

# A Century that we Have Inherited: The 19<sup>th</sup> Century

Text prepared by Prof. Erdal Yavuz. The references are given where possible. For the main sources refer below

**Sources:** Britannica Online <http://www.britannica.com/>, Questia's The Columbia Encyclopedia <http://www.questia.com/library/encyclopedia/>, The Encyclopedia of World History <http://www.bartleby.com/67/>, Hanover College History Department <http://history.hanover.edu/etexts.html>, Library of Congress <http://www.loc.gov/r/>, New Internationalist Magazine <http://www.newint.org/>, The Internet History Sourcebooks Project <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/>, United Kingdom, National Archives <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/>, United States National Archives <http://www.archives.gov/>, Washington State University, World Civilizations online class <http://www.wsu.edu/~dee/>, Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Main\\_Page](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Main_Page), World History: 16th to 19th Centuries <http://www.fsmitha.com/h3/index.html>

## A birds-eye view

The settlements reached at Vienna in 1815 was to create a conservative political framework that would halt social and political revolutions. But new political movements spread across Europe.

Liberals sought greater individual liberties and democracy guaranteed by constitutions and parliaments.

**Radicals** pressed for more democratic political structures and social reforms in favor of workers.

Nationalists urged national boundaries that coincided with ethnic unity. Socialists and anarchists judging that the sources of evil being the unnatural inequality attacked the concept of private property.

In domestic politics consolidation and consensus began to replace "revolution" in the European political scene after 1850 with broader representation in parliaments.

However conservative politicians made use of nationalism as a means of support for their governmental policies.

Competition between nations over colonies led to different alliances. Particularly the unification of Germany upset the balance of power and Germany's emergence resulted in new alliances.

All parties began to construct more powerful militaries to offset the gains of their rivals. As a result more aggressive foreign policies were the outcome which resulted by a general war of nations. The First World War followed by the Second and the consequences shaped politics and culture of the whole 20<sup>th</sup> Century.

## Liberalism and Democracy

"Liberalism" is an "idea" or "belief" that people can and should be free to determine their own destiny. As such, it is an old aspiration or "utopia" of humanity.

But when taken as a definite ideology of the last two centuries, it can be situated as a series of social, political and economic ideas, more or less consistent in itself.

Liberalism takes its roots from the 17th century English Civil War, from the works of Locke, Rousseau, Thomas Paine and from the revolt of American Colonists. The ideas of French revolutionaries as well as the works of certain economists before Adam Smith was primarily important sources of liberalism. **(Reading 1)**.

"Classical liberalism" may be roughly defined by the following basic ideas: Limited government,

the maintenance of the **rule of law**, the prevention of arbitrary power, the sacredness of private property, free contractual relations and the responsibility of individuals for their own fates.

However, it is difficult to produce a precise definition of liberalism in the "political" sense.

## Basic Ideas of liberalism

Liberalism sees individual freedom as primary objective. Actions of individuals in economy and society, as long as each individual maximizes his own utility or profit, will serve to the welfare and prosperity of the whole society.

According to the philosophy of the liberals "human being" in the form of individual has the power of independent judgment and a sense of responsibility if left to his own conscience.

This means that human beings have an unlimited capacity for self improvement if left free from any constraint or intervention. These constraints may come from those who hold the power as well as from certain groups like the "majority", or physical and cultural limitations in a society. It is due to these problems that writers like **Alexis de Tocqueville** and **John Stuart Mill (Reading 2)** displayed intellectual efforts to prevent the "democracy" of becoming a "tyranny of majority".

The basic function of "the state", according to the liberals is to prevent any such intervention or constraint limiting the existence, survival and actions of individual. In that sense it is believed that besides life and liberty, "property" is also a prerequisite of freedom and a guarantee of the survival of the individual.

This is why for the liberals uneducated or propertyless people can not be considered responsible until they are educated within democratic and liberal principles. So, besides the protection of life, liberty and property, provision of basic education is a "visible" task of the state, in a society where all other mechanisms are regulated by the "invisible hand" of the market.

