy, which until 1870 was well behind Britain's, was now poised to overtake it in practically every sphere - whether it was in the production of steel or iron or alkalis. The massive size of the German industrial units called for extensive mechanization. The French pattern of industrialization was very different. According to David Landes, France's was a "muffled industrialization", a "measured autumnal advance", one which "called forth repeated warnings from [those who were]... aghast at the increasing gap between the French and German economies." Italy, Hungary and Russia assimilated only pieces of modern technology and "these advances, achieved at discrete points of the economy, were slow to break down the tenacious backwardness of most branches of economic activity".

It is difficult to correlate the differential rates of industrial development in the above mentioned European countries to their relative importance in the struggle for mastery in the world. However, the growing importance of Germany, which practically called the shots in all international dealings until 1890 must have, to a large extent, to do with its economic preponderance.

Apart from the growing strength of Germany, another important development in this period was the expansionism of Russia. As the Ottoman Empire weakened and the nationalist aspirations of the Balkan peoples became stronger, the Russians could not restrain themselves. Many of the subject nationalities of the Ottoman Empire were Slav and therefore had a strong ethnic affinity with the Russians. Hence Russia gave support to the secessionist moves of these various Balkan peoples, especially the Rumanians and Serbians. This went against the interests of Britain which did not want a dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire. France was also unhappy. From as early as the time of the Crusades, France had been regarded as the protector of Christian rights in the East. But now the Russian Tsar, by posing as the champion of Orthodox or Eastern Christianity, which was the version of Christianity largely followed in the Balkans region, was challenging the French claim.

However, to return to the aftermath of the Franco-Prussian War: Germany did not expect France to recover soon from the disastrous defeat. But France actually did so. She succeeded in paying back the indemnity owing to Germany with remarkable ease. Germany had therefore to withdraw its troops from Paris earlier than it had expected to. It was aware of the fact that France resented the loss of the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine greatly, and that this issue would be a potential source of conflict between the two powers in the future. As a result, Bismarck's entire effort in the following years was to try and deflect the attention of Britain and France away from the European continent towards Africa and in a more indirect way, towards Asia.

French imperialism in Africa made rapid strides in the 1880s. Tunis was occupied in 1881. Madagascar was brought under French control in 1884. It desired to advance into the Sahara

region for which it would have to control Morocco. But Germany and Spain were also interested in the Morocco region. French expansion into the Sudan region led to conflict with Britain and confrontation on the Niger and at Fashoda. Moreover, by 1882 France had to forego its control over Egypt to Britain.

In Europe itself the only area left for expansion was the Balkans where the rising nationalist ferment and the continuing decay of Turkey offered fresh opportunities. Here, Russia was the most interested of powers. Since Russian goodwill was important to Bismarck, Germany did not want to oppose Russia in its activities here.

In 1877 Russia went to war with Turkey and defeated it. It was able to obtain strategic sites like Kars, Ardahan and Erzerum as well as all of Armenia. In fact, the Treaty of San Stefano of 1878, which concluded the Russo-Turkish War, almost brought Britain and Russia to war with the British fleet being ordered to proceed to Constantinople and the British Parliament voting six million pounds for Disraeli's anti-Russian efforts. Had Tsar Alexander II not backtracked at this juncture, realizing the exhaustion and weakness of the Russian army after the Turkish campaign, an ignominious defeat of Russia could have occurred. The Treaty of San Stefano was then placed before a congress of all the major European powers—Britain, France, Turkey, Russia, Italy and Germany—in June 1878 at Berlin. Russia's gains were reduced while Austria stood to gain by being allowed to occupy and administer Bosnia and Herzegovina. Britain got Cyprus and France was promised a free hand in Turkey's North African territory of Tunisia. However, Italy and Germany did not gain any territories as a result of this Congress. Bismarck had played the role of the honest broker at this Congress.

However, this was not enough to end the simmering conflict between Russia and Britain. Benjamin Disraeli, or the Earl of Beaconsfield as he was now known, was singularly anti-Russian. On the other hand, he had a "misplaced faith in the Turkish Sultan".

But what was even more alarming for Britain was Russia's expansion in the Central Asian region. From 1860 onwards Russia was making rapid strides in the Turkestan region. Eastern Turkestan was a nominal province of China. From these regions, robber horsemen would raid the adjoining Russian provinces and the governors of the border provinces of Russia would have to organise frequent punitive expeditions into Turkestan. In 1864 Tashkent fell to the Russians. It was followed by the capture of Samarkand, the famous city of Chenghis Khan and Timur. Soon all of Eastern Turkestan fell into Russian hands. The Western region held out longer but the Khan of Khiva was finally forced to cede his territories to Russia in 1873. This added immensely to Russian prestige, but it also brought Britain and Russia face to face with each other. Britain felt that India, the jewel in her crown, was threatened. But what was more immediate was the prospect of a Russian takeover of Afghanistan, which was a buffer state within the British sphere of influence. In 1885, Russian forces occupied a part of Afghan territory. The British Prime Minister asked Parliament to vote him eleven million pounds for resisting the Russians. But once again the Tsar, now Alexander III, realizing that it was better to exercise discretion, decided to withdraw and to turn his energies instead towards expansion in China.

