Chapter 9: Nationalism and Imperialism

Nationalism

Nationalism is a belief or political ideology that involves an individual identifying with, or becoming attached to, one's nation. Nationalism involves national identity, by contrast with the related construct of patriotism, which involves the social conditioning and personal behaviors that support a state's decisions and actions.

From a political or sociological perspective, there are two main perspectives on the origins and basis of nationalism. One is the primordialist perspective that describes nationalism as a reflection of the ancient and perceived evolutionary tendency of humans to organize into distinct groupings based on an affinity of birth. The other is the modernist perspective that describes nationalism as a recent phenomenon that requires the structural conditions of modern society in order to exist.

There are various definitions for what constitutes a nation, however, which leads to several different strands of nationalism. It can be a belief that citizenship in a state should be limited to one ethnic, cultural, religious, or identity group, or that multinationality in a single state should necessarily comprise the right to express and exercise national identity even by minorities. The adoption of national identity in terms of historical development has commonly been the result of a response by influential groups unsatisfied with traditional identities due to inconsistency between their defined social order and the experience of that social order by its members, resulting in a situation of anomie that nationalists seek to resolve. This anomie results in a society or societies reinterpreting identity, retaining elements that are deemed acceptable and removing elements deemed unacceptable, in order to create a unified community. This development may be the result of internal structural issues or the result of resentment by an existing group or groups towards other communities, especially foreign powers that are or are deemed to be controlling them.

National flags, national anthems and other symbols of national identity are commonly considered highly important symbols of the national community.

With the emergence of a national public sphere and an integrated, country-wide economy in 18th-century England, people began to identify with the country at large, rather than the smaller unit of their family, town or province. The early emergence of a popular patriotic nationalism took place in the mid-18th century, and was actively promoted by the government and by the writers and intellectuals of the time. National symbols, anthems, myths, flags and narratives were assiduously constructed and adopted. The Union Flag was adopted as a national one, the patriotic song "Rule, Britannia!" was composed by Thomas Arne in 1740, and the cartoonist John Arbuthnot created the character of John Bull as the personification of the national spirit.

The widespread appeal of patriotic nationalism was massively augmented by the political convulsions of the late 18th century, the American and French Revolutions. Ultra-nationalist parties sprung up in France during the French Revolution.

The term nationalism was first used by Johann Gottfried Herder the prophet of this new creed. Herder gave Germans new pride in their origins, and proclaimed a national message within the sphere of language, which he believed determines national thought and culture. He attached exceptional importance to the concept of nationality and of patriotism -- "he that has lost his patriotic spirit has lost himself and the whole world about himself", whilst teaching that "in a certain sense every human perfection is national".

The political development of nationalism and the push for popular sovereignty culminated with the ethnic/national revolutions of Europe, for instance the Greek War of Independence. Since that time, nationalism has become one of the most significant political and social forces in history, perhaps most notably as a major influence or postulate of World War I and especially World War II. Nationalism has been spread by widespread literacy, education and communication technologies: Benedict Anderson argued that, "Print language is what invents nationalism, not a particular language per se".

Criticisms
Critics of nationalism have argued that it is often unclear what constitutes a "nation", or why a nation should be the only legitimate unit of political rule. A nation is best viewed as a cultural entity and not a political association, nor as necessarily linked to a particular territorial area. But nationalists hold the opposite as self-evident: that the boundaries of a nation and a state should, as far as possible, coincide with only one culture within its boundaries; multi-culturalism is one of their first targets. Philosopher A.C. Grayling describes nations as artificial constructs, "their boundaries drawn in the blood of past wars". He argues that "there is no country on earth which is not home to more than one different but usually coexisting culture. Cultural heritage is not the same thing as national identity".

Nationalism is inherently divisive because it highlights perceived differences between people, emphasizing an individual's identification with their own nation. The idea is also potentially oppressive because it submerges individual identity within a national whole, and gives elites or political leaders potential opportunities to manipulate or control the masses. Much of the early opposition to nationalism was related to its geopolitical ideal of a separate state for every nation. The classic nationalist movements of the 19th century rejected the very existence of the multi-ethnic empires in Europe. Even in that early stage, however, there was an ideological critique of nationalism. That has developed into several forms of anti-nationalism in the western world. The Islamic revival of the 20th century also produced an Islamic critique of the nation-state.

At the end of the 19th century, Marxists and other socialists (such as Rosa Luxemburg) produced political analysis that were critical of the nationalist movements then active in central and eastern Europe (though a variety of other contemporary socialists and communists, from Lenin (a communist) to Józef Piłsudski (a socialist), were more sympathetic to national self-determination).

In the liberal political tradition there is widespread criticism of 'nationalism' as a dangerous force and a cause of conflict and war between nation-states. Nationalism has often been exploited to encourage citizens to partake in the nations' conflicts. Such examples include the two World Wars, where nationalism was a key component of propaganda material. Liberals do not generally dispute the existence of the nation-states, although some liberal critiques do emphasize individual freedom as opposed to national identity, which is by definition collective.

The pacifist critique of nationalism also concentrates on the violence of nationalist movements, the associated militarism, and on conflicts between nations inspired by jingoism or chauvinism. National symbols and patriotic assertiveness are in some countries discredited by their historical link with past wars, especially in Germany. Famous pacifist Bertrand Russell criticizes nationalism for diminishing the individual's capacity to judge his or her fatherland's foreign policy. Albert Einstein stated that "Nationalism is an infantile disease. ... It is the measles of mankind."