For the classical liberals, except John Stuart Mill, neither the working classes nor the women were entitled to full civic and political rights. However the lower classes and the "women" had, since the end of the 18th century, begun to struggle for rights.

After 1840's these demands will find ever enlarging channels through socialist and radical movements. Another contribution of liberal thought is its influence on those refusing all authority like the "anarchists". **(Reading 3)**

### Liberal policies and reactions

Liberal and democratic movements starting by 18th century, particularly the French Revolution, had its worldwide impacts. While "Enlightened Despots" reinforced their policies in a more conservative manner, particularly after 1820 a conservative front against liberal and democratic movements, "The Holly Alliance", were structured by the efforts of Prince Metternich of Austria.

The reactionary front evidently was not only constituted by the conservative governments of Europe, but also by the Christian Church in declaring and banning contemporary trends like liberalism and democracy as "errors" according to religion.

Liberal economic doctrine is a byproduct of the "Enlightenment", the "Industrial Revolution" and England's superiority in the World trade.

As a result of this England influenced, particularly during 1820's and after, most of the semi-periphery countries towards the adoption of free trade policies and various measures and reforms for liberal laws. Ottoman Trade Agreement of 1838 with England and Ottoman Reforms of Tanzimat is an example. **(Reading 4)**

Liberalism as a political and economic doctrine faced a decline particularly after 1870's due to growing competition and protectionism of industrialized nations.

Today liberalism and democracy are always pronounced together, but it is often remarked that there is no such necessity. The criticisms for liberalism may be summarized by the following arguments.

Liberalism may not necessarily be democratic because the "majority rule" that democracies rely on might not always respect individual rights and provide the rule of law.

Liberalism is not always progressive because classical liberals did not believe in the capacity to progress of the average human beings or women. Not equalitarian, because liberals were against social measures and the "welfare state" which is contrary to the principle that each individual is and must be able to be responsible of his own achievement.

Although liberalism never found a solid political base, the economic policies implemented by the "Monetarists" helped to its rise in the 1980's.

The ideas of "individual freedom" formulated by the liberals contributed to the development of wider "human rights" but also to the breaking of "national" resistances and weakening of social and humanitarian policies.

### Rebirth of an "utopia": Socialism

In its general sense "socialism" is used to define all aspirations, programs and political movements aiming an equal distribution of opportunities and income through the limitation or abolishing of the power acquired by the private ownership of the means of production.

In that sense "socialism" conceives the individual not as one able to maximizing his utility and fulfilling self interest but as one needing social protection and education.

This is an approach which takes the "individual" as one not subjected to "natural laws" but a member of the "social" or "communal" body.

The image of an "ideal" society shared by most socialism(s) is a society in which every member is given an equal opportunity to perfect his capacities and contribute by this to the welfare of the community and in turn getting a share in proportion to his contribution.

The above picture of an "ideal" society was an "utopia" of many former popular movements (like that of Şeyh Bedreddin of early 15th century Anatolia), and writers like Sir Thomas Moore (*Utopia*, 1516, from which the term "utopia" is inherited) and Thomaso Campenalla (*Civitas Solis*, the Society of Sun, 1602).

The roots of the socialist thought and movements can be traced in social transition caused by the industrial revolution and the pain, injustices and inequalities brought by the capitalist system.

Equally the French Revolution with its ideals of "universal citizenship" and "equality" and proving the possibility of "change" constituted one of the starting points of socialist thought and movements.

The term "socialism" began to be used during 1830's for the views of Charles Fourier (1772-1837) and Count Henry de Saint-Simon (1760-1825) in France and Robert Owen (1771-1858) in England.

Their views mostly consisted of ideal societies that they believed to be constructed by engineering of policies and goodwill of humanity. They thought about communal settlements or cooperatives where private property is either abolished or becomes irrelevant.

Among those, it was Robert Owen, and English industrialist, tried to set the example of an ideal establishment in his factories (for example educating the workers and families, decreasing working hours and paying higher wages, etc..) but he will be disillusioned.