24.4 POWER COMBINATIONS AS BACKGROUND TO WORLD WAR I

Austria-Hungary was steadily losing its importance during this period. However, for Germany it was a natural ally, especially against Russia. Though the alliance of the Three Emperors (Russia, Germany and Austria-Hungary) known as the Dreikaiserbund had been forged in June 1881 and renewed in 1884, it finally broke down in 1887. As differences between Russia and Germany increased, Austria-Hungary as well as Italy drew closer to Germany. This process culminated in the formation of the Triple Alliance in 1882.

By the 1890s Russia was experiencing great isolation. So was France. This brought the two together in a Dual Alliance in 1893. Thus, in the 1890s, two sets of European alliances existed. But this did not mean that the European continent was split into two. In the ensuing years, there were several occasions on which Russia cooperated with Germany and Austria and Germany cooperated with Russia and France.

It was England which now felt its isolation most keenly. This was because French and Russian interests in many parts of the world conflicted with those of Britain (as in Sudan or Persia or

Afghanistan) and sometimes Germany too joined Russia and France in opposing British war aims. With talk of building a Berlin-Baghdad Railway at the close of the nineteenth century, it seemed as if Germany was well on its way to replacing England as the protector of the Ottoman Empire.

Britain tried to end its isolation in Europe by seeking an alliance with Germany in 1898. But the Germans were not too enthusiastic because they enjoyed a favourable position between the Franco-Russian and British camps and did not want to change this position. Anglo-German negotiations broke down in 1901 because of Germany's unwillingness to help Britain against Russian encroachment in the Far East and Britain's corresponding reluctance to help Germany against Russia in eastern Europe.

In 1902 Britain made an alliance with Japan in a bid to stop Russia's advance in the Far East. But this was not enough to end England's feeling of isolation, especially in Europe. Hence it began to extend the hand of friendship to France. The latter was in a mood to respond because its alliance with Russia had worn thin over the Fashoda incident, when the Russians had refused to support France. Fashoda in Sudan had witnessed a clash of British and French troops in 1898. Both the powers wanted to control Sudan. Finally, the French gave in and Britain gained control over this region.

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

In 1905 Russia suffered an ignominious defeat at the hands of Japan. It had a humbling effect and in the post-1905 period Russia was much more willing to mend relations with Britain. The latter was also keen to end its colonial differences with Russia. The Anglo-Russian Agreement of 1907 settled the long-standing rivalries between the two powers over Afghanistan, Persia and Tibet.

Thus a Triple Entente of Britain, France and Russia, to rival the Triple Alliance of Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy, had materialised. But now the focus of attention shifted to the Balkans.

The outbreak of a revolution in Turkey in 1908 provided the impetus. Tired of Sultan Abdul Hamid II's corrupt and decadent regime and his refusal to live up to the repeated promises of reform, a group of liberal patriots, who called themselves the "Young Turks", overthrew the Sultan's rule. As a fallout of these developments, Austria decided to annex Bosnia and Herzegovina, which it had been administering since 1878. This brought protests from Russia. It demanded that Austria's action be brought before an international conference. The Serbians, who had nurtured hopes of acquiring Bosnia-Herzegovina some day, joined the Russians in their protest. But Germany and Austria held that they would not agree to a conference unless the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina was recognised beforehand. Ultimately, they had their way largely because Russia, after its defeat at the hands of Japan, was in no position to go to war against Austria-Hungary and Germany at this juncture. This incident revealed the might of Germany and its growing ability to strongly assert itself, though on this occasion on behalf of Austria. This tendency had ominous forebodings for the future.

The Bosnian crisis left a legacy of tension which lasted until the First World War. Both Russia and Serbia were feeling humiliated. Italy felt slighted because Austria had not consulted it before annexing Bosnia-Herzegovina. Perhaps as a consequence of this, Italy entered into a secret understanding with Russia in 1909 whereby it promised to support Russia's interests in the Straits of Dardanelles in return for Russia's support for Italian designs in Tripoli (Libya).

1911 saw the outbreak of the second Moroccan crisis. There was a local insurrection in Morocco. French troops intervened. Germany protested against what it described as a violation of Moroccan independence. It sent a gunboat, the Panther, to the Moroccan port of Agadir to protect German lives and interests in Morocco. Finally, at the initiative of Britain, Germany was persuaded to go back on its claims and settle the crisis. Europe had once again been brought to the brink of war.

During the second Moroccan crisis, Britain suspected that Germany wanted to establish a naval base in Morocco which would threaten Britain's own base at Gibraltar. Anglo-German naval rivalry had originated earlier. In 1889 England had adopted a "two-power standard" whereby the British would have a naval fleet 10% stronger than the combined navies of the two next-strongest powers. Germany had in 1898 embarked on a course of naval expansion which made it the second-strongest naval power in the world by 1914. This was galling for England which felt that Germany did not really require a navy, especially since it already had such a powerful army. A naval build-up could only mean that it wished to challenge Britain's naval supremacy some time in the future. On at least two occasions, first in 1908 and then again in 1912, Britain urged Germany to slow down its naval construction, but Germany was in no mood to back down. The naval rivalry worsened relations between Germany and Britain considerably.