**Unification of Germany**

The formal unification of Germany into a politically and administratively integrated nation state officially occurred on 18 January 1871 at the Versailles Palace in the Hall of Mirrors in France. Princes of the German states gathered there to proclaim Wilhelm I of Prussia as German Emperor after the French capitulation in the Franco-Prussian War. Unofficially, the de facto transition of most of the German-speaking populations into a federated organization of states had been developing for some time through alliances formal and informal between princely rulers — but in fits and starts, as self-interests of parties hampered the process over nearly a century of aristocratic experimentation from the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire (1806) and the subsequent rise of nationalism over the span of the Napoleonic Warsera.

Unification exposed tensions due to religious, linguistic, social, and cultural differences among the inhabitants of the new nation, suggesting that 1871 only represents one moment in a continuum of the larger unification processes. The **Holy Roman Emperor was** often called "Emperor of all the Germanies", news accounts referred to "The Germanies", and in the empire, its members of higher nobility were referred to as "Princes of Germany" or "Princes of the Germanies" — for the lands once called East Francia had been organised and governed as pocket kingdoms since times before the rise of Charlemagne (800 AD). Given the mountainous terrains of much of the territory, it is obvious that isolated peoples would develop cultural, educational, linguistic, and religious-based differences over such a lengthy time period. But Germany of the nineteenth century would enjoy transportation and communications improvements tying the peoples into a greater, tighter culture, as has the entire world under the influence of better communications and transportation infrastructures.
The Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, which had included more than 500 independent states, was effectively dissolved when Emperor Francis II abdicated (6 August 1806) during the War of the Third Coalition. Despite the legal, administrative, and political disruption associated with the end of the Empire, the people of the German-speaking areas of the old Empire had a common linguistic, cultural, and legal tradition further enhanced by their shared experience in the French Revolutionary Wars and Napoleonic Wars. European liberalism offered an intellectual basis for unification by challenging dynastic and absolutist models of social and political organization; its German manifestation emphasized the importance of tradition, education, and linguistic unity of peoples in a geographic region. Economically, the creation of the Prussian Zollverein (customs union) in 1818, and its subsequent expansion to include other states of the German Confederation, reduced competition between and within states. Emerging modes of transportation facilitated business and recreational travel, leading to contact and sometimes conflict among German speakers from throughout Central Europe.

The model of diplomatic spheres of influence resulting from the Congress of Vienna in 1814–15 after the Napoleonic Wars endorsed Austrian dominance in Central Europe. However, the negotiators at Vienna took no account of Prussia's growing strength within and among the German states and so failed to foresee that Prussia would rise up to challenge Austria for leadership. This German dualism presented two solutions to the problem of unification: Kleindeutsche Lösung, the small Germany solution (Germany without Austria), or Großdeutsche Lösung, the greater Germany solution (Germany with Austria).

Historians debate whether Otto von Bismarck — Minister President of Prussia — had a master plan to expand the North German Confederation of 1866 to include the remaining independent German states into a single entity or simply to expand the power of the Kingdom of Prussia. They conclude that factors in addition to the strength of Bismarck's Realpolitik led a collection of early modern polities to reorganize political, economic, military, and diplomatic relationships in the 19th century. Reaction to Danish and French nationalism provided foci for expressions of German unity. Military successes — especially those of Prussia — in three regional wars generated enthusiasm and pride that politicians could harness to promote unification. This experience echoed the memory of mutual accomplishment in the Napoleonic Wars, particularly in the War of Liberation of 1813–14. By establishing a Germany without Austria, the political and administrative unification in 1871 at least temporarily solved the problem of dualism.

**Italian unification**

*Let him who loves his country in his heart, and not with his lips only, follow me.*

-- Giuseppe Garibaldi

According to Austrian Prince Metternich, architect of the Congress of Vienna, Italy was not a nation but a "geographic expression". Since the Italian Renaissance of the 15th century, and even before, Italy had consisted of rival principalities competing with each other for economic success. The people of the region did, however, share a common language (despite local dialects) and a common history.

As with Spain, popular rebellions immediately following Napoleon's defeat were put down by the Congress System. The kingdoms of Naples and Sicily, following Spain's lead, adopted a liberal constitution following revolt. Austrian troops invaded to restore the conservative king. Austria already controlled the provinces of Lombardy and Venetia, the two regions on its border. This expansion of Austrian control, compounded by continued foreign intervention, added fuel to a movement known the Risorgimento, a nationalist movement for a united Italy. Groups such as Young Italy, led by nationalist Giuseppe Mazzini, and the Carbonari, a secret society, agitated for independence in the 1820s and 1830s.

Calls for national unification combined with calls for liberalism in almost every Italian state. Some liberals desired only constitutional government for their own principality, others agitated for Italian unification, some did both. Sicily experienced the very first European revolution of 1848, when liberals called for a return to the constitution they'd been granted in 1812. The revolutions of 1848 would lead to the short-lived adoption of constitutions and parliaments in most Italian states, but these gains were reversed by impatient rulers by the end of 1849.
The success of Italian unification is usually attributed to two men: Count Camillo de Cavour, and Giuseppe Garibaldi. Cavour was prime minister to Victor Emmanuel II of Piedmont-Sardinia, the strongest Italian kingdom and a place where anti-Austrian sentiment ran high. During the 1840s, the first Italian War of Independence led to the repeated defeat of Sardinia by better-trained Austrian troops. Cavour realized that international support was crucial, and got support from Britain and France in seizing Lombardy and much of the north from Austria. Garibaldi, a guerilla leader who had originally been exiled from Sardinia, led an expedition of "Red Shirts" to Sicily, thus controlling the south. He was persuaded to cede these areas to Victor Emmanuel, now named the King of Italy. The remaining states, the Papal States and Venetia, would be added to Italy by 1871.