He later will try to organize "model communes" in the U.S.A. ( for example New-Harmony Commune in Indiana) but this project will not last. This is why later Karl Marx (1818-1883) and Frederich Engels (1820-1895) will call them "utopian socialists".

The famous socialist dictum "from each according to his ability and to each according to his need" also belongs to a famous French "bourgeois"(According to Marx) socialist Louis Blanc (1811-1882).

### Karl Marx and after

The foundations of contemporary socialism was started by Karl Marx and Frederich Engels who will call their socialism as "scientific" to differ from the former thoughts. Later the economic, political and sociological theories of this version of socialism will be named by the name of its founding father: Marxism.

Marxism was influenced by the works of German Philosophers, particularly of Hegel's analysis of historical process. English economist Adam Smith and David Ricardo's works and particularly their theories on the labor value constituted the starting point for taking into

consideration the role of economics in social relations.

Marxian approach to all sciences and philosophy is by their capacity to change and perfect the society. As Karl Marx says in his Thesis on Feuerbach (1845) that "the philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point, however, is to change it."

Marxist theory analysis the historical change by the evolution of productive forces and respective response of production relations to these changes. **(Reading 5)**

So, every definite state of society (thesis) develops within itself the contradictory forces of change (anti-thesis) resulting with a new form of economy and society (synthesis). This analysis of history sees the "change" in mutual relationship (dialectical) of the "material" (economic) factors of societies. (Where comes the term Dialectical Materialism.)

The political and organizational activities of Marx, Engels and other socialists of the same like started by the Communist Manifesto published in 1848. **(Reading 6)** Followed by the International Working Men's Association (1864). (Known as the First International) uniting also within its ranks the anarchists and socialists. Socialism of Marx and Engels after 1870s will be more influential among the intellectuals and labor movements of Europe and regenerate "social democratic" movements also form its ranks. An example is the German Social Democratic Party which obtained considerable seats in the elections of 1877.

The rising tide of social and economic reform demands also gave way to "Christian Socialism" by mid 19th century who was trying to find its inspiration of equality in the teachings of the religion.

### **Anarchism, the brother enemy of Socialism**

The idea of Anarchism (*an* = without, *archy* = rule) is the belief that state and all forms of authority harms the "human" who if left by himself has the capacity of live and prosper happily and equitably.

Their difference from "socialists" is that the formers believe that in order to get rid of the state first it must be controlled. Anarchists refuse all acquisition of power which may become an instrument of exploitation and oppression. The criticism of the concept of a "socialist state" of anarchists rely on this truth. **(Reading 7)**

Anarchists believe that if human being can act not according to the imposed values but according to their own instincts, they can be able to create a cooperative, equalitarian society.

Refusal of authority, goes far back to Stoics and Cynics of ancient Greece, to certain sets of Christian and Islamic cultures. However it is Pierre Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865), the author of famous *What is Property* (1840) is considered to be founder of Anarchism. According to him who does the work also merits the right of possession. His project is the replacement of the state by voluntary, cooperative associations of independent autonomous sectors who will provide members the necessary means of production. The anarchist movement later led by

Russian Michael Bakunin (1814-1876) and Pyotr Kropotkin, contrary to Proudhon defended revolutionary violence to destroy the state.

Actually, "Anarchism" as a radical ideology found adherents among intellectuals and writer like Oscar Wilde, Stephan Mallarme, Herbert Marcus, Lewis Mumford, etc., and continues to be influential among "counter-culture" groups of today.

### **Capitalist competition towards "The War"**

During the first half of the 19th century England was the leading industrial nation. France was mostly preoccupied with its domestic problems and Prussia and Italy were yet to realize their national economic and political unites. All these nations including Austria and Russia were dealing with European issues of political and military balances.

By mid 19th century France and the USA and by the following decades Germany, Italy and other European countries caught up with the pace of industrialization. This resulted by protectionist and aggressive international competition and eventually wars for the markets among nations.