In this narrative we have discussed Italy's role in the imperial rivalry only marginally. Italy was also desirous of acquiring colonies, especially in north Africa, at the expense of the Ottoman Empire. However, because of its relatively insignificant status, it had had little success. In 1912, Italy suddenly decided to take the plunge and annexed Tripoli. It had secured the consent of all the major powers in this campaign and hence there was no major Moroccan-type crisis this time. But the impact of the annexation of Tripoli was far-reaching in a more fundamental sense. If Tripoli could be wrested from the Ottoman Empire, then why should not Serbia and Greece also try and seize territories from it? In October 1912 Greece and Serbia invaded the Ottoman Empire and decisively defeated it. By the Treaty of London of May 1913, the Ottoman Empire lost all its European possessions except the region adjacent to the Straits of Dardanelles.

That was the First Balkans War. It was followed within a month by a second Balkan War but now the conflict was over the division of the spoils. Serbia wanted an outlet to the Adriatic, which Austria and Italy were not willing to concede. Following this, tension erupted between Bulgaria and Serbia over some territories in Macedonia - a war in which Bulgaria had to back down and concede the greater part of Macedonia to the Greeks and Serbians.

In the immediate run-up to the First World War the growing strength and aggressive designs of Serbia were an important contributory factor. This small country was determined to add to its territories — not content with the Macedonian territories, it now laid claim to parts of Albania as well. Russia backed Serbia in this attempt. Austria was bitterly opposed to it, but Germany restrained Austria. England and Italy were in favour of the independence of Albania. Finally, Russia withdrew its support to Serbia and the crisis was diffused. But the Serbians continued to harbour strong resentment against Austria.

It is well-known that the immediate cause of the First World War was the assassination of Archduke Francis Ferdinand, heir to the Austrian throne at the Bosnian capital of Sarajevo on 28 June 1914. A secret society of Serbian nationalists called the "Black Hand" was responsible for the killing. Even though the Serbian government did not have any hand in the assassination, Austria was determined to punish Serbia for the murder. On 28 August 1914, it broke off diplomatic relations with Serbia and declared war on it. Russia, anxious about Serbia's fate, also prepared for war against Austria. Germany, on seeing this, sent an ultimatum to Russia demanding that it cease its preparations for war. On receiving a reply from the Tsar that this was impossible, Germany declared war on Russia on 1 August 1914. It followed it up with a declaration of war on France two days later. The idea was to strike France at its most vulnerable spot, at the border between France and Belgium. It was Germany's invasion of Belgium which brought Britain into the war.

Thus the caution and care that had been taken over the previous thirty-four years to prevent the outbreak of a general European conflict was now thrown to the winds. It seems ironic that one of the smallest and newest nations of Europe, Serbia, should have triggered off the First World War. But as in all such historical events, the immediate cause reflected the larger forces at work. Behind Serbia was the long-standing conflict between the Russians and the Austrians. Austria had Germany as a strong ally and Russia had France. If France was threatened with invasion, Britain felt vulnerable and was therefore compelled to come to the rescue of France.

The First World War was fought in Europe but the rivalries that brought this climax, had covered practically the entire planet. From China to India to Central Asia to Persia to Greece and the Balkans to Africa the conflict ranged and the peace agreements after the conclusion of the War also affected all these far-flung parts of the world.

Check Your Progress

- 1) In what ways the theories of imperialism propounded by Gallagher and Robinson differed from that of V.I. Lenin?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

- 2) Describe in 100 words the Russian expansions in the 19th century.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

- 3) Why did Britain ally with its traditional rival, France, in the beginning of the 20th century?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

24.5 LET US SUM UP

The theories of imperialism formulated by various scholars mainly emphasized on the European domination of the world in the period under review. Later in the 20th century, USA and Japan also emerged as two major players in the global arena. But till the World War I in 1914-1918, European nations remained the major colonial powers. Spain and Portugal were the earliest countries to acquire colonies in various parts of the world. Britain and France later supplanted them on account of their superior economic and military powers. Russia, on its own, went on expanding its territories by grabbing the adjoining areas thereby emerging as a major power in Europe. Germany was a late entrant on the scene. But its pace of industrialization was so fast that it soon developed as a great power. However, by that time, the scope of colonial expansion had become limited. Although it got its share in Africa, it was not satisfied and this dissatisfaction led to intense rivalry giving rise to various political alliances worldwide. Spurred by political and economic ambitions, these alliances finally led to the World War I.

24.6 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISE

Check Your Progress

- 1) See section 24.2
- 2) See sections 24.3
- 3) See sections 24.4

SOME USEFUL BOOKS FOR THIS BLOCK

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| Agatha Ramm | : | <i>Europe in the Nineteenth Century, 1789-1905</i> |
| James Joll | : | <i>Europe Since 1870</i> |
| David Thomson | : | <i>Europe Since Napoleon</i> |
| Owen and Sutcliffe (ed.) | : | <i>Studies in the Theory of Imperialism</i> |