United States Reunification

When the United States of America had been founded in the 18th century, there were already acknowledged differences between the commercial northern states and the agricultural southern states. After winning the War for American Independence, the initial government had been a Confederacy, where states had retained many rights and the central government was weak. A party of Federalists, including men like James Madison, determined that a stronger central power would increase stability and international presence. They constructed the U.S. Constitution and spearheaded its adoption in 1789. Attached to the Constitution was a Bill of Rights, demanded by the more republican elements who wanted civil rights protected from this new central power.

Rather than being relieved by expansion westward and industrialization, sectional differences had sharpened during the early nineteenth century. The northern area had been the center of industrialization, while the south remained a producer of agricultural good for both Europe and the northern states. Tariffs had been introduced by the northern commercial interests in Congress, and frequently harmed the south, which needed to import manufactured goods. Although the slave trade had been eradicated early in the century, an expanding population of American slaves provided that heart of southern agricultural labor, producing the millions of tons of cotton that was the foundation of the southern economy. The expansion into Texas by southern farmers holding slaves, and the argument over state sovereignty on the slave issue, increased tensions during the 1850s.

By this time, the U.S. Constitution had been in place for several generations, and the right to the protection of property was considered one of its foundations. As societies defining slavery as a moral crime emerged in the north, defenders emerged in the south. Extremists on both sides were part of the sectionalist crises of the 1850s. The election of Abraham Lincoln to the presidency in 1860, just at the point when southern states were being outvoted repeatedly in Congress, precipitated the secession of six Southern states, who proclaimed themselves a new nation: The Confederate States of America. Upon his inauguration, Lincoln resolved to do nothing, believing the states to be part of the union regardless. However, after shots were fired over the Federal re-supplying of a fort in South Carolina (one of the secessionist states), Lincoln called for volunteers to fight the "insurrection". Realizing that Lincoln's terminology meant that he saw the states as in rebellion rather than as their own nation, five more states seceded, later followed by two others. Romantic nationalism became immediately important, particularly in the development of the Confederate flag.

The American Civil War ensued, beginning as a battle to "preserve the union" but ending, after four bloody years, as a battle against the institution of slavery. When the Union troops won, however, there was controversy over how to deal with former slaves in the nation's new conception of itself. Radicals in Congress, acting before southern states had been readmitted, instituted not only the end of slavery, but also the right to vote for all adult males, regardless of race or former servitude. Although difficult to enforce once southern states were readmitted, these amendments to the Constitution provided a foundation for a more democratic state.

The concept of the Confederacy, with a moderate federal government but substantial rights for the
"states" or entities within it, had international repercussions. Although it failed with the victory of the United States, the model of confederacy would be used by other countries in developing their concepts of nationhood.

**Imperialism**

Imperialism is defined as "an unequal human and territorial relationship, usually in the form of an empire, based on ideas of superiority and practices of dominance, and involving the extension of authority and control of one state or people over another." Imperialism is a process and ideology that does not only focus on political dominance, but rather, conquest over expansion. Imperialism is particularly focused on the control that one group, often a state power, has on another group of people. There are "formal" or "informal" imperialism. "Formal imperialism" is, "the physical control or full-fledged colonial rule". "Informal control" is less direct, however; it is still a powerful form of dominance.

There are three waves of imperialism; Americas (North, South and the Caribbean), Asia and Africa. From the fifteenth century forward, Spain and Portugal were responsible for colonizing South America. Both Spain and Portugal were soon followed by the British, French and Dutch, who gained territory in North America. Britain, with the support from the East India Company, colonized Asia. Portugal, Netherlands and France also had Asian colonial possessions. The third wave, Africa, was described as 'New Imperialism'. This was structured by the "Berlin Conference (1884–85), which involved the main European powers and served to divide Africa between them".

The word imperialism became common in the United Kingdom during the 1870s and was used with a negative connotation. In Great Britain, the word had until then mostly been used to refer to the politics of Napoleon III in obtaining favorable public opinion in France through foreign military interventions.

**Colonialism vs. imperialism**

The term "imperialism" is often conflated with "colonialism", however many scholars have argued that each have their own distinct definition. **Imperialism** and **colonialism** have been used in order to describe one's superiority, domination and influence upon a person or group of people. Robert Young writes that while imperialism operates from the center, is a state policy and is developed for ideological as well as financial reasons, colonialism is simply the development for settlement or commercial intentions. Colonialism in modern usage also tends to imply a degree of geographic separation between the colony and the imperial power. Particularly, Edward Said distinguishes the difference between imperialism and colonialism by stating; "imperialism involved 'the practice, the theory and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan center ruling a distant territory', while colonialism refers to the 'implanting of settlements on a distant territory.' Contiguous land empires such as the Russian or Ottoman are generally excluded from discussions of colonialism. Thus it can be said that imperialism includes some form of colonialism, but colonialism itself does not automatically imply imperialism, as it lacks a political focus.

Imperialism and colonialism both dictate that the political and economic advantage over a land and the indigenous populations they control, scholars sometimes find it difficult to illustrate the difference between the two. Although imperialism and colonialism focus on the suppression of one another, if Colonialism refers to the process of a country taking physical control of another, Imperialism refers to the political and monetary dominance, either formally or informally. Colonialism is seen to be the architect deciding how to start dominating areas and then
imperialism can be seen as creating the idea behind conquest cooperating with colonialism. Colonialism is when the imperial nation begins a conquest over an area and then eventually is able to rule over the areas the previous nation had controlled. Colonialism's core meaning is the exploitation of the valuable assets and supplies of the nation that was conquered and the conquering nation then gaining the benefits from the spoils of the war. The meaning of imperialism is to create an empire, by conquering the other state's lands and therefore increasing its own dominance. Colonialism is the builder and preserver of the colonial possessions in an area by a population coming from a foreign region. Colonialism can completely change the existing social structure, physical structure and economics of an area; it’s not unusual that the characteristics of the conquering peoples are inherited by the conquered indigenous populations.