During the second half of the 19th century trade volumes grew very rapidly and important shifts of power as a result of fierce competition took place, and the share of countries in the world trade changed as can be observed from the tables.

### **From Free Trade to Protectionism**

At the start of the Industrial Revolution, England, not being influenced by the competition due to its superiority in industry and control of raw materials and the sea routes, adopted and forced other countries the application of "free trade" policies. However after 1870's there was a return towards protection. The causes were:

1. Increasing competition of American and Australian goods.
2. Increased industrial powers and struggle for markets of the continental countries.
3. Economic depressions of 1873, 1882, 1890 and 1907 and steady decrease of prices between 1873 and 1896.
4. Increasing "nationalism" as an ideology.

As a result after 1870's tariffs began to be raised by European nations to protect their home markets from foreign products. This was accompanied by national measures to secure more foreign markets and more colonies. Also, the protective policies through tariffs facilitated the formation of monopolies resulting by an increase in prices.

Increasing trade and the struggle for overseas markets necessarily brought "territorial" expansion by military interventions, and penetration into "backward" areas of the world: **"Imperialism"**.

"Imperialism" is the expansion of the capitalist market towards non-capitalist, non-market regions often by force and through the destruction of traditional institutions and industries in order to create a dependence to the economies of the center and exploit the periphery for the benefit of the center.

## Explanations (or theories) of Imperialism

Neo-classical economic theory in that sense is interested only by the exchange side and believe that if restrictions on trade removed and pure competition could be realized the “natural” consequences would benefit all parties.

One of the earlier pioneering works with an alternative look on Imperialism belongs to John A. Hobson (1858-1940) a radical British academician and writer. In his book *Imperialism: A Study* (1902) he starts with an analysis of the basic nature of capitalist competition with higher savings and investments which results by “under consumption”. Because: 1. Capitalist accumulation increases the productive capacity more than demand. 2. Wage incomes are behind property incomes so consumption do not rise as fast as national income.

This leads to imbalances and crisis and the solution to keep capitalist economies fully employed is imperialist expansion. Hobson's recommendation to overcome this problem were the measures realizing more economic equality and increasing the domestic demand through wage increases.

Rosa Luxemburg (1871-1919), a Polish theoretician and activist of socialism was one of the leaders of German socialist movement of 1910's and killed in 1919 during the German Socialist Revolution. She is famous also for her book *The Accumulation of Capital* (1913). Her analysis mostly derived from Karl Marx is based on the nature of two sectors. Sector I is where the “producers goods” are and Sector II is the sector of consumer goods. As capitalist economy develops increase in capital accumulation means also the growth of Sector I, while necessarily the real wages do not increase at the same rate. This means that Sector II' s demand for goods of Sector I remains limited.

In order to prevent “surplus” of Sector I, military spending and markets for the surplus goods becomes inevitable. For this aim the imperialist economies need to destroy traditional economies of the periphery and transform them to “market” economies.

In brief, capitalist economies can not do without a continuous expansion, because of their need for:

- a. new markets for increasing and accumulating volumes of produced goods.
- b. to invest capital where returns would be high and risks slight.
- c. to relieve pressure of overpopulation of the center towards the periphery through migration.
- d. cheaper raw materials and foodstuffs.
- e. to increase political, cultural and economic prestige and fulfill “civilizing” tasks.

## Rivalries and the War

The partition of the colonies among European nations throughout the 19th century and the first quarter of the 20th century was as follows.

**England:** Occupied Egypt (1882), conquered Sudan, expanded northward from Cape Colony (Boer War 1899-1902), increased influence in Middle East. Agreed with Russia on Persia, dominated completely India, Burma, Afghanistan, New Zealand and Australia.

**France:** Acquired territories from Congo to Senegal, dominated North Africa: Algeria, Tunis and Morocco; and Indo-China in Asia.

