2) Imperialists often argued they were doing imperialized people a favor (e.g., Jules Ferry). In what ways might a neutral observer consider such assertions about the advantages of imperialism to be true? If there are any, do such truths make imperialist assertions about the progressive nature of imperialism acceptable? If there aren't any, why did imperialists bother to make arguments about the benefits of imperialism? Use examples from the excerpt of a speech by Jules Ferry and other material assigned for this module.

Imperialism found power from anticipations of economic gain, religious fervor, the need to expand territory, the need to compete with other countries, and the need to spread influence. While it benefited nations, it also came at a cost not seen or heard by many. **A neutral observer would find that assertions about imperialism helping a nation to do things like defend itself and respond to a competitive global market are true. These truths do not, however, make imperialism acceptable, but imperialists made these arguments anyway to prevent or slow resistance to their actions or decisions.**

Jules Ferry, a former Prime Minister of France, defends imperialism by arguing how establishing colonies was the only way for France to keep its economy in operation. In fact, Ferry states that what France is lacking is “more and more export markets” (The Human Record, Ch. 8, pg. 257). The reason for this being that Germany and other neighbors had erected “barriers” (tariffs, in this case) which had hindered free trade. Ferry also argues that other nations are exporting goods at a rapid pace, which is becoming noticeable in their own local markets. The concern for Ferry is that given enough time, foreign goods will eventually outperform their own goods in their own local markets, putting many of their industries at risk of declining. He also mentions in his speech that other markets are becoming “more difficult to access for our industrial products” (The Human Record, Ch. 8, pg. 257). Competition over things like natural resources, access to new markets, and access to potential cheap labor compelled imperialists to establish and control as many colonies as they can and as quickly as possible.

Another concern brought by Jules Ferry to defend imperialism is the irrefutable need for national security. He reminds his audience that “a warship cannot carry more than fourteen days’ worth of coal” (The Human Record, Ch. 8, pg. 258). Because of this limitation, France would need stations for provision, shelters, and ports for defense in the ocean. Therefore, France needed to colonize places like Tunisia, Saigon, Madagascar, and so on. As explained by Jules Ferry himself, a ship without coal is a ship that is lost and abandoned, forfeited to whomever may come along and claim it. Seeing how many of their rivals are busy perfecting their military, it exacerbates the need for national security and creates pressure for France to always have war readiness to some extent. In another source, Ferry also describes how other nations are transitioning towards becoming powerful industrial giants and independent. As “every country seeks to do its own spinning and weaving, forging, and distilling” (The Human Record, Ch. 8, pg. 259), this becomes a power concern for France in the long run.

Other examples of justifying imperialism may come from the Japanese plan for establishing the Greater East Co-Prosperity Sphere. According to the Japanese, their plan is to “cause East Asia to return to its original form of independence and co-prosperity by shaking off the yoke of Europe and America'' (The Human Record, Ch. 12, pg. 409). Their defense for wanting to expand their influence on places like Korea, North China, and Manchuria was so they could liberate them and allow them to develop themselves in peaceful cooperation. As stated in their plan, “aggressive American and British influences in East Asia shall be driven out of the area of Indo-China and the South Seas'' (The Human Record, Ch. 12, pg. 410). They also plan on driving out aggressive Russian influence in East Asia as well as liberating Australia, India, and so on. According to them, the purpose is not to exploit, but to achieve co-prosperity with all these territories.

As convincing as these arguments may be in defense of imperialism, they did not perfectly justify it. In opposition to imperialism, John A. Hobson provides some reasons explaining why it does not work. He argues that military preparation and costs stop “the expenditure of the current income of the State upon productive public projects” (The Human Record, Ch. 8, pg. 260). The issue with military spending is that the money that went towards it could have instead gone to social programs that would have benefited the people at home. That money could have gone towards things like railways, canals, mines, improvement of agriculture, the establishment of factories, and other public works. Another issue with imperialism is that it often ends in the extermination of “lower races”. As John A. Hobson describes it, colonization often implies the extermination of the “lower” races. He brings up many examples of this like “the case of Australian Bushmen, African Bushmen and Hottentots, [American] Red Indians, and [New Zealand] Maoris” (The Human Record, Ch. 8, pg. 261). As explained by Hobson, many of these “lower” races tend to disappear simply because others cannot exploit them profitably or do not need them.

One example of imperialism at its worst can come from the Lagos Treaty of Cession. This treaty led to actual British control of Lagos and took power from King Docemo. In the treaty, King Docemo gives the Queen of Great Britain “the port and Island of Lagos, with all rights, profits, territories, and appurtenances” (The Human Record, Ch. 9, pg. 278). Even though Great Britain signed many treaties to halt the slave trade, this one was more notorious in that Britain took control of actual territory. Imperialists often gave treaties like these with vague and frequently misleading discussions, with the signing of a document in a language that African leaders may not have understood. In one case, King Lobengula of Matabeleland realized he had been duped sometime after signing an agreement with British imperialists. King Lobengula then writes a letter to Queen Victoria complaining that he “had given by that document the right to all the minerals” (The Human Record, Ch. 9, pg. 281) of his country and not the right to dig one big hole, as they made him believe. It is cases like these that help show why people concerned themselves with imperialism going against principles of social justice and freedom.

While a neutral observer may find valid assertions about imperialism regarding things like the need for self-defense and economic strategy to be true, the observer would also find that these assertions do not completely justify imperialism. Supporters of imperialism may argue that they are doing this to protect their people and to create a better economy, but they fail to mention doing so at the expense of others. While imperialists may not always use force to colonize other territories, they often hoodwink foreign leaders into supporting their causes. Supporters of imperialism may argue that they are doing this to liberate others, but they are simply providing euphemisms for enslaving others.