**Justification**

A controversial aspect of imperialism is the defense and justification of empire-building based on seemingly rational grounds. J. A. Hobson identifies this justification on general grounds as: "It is desirable that the earth should be peopled, governed, and developed, as far as possible, by the races which can do this work best, i.e. by the races of highest 'social efficiency". Many others argued that imperialism is justified for several different reasons. Friedrich Ratzel believed that in order for a state to survive, imperialism was needed. Halford Mackinder felt that Great Britain needed to be one of the greatest imperialist and therefore justified imperialism. The rhetoric of colonizers being racially superior appears to have achieved its purpose, for example throughout Latin America "whiteness" is still prized today and various forms of blanqueamiento (whitening) are common.

Technology and economic efficiency were often improved in territories subjected to imperialism through the building of roads, other infrastructure and introduction of new technologies.

The principles of imperialism are often generalizable to the policies and practices of the British Empire "during the last generation, and proceeds rather by diagnosis than by historical description". British imperialism often used the concept of Terra nullius (Latin expression which stems from Roman law meaning 'empty land'). The country of Australia serves as a case study in relation to British settlement and colonial rule of the continent in the eighteenth century, as it was premised on terra nullius, and its settlers considered it unused by its sparse Aboriginal inhabitants.

**Imaginative Geographies and Orientalism**

Imperial control, both territorial and non-territorial, is justified through discourses that shape our understanding of different spaces. The concept of imaginative geographies explains how this understanding is limited by our attitudes and ideas which work to obscure the reality of these spaces.

Orientalism, as theorized by Edward Said, refers to how the West developed an imaginative geography of the East. This imaginative geography relies on an essentializing discourse that represents neither the diversity nor the social reality of the East. Rather, by essentializing the East, this discourse uses the idea of place-based identities to create difference and distance between "we" the West and "them" the East, or "here" in the West and "there" in the East. This difference was particularly apparent in textual and visual works of early European studies of the Orient that positioned the East as irrational and backward in opposition to the rational and progressive West. Defining the East as a negative vision of itself, as its inferior, not only increased the West’s sense of self, but also was a way of ordering the East and making it known to the West so that it could be dominated and controlled.

The discourse of Orientalism therefore served as an ideological justification of early Western imperialism, as it formed a body of knowledge and ideas that rationalized social, cultural, political, and economic control of other territories. The ward orient has interesting connections in other languages. For instance in Russian language the ward "orientir", that means landmark, has the same root as the English ward orient. The Cultural Imperialism was one of the major parts in E.Said's analysis. The Orientalism became a first part of the trilogy written by Said focusing on the idea of cultural imperialism. His ideas were briefly discussed in K.Morin's work called "Key Contemporary Thinkers on Space and Place". Said's focus on cultural imperialism is described as "showing how the political or economic or administrative fact relies on this legitimating discourse". Another major work thatollowed the discourse on Orientalism and provided more insights on Imperialism came out in 1993 with the title Culture and Imperialism. Under such name, Said wrote a series of essays that introduced the number of ideas or "intellectual conundrums" (riddles) risen out of Orientalist views, that the thinkers and concept makers of the twentieth century continued to argue about. The contradictions in his own work were criticized by another authors, however mostly supporting his main arguments. In his work on Cultural Imperialism Said had chosen to compare the influence of
imperialist ideas in different contexts, in other words to look at "cultural imperialism across humanism, Marxism and post-structuralism". It is important to note that Orientalism as a discourse was not only influential in the past, but is still present today, shaping the production of images in the West that are used to represent the East. The way in which the East is performed for the West through these images is used to justify the ongoing division of the world between the East and the West and contemporary Western imperialism.

Geography was a justification for imperialism. "The end of the 19th century and the early part of the 20th witnessed the rise of "environmental determinism", an approach that regarded human beings or human society as being the product of the environment within which they lived." Environmental determinism was used as a justification for imperial practices. As European climates were seen to produce a moral, hard working human being, while tropical climates were said to produce a morally degenerate, sexually promiscuous, lazy species. This racial hierarchy was used to justify continued exploitation of lesser peoples.

**Cartography**

One of the main tools used by imperialists was cartography. Cartography is "the art, science and technology of making maps" but this definition is problematic. It implies that maps are objective representations of the world when in reality they serve very political means. For Harley, maps serve as an example of Foucault’s power and knowledge concept.

To better illustrate this idea, Bassett focuses his analysis of the role of nineteenth-century maps during the "scramble for Africa". He states that maps "contributed to empire by promoting, assisting, and legitimizing the extension of French and British power into West Africa". During his analysis of nineteenth-century cartographic techniques, he highlights the use of blank space to denote unknown or unexplored territory. This provided incentives for imperial and colonial powers to obtain "information to fill in blank spaces on contemporary maps". It also encouraged empire building as countries were in competition with one another to see who could fill in the blank spaces first.

Although cartographic processes advanced through imperialism, further analysis of their progress reveals many biases linked to eurocentrism. According to Bassett, "nineteenth-century explorers commonly requested Africans to sketch maps of unknown areas on the ground. Many of those maps were highly regarded for their accuracy" but were not printed in Europe unless Europeans verified them.

**Age of Imperialism**

The Age of Imperialism, a time period beginning around 1700, saw (generally European) industrializing nations engaging in the process of colonizing, influencing, and annexing other parts of the world in order to gain political power. Although imperialist practices have existed for thousands of years, the term "Age of Imperialism" generally refers to the activities of European powers from the early 18th century through to the middle of the 20th century, for example, the "The Great Game" in Persian lands, the "Scramble for Africa" and the "Open Door Policy" in China.