**Germany:** Southwest and East Africa, Togoland and Cameroon. Penetration in the Middle East: “**Drang nach Osten**”.

**Italy:** Some footholds in Red-Sea region and occupation of Tripoli.

**Austria:** Expanded in the Balkans at the expense of the Ottoman Empire.

**Russia:** Collision with England and Germany in the Near East.

**Dutch:** Indonesia, Borneo and part of New Guinea.

**Portugal:** Angola and Mozambique.

The possession of colonies was a sign of a country's military and economic power thus national greatness and vitality in relation to that of its rivals.

This psycho-political mood is fed by increasing “nationalistic” philosophies and also by “**Social Darwinism**” where struggle for survival of the stronger was considered to be a natural necessity.

As a result the advanced “white race” took on himself as a duty or an obligation to “civilize” the underdeveloped peoples of the world. In addition humanitarian and religious motives of volunteers and missionaries also contributed to imperialist policies. The “civilizing” mission repeats itself today by the Iraq intervention of the U.S.A. But if you read the report of the famous **Lawrence of Arabia (Reading 8)** you will see that things really repeat!

Towards the end of the 19th century major European powers had divided Africa and most parts of Asia and the USA also expanded towards Central America and the Pacific.

In Europe, diplomatic ties and alliances changed through time. During 1870's and 1880's Germany as a rising power dominated and established ties with Austria, Russia, Italy and the Ottoman Empire.

After 1890 France gained prestige and power and a new closeness of France, Russia, England and Italy formed against the camp of Germany and Austria.

This turbulent diplomatic and military rivalry will result with the break out of World War I in 1914. It was a “world” war between “Allies” France, Russia, England, Serbia, and later Italy, Rumania, Greece, United States and Japan against “The Central Powers” : Germany, Austria-Hungary, Ottoman Empire and Bulgaria.

## Tables

### A. Countries and their colonies at the outbreak of World War I

Country	Colonies	Area (in square miles)		Population	
		Mother country	Colonies	Mother country	Colonies
England	55	120,953	12,044,000	46,053,700	391,582,528
France	29	207,076	4,110,409	39,602,000	62,350,000
Germany	10	208,830	1,231,000	64,926,000	13,075,000
Belgium	1	11,373	910,000	7,571,000	15,000,000
Portugal	8	35,500	804,440	5,960,000	10,021,000
Netherlands	8	12,761	762,863	6,102,000	37,410,000
Italy	4	110,623	591,250	35,239,000	1,396,000

Source: Shepard Banczoft Clogh and Charles Woolsey Cole, *Economic History of Europe*, D.C. Heath & Co., 1966

### B. Percentage shares of certain countries in the world trade

Years	England	USA	Germany	France
1840	32	8	-	10
1880	23	10	9	11
1913	17	10	12	12

### C. Percentage of Territories Belonging to the European/US Colonial Powers (1900)

Region	Controlled
Africa	90.4%
Polynesia	98.9%
Asia	56.5%
Australia	100.0%
Americas	27.2%

### D. Extent of Colonialism, year 1939

Country	Area (in square Miles)	Population	Area of Colonies	Population of Colonies
Great Britain	94,000	45,500,100	13,100,000	470,000,000
France	212,600	42,000,000	4,300,000	65,000,000
Belgium	11,800	8,300,000	940,000	13,000,000
Netherlands	13,200	8,500,000	790,000	66,000,000
Germany (1914)	210,000	67,500,000	1,100,000	13,000,000

Source: Mary Evelyn Townsend, *European Colonial Expansion Since 1871* Chicago: J.P. Lippincott Company, 1941), p. 19

## Terms and Names

**radical** (Latin *radix* meaning root) has been used since the late 18th century as a label in political science for those favoring or trying to produce political reforms. An understanding of “reform” which include changes to the social order is attributed to “radicalism” and sometimes used to denote political extremes of right or left.

Historically, early radical aims of liberty and electoral reform in Great Britain widened with the American Revolution and French Revolution so that some radicals sought republicanism, abolition of titles, redistribution of property and freedom of the press. In the later 19th century in both the United Kingdom and continental Europe the term Radical came to denote a progressive liberal ideology.

**“rule of law”** This principle means that individuals should be governed by generally applicable and publicly known laws and not by the arbitrary decisions of kings, presidents, or bureaucrats. Such laws should protect the freedom of all individuals to pursue happiness in their own ways and should not aim at any particular result or outcome.

The concept “rule of law” is generally associated with several other concepts, such as:

***Nullum crimen, nulla poena sine praevia lege poenali*** - No crime (can be committed), no punishment (can be imposed) without a previous penal law.

***Presumption of innocence*** - All individuals are “innocent until proven otherwise”

***Legal equality*** - All individuals are given the same rights without distinction to their social stature, religion, political opinions, etc.

***Habeas corpus*** – (in full *habeas corpus ad subjiciendum*), a Latin term meaning “you must have the body to be subjected (to examination)”. A person who is arrested has the right to be told what crimes he or she is accused of., and to request that his or her custody be reviewed by judicial authority. Persons unlawfully imprisoned have to be freed.

**Alexis de Tocqueville** (Alexis-Charles-Henri Clérel de Tocqueville) (1805–1859) was a French political thinker and historian. His most famous works are *Democracy in America* and *The Old Regime and the Revolution* (1856). He championed liberty and democracy.

Tocqueville was a major observer and philosopher of democracy, which he saw as an equation that balanced liberty and equality, concern for the individual as well as the community. He thought that extreme social equality would lead to isolation, more intervention by the government and thus less liberty.

He is famous for his observation that it is easier for the world to accept a simple lie than a complex truth. His advocacy of private charity rather than government aid to assist the poor has often been cited admiringly by conservatives and classical liberals, particularly in the late 20th and early 21st centuries.

**John Stuart Mill** (1806–73), British philosopher and economist. He was educated privately by his father, James Mill. In 1823, abandoning the study of law, he became a clerk in the East India company. During this period he contributed to various periodicals and met with discussion groups on the problems of political theory.

His *A System of Logic* (1843) was followed in 1848 by the *Principles of Political Economy*, which influenced English radical thought. From 1865 to 1868 he served as a member of Parliament. John Stuart Mill's philosophy followed the doctrines of his father and Jeremy Bentham, but he sought to temper them with humanitarianism. At times Mill came close to socialism. He constantly advocated political and social reforms, such as proportional representation, emancipation of women, and the development of labor organizations and farm cooperatives. Mill's influence has been strong in economics, politics, and philosophy.

**utopia** In its most common meaning, refers to the human efforts to create a better, or a perfect society. “Utopian” in a negative meaning is used to discredit ideas as too advanced, too optimistic or unrealistic, impossible to realize. In its original sense used for an ideal society or world whose inhabitants exist under seemingly perfect conditions.

The word first occurred in Sir Thomas More's *Utopia*, from the Greek words for “not” (*ou*) and “place” (*topos*) and thus meant “nowhere.” More's utopia describes a communist city-state in which the institutions and policies were entirely governed by reason. The order and dignity of such a state was intended to provide a notable contrast with the unreasonable polity of Christian Europe, divided by self-interest and greed for power and riches.

**Imperialism** 1. In general, the extension of the power of a state through the acquisition, usually by conquest of other territories, the subjugation of their inhabitants to an alien rule imposed on them by force, and their economic and financial exploitation by the imperial power. Imperialism in this general sense of ‘empire’ is old as history.

2. More specifically, as a development from the older term ‘empire’ the word imperialism was adopted in England in the 1890's... to develop and extend the British Empire... The word was taken into other languages to describe the contest between rival European powers to secure colonies and

spheres of influence in Africa and elsewhere, a contest which dominated international politics from the 1880's to 1914 and caused this period to be named the Age of Imperialism.

**Colonialism** is a form of imperialism based on a sharp and fundamental distinction between the ruling nation and the subordinate (colonial) populations... of different physique and culture... Colonialism always consists of unequal rights... and the policy of perpetuating the economic differentiation between the colonies and the metropolis.

**Cultural Imperialism** is the use of political and economic power to exalt and spread the values and habits of a foreign culture at the expense of a native culture. (An example... is the export of American films. Although cultural imperialism may be pursued for its own sake it frequently operates as an auxiliary of economic imperialism- as when American films create a demand for American products.)