Europe's expansion into territorial imperialism was largely focused on economic growth by collecting resources from colonies, in combination with assuming political control by military and political means. The colonization of India in the mid-18th century offers an example of this focus: there, the "British exploited the political weakness of the Mughal state, and, while military activity was important at various times, the economic and administrative incorporation of local elites was also of crucial significance" for the establishment of control over the subcontinent's resources, markets, and manpower. Although a substantial number of colonies had been designed to provide economic profit and to ship resources to home ports (mostly through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries), Fieldhouse suggests that in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in places such as Africa and Asia, this idea is not necessarily valid:

Modern empires were not artificially constructed economic machines. The second expansion of Europe was a complex historical process in which political, social and emotional forces in Europe and on the periphery were more influential than calculated imperialism. Individual colonies might serve an economic purpose; collectively no empire had any definable function, economic or otherwise. Empires represented only a particular phase in the ever-changing relationship of Europe with the rest of the world: analogies with industrial systems or investment in real estate were simply misleading.
European expansion greatly accelerated in the 19th century. To obtain raw materials, Europe expanded imports from other countries and from the colonies. European industrialists sought raw materials such as dyes, cotton, vegetable oils, and metal ores from overseas. Concurrently, industrialization was quickly making Europe the center of manufacturing and economic growth, driving resource needs.

Communication became much more advanced during European expansion. With the invention of railroads and telegraphs, it became easier to communicate with other countries and to extend the administrative control of a home nation over its colonies. Railroads and globalized shipping assisted in transporting massive amounts of goods to and from colonies.

Along with advancements in communication, Europe also continued to advance in military technology. European chemists made deadly explosives that could be used in combat, and with innovations in machinery they were able to manufacture improved firearms. By the 1880s, the machine gun had become an effective battlefield weapon. This technology gave European armies an advantage over their opponents, as armies in less-developed countries were still fighting with arrows, swords, and leather shields (e.g. the Zulus in Southern Africa during the Anglo-Zulu War of 1879).

**Britain**

Britain's imperialist ambitions can be seen as early as the fifteenth century. In 1599 the British East India Company was established and was chartered by Queen Elizabeth in the following year. With the establishment of trading posts in India, the British were able to maintain strength relative to others empires such as the Portuguese who already had set up trading posts in India. In 1767 political activity caused exploitation of the East India Company causing the plundering of the local economy, almost bringing the company into bankruptcy.

By the year 1670 Britain imperialist ambitions were well off as she had colonies in Virginia, Bermudas, Honduras, Antigua, Barbados, Jamaica and Nova Scotia.

Due to the vast imperialist ambitions of European countries, Britain had several clashes with France. This competition was evident in the colonization of what is now known as Canada. John Cabot claimed Newfoundland for the British while the French established colonies along the St. Lawrence River and claiming it as "New France". It was clear that Britain had formed a strong state because she had a complex network of relations.

Britain continued to expand by colonizing countries such as New Zealand and Australia both of which were not empty land as they had their own locals and cultures. Britain's nationalistic movements were evident with the creation of the common wealth countries where there was a shared nature of national identity.

**France**

The "First colonial empire", that existed until 1814, by which time most of it had been lost, and the "Second colonial empire", which began with the conquest of Algiers in 1830 and came for the most part to an end with the granting of independence to Algeria in 1962. The French history was marked by numerous wars, large and small, and also by significant help to France itself from the colonials in the world wars.

During the 16th century, the French colonization of the Americas began with the creation of New France. It was followed by the establishment of trading posts in Asia and Africa in the 17th century.

In the 19th and 20th centuries, it was the second-largest colonial empire in the world behind the British Empire, extending over 12,347,000 km² (4,767,000 sq. miles) at its height in the 1920s and 1930s. France controlled nearly 1/10th of the Earth's land area, with a population of 110 million people on the eve of World War II (5% of the world's population at the time).

France took control of Algeria in 1830 but began in earnest to rebuild its worldwide empire after 1850, concentrating chiefly in North and West Africa, as well as South-East Asia, with other conquests in Central and East Africa, as well as the South Pacific. Republicans, at first hostile to empire, only became supportive when Germany started to build her own colonial empire. As it developed, the new empire took on roles of trade with France, supplying raw materials and purchasing manufactured items, as well as lending prestige to the motherland and
spreading French civilization and language as well as Catholicism. It also provided crucial manpower in both World Wars.

It became a moral justification to lift the world up to French standards by bringing Christianity and French culture. In 1884 the leading exponent of colonialism, Jules Ferry declared France had a civilising mission: "The higher races have a right over the lower races, they have a duty to civilize the inferior". Full citizenship rights – ‘assimilation’ – were offered, although in reality assimilation was always on the distant horizon. Contrasting from Britain, France sent small numbers of settlers to its colonies, with the only notable exception of Algeria, where French settlers nevertheless always remained a small minority.

In World War II, Charles de Gaulle and the Free French used the overseas colonies as bases from which they fought to liberate France. However after 1945 anti-colonial movements began to challenge the Empire. France fought and lost bitter wars in Vietnam and Algeria in the 1950's. Its settlers and many local supporters relocated to France. Nearly all of France's colonies gained independence by 1960, but France retained great financial and diplomatic influence. It has repeatedly sent troops to assist its former colonies in Africa in suppressing insurrections and coups d'état.

**Germany**

From their original homelands in Scandinavia and northern Europe, Germanic tribes expanded throughout northern and western Europe in the middle period of classical antiquity; southern Europe in late antiquity, conquering Celtic and other peoples; and by 800 CE, forming the Holy Roman Empire, the first German Empire. However, there was no real systemic continuity from the Western Roman Empire to its German successor which was famously described as "not holy, not Roman, and not an empire", as a great number of small states and principalities existed in the loosely autonomous confederation. Although by 1000 CE, the Germanic conquest of central, western, and southern Europe (west of and including Italy) was complete, excluding only Muslim Iberia. There was, however, little cultural integration or national identity, and "Germany" remained largely a conceptual term referring to an amorphous area of central Europe.