**“Drang nach Osten”** (German: “Drive to the East”) The term originally referred to the eastward movement of German settlers in the 12th and 13th centuries but was resurrected by Adolf Hitler in the 20th century to describe his plans for acquiring Lebensraum (“living space”) for Germans.

Germany, after the Congress of Berlin, became increasingly interested in extending its influence over the Ottoman Empire. The German-Austrian Drang nach Osten [drive to the East] policy became manifest in the reorganization of the Turkish army by German officers, the construction of Baghdad Railway, the crisis over Morocco, and the Austrian annexation (1908) of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

**Social Darwinism** A term used to describe a concept in social theory which holds that Darwin's theory of evolution by natural selection can also be applied to societies or groups within a society. Initially expressed in the writings of English philosopher Herbert Spencer, Social Darwinism first became popular in the late 19th century and continued in popularity until the end of World War II.

Social Darwinists often used the theory to justify social inequality as being meritocratic, and it has also been used to justify racism and imperialism, in a cultural application of Herbert Spencer's idea of the "survival of the fittest."

**Lawrence of Arabia** [Lawrence, T. E.] (Thomas Edward Lawrence), 1888-1935, British adventurer, soldier, and scholar, known as Lawrence of Arabia. While a student at Oxford he went on a walking tour of Syria and in 1911 joined a British Museum archaeological expedition in Mesopotamia. He remained in the Middle East until 1914, learning colloquial Arabic and making exploratory trips and archaeological surveys. After the outbreak of World War I, Lawrence was attached to the intelligence section of the British army in Egypt.

In 1916, he joined the Arab forces under Faisal al Husayn ( Faisal I ) and became a leader in their revolt against Turkish rule.. After the war he was a delegate to the Paris Peace Conference, where he sought to achieve independence for the Arabs. He became (1919) a research fellow at Oxford and served (1921-22) as Middle East adviser to the colonial office, working constantly to promote the formation of independent Arab states.

In Paris in 1919, Lawrence began to write a narrative of his Arabian adventures, and the result was the celebrated *Seven Pillars of Wisdom*, published commercially until 1935. An abridged version, *Revolt in the Desert*, appeared in 1927. Among his other works are a translation of the *Odyssey* (1932), *Oriental Assembly* (papers, ed. by his brother, A. W. Lawrence, 1939), and his letters (ed. by David Garnett, 1938, new ed. 1964).

## Readings

### Reading 1

#### Adam Smith: from "The Wealth of Nations"

*Adam Smith (1723-1790) born in Scotland, one of the most popular economists of his days as well as today. He is mostly associated with the famous liberalist "laissez faire, laissez passer" slogan, which do not belong to him but to the Physiocrats. Smith believed that if left free, individual pursuits of self-interest in an economy would provide the prosperity for the whole society. In such a system, the government's role should be restricted only to protect the life, liberty and property of the people. His most popular book, published in 1776: "An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations" is referred shortly; "The Wealth of Nations".*

#### **From Ch. II: Of the Principle which gives occasion to the Division of Labour**

...Whoever offers to another a bargain of any kind, proposes to do this. Give me that which I want, and you shall have this which you want, is the meaning of every such offer; and it is in this manner that we obtain from one another the far greater part of those good offices which we stand in need of. It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest. We address ourselves, not to their humanity but to their self-love, and never talk to them of our own necessities but of their advantages.

....