Not a maritime power, and not a nation-state, as it would eventually become, Germany’s participation in Western imperialism was negligible until the late 19th century. The participation of Austria was primarily as a result of Habsburg control of the First Empire, the Spanish throne, and other royal houses. After the defeat of Napoleon, who caused the dissolution of that Holy Roman Empire, Prussia and the German states continued to stand aloof from imperialism, preferring to manipulate the European system through the Concert of Europe. After Prussia unified the other states into the second German Empire after the Franco-German War, its long-time Chancellor, Otto von Bismarck (1862–90), long opposed colonial acquisitions, arguing that the burden of obtaining, maintaining, and defending such possessions would outweigh any potential benefits. He felt that colonies did not pay for themselves, that the German bureaucratic system would not work well in the tropics and the diplomatic disputes over colonies would distract Germany from its central interest, Europe itself.

However, in 1883–84 Germany began to build a colonial empire in Africa and the South Pacific, before losing interest in imperialism. Historians have debated exactly why Germany made this sudden and short-lived move. Bismarck was aware that public opinion had started to demand colonies for reasons of German prestige. He was influenced by Hamburg merchants and traders, his neighbors at Friedrichsruh. The establishment of the German colonial empire proceeded smoothly, starting with German New Guinea in 1884.

After the Treaty of Versailles and the collapse of the Third Reich, and the failure of its attempt to create a great land empire in Eurasia, Germany was split between Western and Soviet spheres of influence until the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union.

**United States**

The early United States expressed its opposition to Imperialism, at least in a form distinct from its own Manifest Destiny, in policies such as the Monroe Doctrine. However, beginning in the late 19th and early 20th century, policies such as Theodore Roosevelt’s interventionism in Central America and Woodrow Wilson’s mission to "make the world safe for democracy" were often backed by military force, but more often affected from behind the scenes, consistent with the general notion of hegemony and imperium of historical empires. In 1898, Americans who opposed imperialism created the **Anti-Imperialist League** to oppose the US annexation of the Philippines and
Cuba. One year later, a war erupted in the Philippines causing business, labor and government leaders in the US to condemn America's occupation in the Philippines as they also denounced them for causing the deaths of many Filipinos. American foreign policy was denounced as a "racket" by Smedley Butler, an American general. He said, "Looking back on it, I might have given Al Capone a few hints. The best he could do was to operate his racket in three districts. I operated on three continents".

**Franco-Prussian War (1870-71)**

The Franco-Prussian War or Franco-German War (German: Deutsch-Französischer Krieg, lit. German-French War, French: Guerre franco-allemande, lit. French-German War), often referred to in France as the War of 1870 (19 July 1870 – 10 May 1871), was a conflict between the Second French Empire and the German states of the North German Confederation led by the Kingdom of Prussia. The conflict centered on Prussian ambitions to extend German unification. Prussian chancellor **Otto von Bismarck** planned to provoke a French attack in order to draw the southern German states—Baden, Württemberg, Bavaria and Hesse-Darmstadt—into an alliance with the Prussian-dominated North German Confederation.

Bismarck adroitly created a diplomatic crisis over the succession to the Spanish throne, then rewrote a dispatch about a meeting between King William of Prussia and the French foreign minister, to make it appear that the French had been insulted. The French press and parliament demanded a war, which the generals of Napoleon III assured him that France would win. Napoleon and his Prime Minister, Émile Ollivier, for their parts sought war to solve their problems with political disunity in France. On 16 July 1870, the French parliament voted to declare war on the German Kingdom of Prussia and hostilities began three days later. The German coalition mobilised its troops much more quickly than the French and rapidly invaded northeastern France. The German forces were superior in numbers, had better training and leadership and made more effective use of modern technology, particularly railroads and artillery.

A series of swift Prussian and German victories in eastern France, culminating at the Battle of Sedan and the Siege of Metz saw the French army decisively defeated; Napoleon III was captured at Sedan on 2 September. A Government of National Defence declared the Third Republic in Paris on 4 September and continued the war. For the next five months the German forces fought and defeated new French armies in northern France. Following the Siege of Paris, the capital fell on 28 January 1871. The German states proclaimed their union as the German Empire under the Prussian king, Wilhelm I, uniting Germany as a nation-state. The Treaty of Frankfurt of 10 May 1871 gave Germany most of Alsace and some parts of Lorraine, which became the Imperial territory of Alsace-Lorraine (Reichsland Elsaß-Lothringen).

Following defeat, a revolutionary uprising called the **Paris Commune** seized power in the capital and held it for two months, until it was bloodily suppressed by the regular French army at the end of May 1871. The German conquest of France and the unification of Germany upset the European balance of power that had existed since the Congress of Vienna in 1815 and Otto von Bismarck maintained great authority in international affairs for two decades. French determination to regain Alsace-Lorraine and fear of another Franco-German war, along with British concern over the balance of power, became factors in the causes of World War I.

**Origins of Modern Nationalism**

The Watch on the Rhine (1870)

"This was a favorite song of the German soldiers during the Franco-Prussian War of 1870" (Eva March Tappan, ed., *The World's Story: A History of the World in Story, Song and Art*, 14 Vols., (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1914)
"Now the song is probably most famous as the song sung by Nazi soldiers in Rick's Bar in Casablanca. There is drowned out by the Marseillaise." (Paul Halsall, Modern History Sourcebook, Fordham University, 1998)

A VOICE resounds like thunder-peal,
'Mid dashing waves and clang of steel:
The Rhine, the Rhine, the German Rhine!
Who guards to-day my stream divine?
Chorus: Dear Fatherland, no danger thine;
Firm stand thy sons to watch the Rhine!

They stand, a hundred thousand strong,
Quick to avenge their country's wrong;
With filial love their bosoms swell,
They'll guard the sacred landmark well!
Chorus: Dear Fatherland, no danger thine;
Firm stand thy sons to watch the Rhine!

The dead of an heroic race
From heaven look down and meet this gaze;
He swears with dauntless heart, "O Rhine,
Be German as this breast of mine!"
Chorus: Dear Fatherland, no danger thine;
Firm stand thy sons to watch the Rhine!

While flows one drop of German blood,
Or sword remains to guard thy flood,
While rifle rests in patriot hand,
No foe shall tread thy sacred strand!
Chorus: Dear Fatherland, no danger thine;
Firm stand thy sons to watch the Rhine!

Our oath resounds, the river flows,
In golden light our banner glows;
Our hearts will guard thy stream divine:
The Rhine, the Rhine, the German Rhine!
Chorus: Dear Fatherland, no danger thine;
Firm stand thy sons to watch the Rhine!

Question: What is the thesis of this song, the statement it is trying to make?

Emmeline Pankhurst: My Own Story (1914)

It was at this time, February, 1913, less than two years ago as I write these words, that militancy, as it is now generally understood by the public began -- militancy in the sense of continued, destructive, guerrilla warfare against the Government through injury to private property.

Some property had been destroyed before this time, but the attacks were sporadic, and were meant to be in the nature of a warning as to what might become a settled policy. Now we indeed lighted the torch, and we did it with the absolute conviction that no other course was open to us. We had tried every other measure, as I am sure that I have demonstrated to my readers, and our years of work and suffering and sacrifice had taught us that the Government would not yield to right and justice, what the majority of members of the House of Commons admitted was right and justice, but that the Government would, as other governments invariably do, yield to expediency. Now our task was to show the Government that it was expedient to yield to the women's just demands. In order to do that we had to make England and every department of English life insecure and unsafe. We had to make English law a failure and the courts farce comedy theatres; we had to discredit the Government and Parliament in the eyes of the world; we had to spoil English sports, hurt business, destroy valuable property, demoralise the world of society, shame the churches, upset the whole orderly conduct of life.
That is, we had to do as much of this guerilla warfare as the people of England would tolerate. When they came to the point of saying to the Government: "Stop this, in the only way it can be stopped, by giving the women of England representation," then we should extinguish our torch.

Americans, of all people, ought to see the logic of our reasoning. There is one piece of American oratory, beloved of schoolboys, which has often been quoted from militant platforms. In a speech now included among the classics of the English language your great statesman, Patrick Henry, summed up the causes that led to the American Revolution. He said: 'Ye have petitioned, we have remonstrated, we have supplicated, we have prostrated ourselves at the foot of the throne, and it has all been in vain. We must fight-I repeat it, sir, we must fight.'

Patrick Henry, remember, was advocating killing people, as well as destroying private property, as the proper means of securing the political freedom of men. The Suffragettes have not done that, and they never will. In fact the moving spirit of militancy is deep and abiding reverence for human life. In the latter course of our agitation I have been called upon to discuss our policies with many eminent men, politicians, literary men, barristers, scientists, clergymen. One of the last named, a high dignitary of the Church of England, told me that while he was a convinced suffragist, he found it impossible to justify our doing wrong that right might follow. I said to him: 'Ye are not doing wrong-we are doing right in our use of revolutionary methods against private property. It is our work to restore thereby true values, to emphasise the value of human rights against property rights. You are well aware, sir, that property has assumed a value in the eyes of men, and the eyes of the law, that it ought never to claim. It is placed above all human values. The lives and health and happiness, and even the virtue of women and children-that is to say, the race itself-are being ruthlessly sacrificed to the god of property every day of the world.'

To this my reverend friend agreed, and I said: "If we women are wrong in destroying private property in order that human values may be restored, then I say, in all reverence, that it was wrong for the Founder of Christianity to destroy private property, as He did when He lashed the money changers out of the Temple and when He drove the Gaderene swine into the sea."

It was absolutely in this spirit that our women went forth to war. In the first month of guerilla warfare an enormous amount of property was damaged and destroyed. On January 31st a number of putting greens were burned with acids; on February 7th and 8th telegraph and telephone wires were cut in several places and for some hours all communication between London and Glasgow were suspended; a few days later windows in various of London's smartest clubs were broken, and the orchid houses at Kew were wrecked and many valuable blooms destroyed by cold. The jewel room at the Tower of London was invaded and a showcase broken. The residence of H. R. H. Prince Christian and Lambeth Palace, seat of the Archbishop of Canterbury, were visited and had windows broken. The refreshment house in Regents Park was burned to the ground on February 12th and on February 18th a country house which was being built at Walton-on-the-Hill for Mr. Lloyd-George was partially destroyed, a bomb having been exploded in the early morning before the arrival of the workmen....

Question: What is the thesis of this selection by Pankhurst?

Cecil Rhodes: Confession of Faith (1877)

...I contend that we are the finest race in the world and that the more of the world we inhabit the better it is for the human race. Just fancy those parts that are at present inhabited by the most despicable specimens of human beings what an alteration there would be if they were brought under Anglo-Saxon influence, look again at the extra employment a new country added to our dominions gives. I contend that every acre added to our territory means in the future birth to some more of the English race who otherwise would not be brought into existence. Added to this the absorption of the greater portion of the world under our rule simply means the end of all wars. ...

...Africa is still lying ready for us it is our duty to take it. It is our duty to seize every opportunity of acquiring more territory and we should keep this one idea steadily before our eyes that more territory simply means more of the Anglo-Saxon race more of the best the most human, most honourable race the world possesses. ...

I contend that there are at the present moment numbers of the ablest men in the world who would devote their whole lives to it. ...

Question: What is the thesis of this document by Rhodes?

J.A. Hobson: Imperialism (1902)

From social reformer and economist John Atkinson Hobson's book Imperialism.
The decades of Imperialism have been prolific in wars; most of these wars have been directly motivated by aggression of white races upon "lower races," and have issued in the forcible seizure of territory. Every one of the steps of expansion in Africa, Asia, and the Pacific has been accompanied by bloodshed; each imperialist Power keeps an increasing army available for foreign service; rectification of frontiers, punitive expeditions, and other euphemisms for war are in incessant progress. The pax Britannia, always an impudent falsehood, has become in recent years a grotesque monster of hypocrisy; along out Indian frontiers, in West Africa, in the Soudan, in Uganda, in Rhodesia fighting has been well-nigh incessant. . . .

Our economic analysis has disclosed the fact that it is only the interests of competing cliques of business men -- investors, contractors, export manufacturers, and certain professional classes--that are antagonistic; that these cliques, usurping the authority and voice of the people, use the public resources to push their private businesses, and spend the blood and money of the people in this vast and disastrous military game, feigning national antagonisms which have no basis in reality. It is not to the interest of the British people, either as producers of wealth or as taxpayers, to risk a war with Russia and France in order to join Japan in preventing Russia from seizing Korea; but it may serve the interests of a group of commercial politicians to promote this dangerous policy. The South African war [Boer War], openly fomented by gold speculators for their private purposes, will rank in history as a leading case of this usurpation of nationalism. . . .

. . . So long as this competitive expansion for territory and foreign markets is permitted to misrepresent itself as "national policy" the antagonism of interests seems real, and the peoples must sweat and bleed and toil to keep up an ever more expensive machinery of war. . . .

. . . The industrial and financial forces of Imperialism, operating through the party, the press, the church, the school, mould public opinion and public policy by the false idealisation of those primitive lusts of struggle, domination, and acquisitiveness which have survived throughout the eras of peaceful industrial order and whose stimulation is needed once again for the work of imperial aggression, expansion, and the forceful exploitation of lower races. For these business politicians biology and sociology weave thin convenient theories of a race struggle for the subjugation of the inferior peoples, in order that we, the Anglo-Saxon, may take their lands and live upon their labours; while economics buttresses the argument by representing our work in conquering and ruling them as our share in the division of labour among nations, and history devises reasons why the lessons of past empire to not apply to ours, while social ethics paints the motive of "Imperialism" as the desire to bear the "burden" of educating and elevating races of "children." Thus are the "cultured" or semi-cultured classes indoctrinated with the intellectual and moral grandeur of Imperialism. For the masses there is a cruder appeal to hero-worship and sensational glory, adventure and the sporting spirit: current history falsified in coarse flaring colours, for the direct stimulation of the combative instincts. . . .

The presence of a scattering of white officials, missionaries, traders, mining or plantation overseers, a dominant male caste with little knowledge of or sympathy for the institutions of the people, is ill-calculated to give to these lower races even such gains as Western civilisation might he capable of giving. . . .

This failure to justify by results the forcible rule over alien peoples is attributable to no special defect of the British or other modern European nations. It is inherent in the nature of such domination. . . .

Question: What is the thesis of this document by Hobson?

Puccini, Giacosa, Illica: Madama Butterfly (1902)

Music by Giacomo Puccini.
Libretto by Giuseppe Giacosa and Luigi Illica.
Translation by Robert Glaubitz (ariaman@aria-database.com)

Un bel di, vedremo, Butterfly's aria from Madama Butterfly

Un bel di, vedremo
Levarsi un fil di fumo
Sull'estremo confin del mare
E poi la nave appare
E poi la nave è bianca.
Entra nel porto, romba il suo saluto.

Vedi? È venuto!
Io non gli scendo incontro, io no.

One good day, we will see
Arising a strand of smoke
Over the far horizon on the sea
And then the ship appears
And then the ship is white
It enters into the port, it rumbles its salute
Do you see it? He is coming!
I don't go down to meet him, not I.
I stay upon the edge of the hill
Mi metto là sul ciglio del colle
E aspetto gran tempo
e non mi pesa a lunga attesa.

E uscito dalla folla cittadina
Un uomo, un picciol punto
S'avvia per la collina.
Chi sarà? Chi sarà?
E come sarà giunto
Che dirà? Che dirà?
Chiamerà Butterfly dalla lontana

o senza far risposta
Me ne starò nascosta
Un po' per celia,
Un po' per non morire
Al primo incontro,
Ed egli al quanto in pena
Chiamerà, chiamerà:

"Piccina - mogliettina
Olezzo di verbena"
Il nomi che mi dava al suo venire.

Tutto questo avverrà,
te lo prometto
Tienti la tua paura -
Io con sicura fede lo aspetto.

And I wait a long time
but I do not grow weary of the long wait
And leaving from the crowded city,
A man, a little speck
Climbing the hill.
Who is it? Who is it?
And as he arrives
What will he say? What will he say?
He will call Butterfly from the distance
I without answering
Stay hidden
A little to tease him,
A little as to not die.
At the first meeting,
And then a little troubled
He will call, he will call

"Little one, dear wife
Blossom of orange"
The names he called me at his last coming.
All this will happen,
I promise you this
Hold back your fears -
I with secure faith wait for him.

Question: What issues pertaining to imperialism, feminism and other issues are dealt with in this aria?