As it is by treaty, by barter, and by purchase that we obtain from one another the greater part of those mutual good offices which we stand in need of, so it is this same trucking disposition which originally gives occasion to the division of labor. In a tribe of hunters or shepherds a particular person makes bows and arrows, for example, with more readiness and dexterity than any other. He frequently exchanges them for cattle or for venison with his companions; and he finds at last that he can in this manner get more cattle and venison than if he himself went to the field to catch them. From a regard to his own interest, therefore, the making of bows and arrows grows to be his chief business, and he becomes a sort of armourer. Another excels in making the frames and covers of their little huts or movable houses. He is accustomed to be of use in this way to his neighbors, who reward him in the same manner with cattle and with venison, till at last he finds it his interest to dedicate himself entirely to this employment, and to become a sort of house-carpenter. In the same manner a third becomes a smith or a brazier, a fourth a tanner or dresser of hides or skins, the principal part of the nothing of savages. And thus the certainty of being able to exchange all that surplus part of the produce of his own labor, which is over and above his own consumption, for such parts of the produce of other men's labor as he may have occasion for, encourages every man to apply himself to a particular occupation, and to cultivate and bring to perfection whatever talent or genius he may possess for that particular species of business.

### Reading 2

#### John Stuart Mill - On Liberty

Source:<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/modsbook.html>

*John Stuart Mill, one of the foremost nineteenth-century spokesmen for liberalism, advocated Utilitarianism in ethics, i.e., the view that we should each act so as to promote the greatest happiness for the greatest number of people. Yet he was a champion of individual's rights, calling, among other things, for more power and freedom for women. In his treatise On Liberty he argues that in the past the danger had been that monarchs held power at the expense of the common people and the struggle was one of gaining liberty by limiting such governmental power. But now that power has largely passed into the hands of the people at large through democratic forms of government, the danger is that the majority denies liberty to individuals, whether explicitly through laws, which he calls "acts of public authority," or more subtly through morals and social pressure, which he calls "collective opinion"*

#### Chapter V.

( On education) Were the duty of enforcing universal education once admitted, there would be an end to the difficulties about what the State should teach, and how it should teach, which now convert the subject into a mere battle-field for sects and parties, causing the time and labor which should have been spent in educating, to be wasted in quarrelling about education. If the government would make up its mind to require for every child a good education, it might save itself the trouble of providing one. It might leave to parents to obtain the education where and how they pleased, and content itself with helping to pay the school fees of the poorer classes of children, and defraying the entire school expenses of those who have no one else to pay for them.



The objections which are urged with reason against State education, do not apply to the enforcement of education by the State, but to the State's taking upon itself to direct that education: which is a totally different thing. That the whole or any large part of the education of the people should be in State hands, I go as far as any one in deprecating. All that has been said of the importance of individuality of character, and diversity in opinions and modes of conduct, involves, as of the same unspeakable importance, diversity of education. A general State education is a mere contrivance for moulding people to be exactly like one another: and as the mould in which it casts them is that which pleases the predominant power in the government, whether this be a monarch, a priesthood, an aristocracy, or the majority of the existing generation, in proportion as it is efficient and successful, it establishes a despotism over the mind, leading by natural tendency to one over the body. An education established and controlled by the State, should only exist, if it exist at all, as one among many competing experiments, carried on for the purpose of example and stimulus, to keep the others up to a certain standard of excellence. Unless, indeed, when society in general is in so backward a state that it could not or would not provide for itself any proper institutions of education, unless the government undertook the task; then, indeed, the government may, as the less of two great evils, take upon itself the business of schools and universities, as it may that of joint-stock companies, when private enterprise, in a shape fitted for undertaking great works of industry does not exist in the country. But in general, if the country contains a sufficient number of persons qualified to provide education under government auspices, the same persons would be able and willing to give an equally good education on the voluntary principle, under the assurance of remuneration afforded by a law rendering education compulsory, combined with State aid to those unable to defray the expense.

### Reading 3 Henry David Thoreau: "Civil Disobedience"

*Henry David Thoreau (1817-62), American writer and naturalist. In 1846, Thoreau refused to pay his tax, as a protest against slavery in America. He went to jail. Thoreau then wrote "Resistance to Civil Government," which was published 1849 and later became known as "Civil Disobedience."*

I heartily accept the motto, "That government is best which governs least"; and I should like to see it acted up to more rapidly and systematically. Carried out, it finally amounts to this, which also I believe - "That government is best which governs not at all"; and when men are prepared for it, that will be the kind of government which they will have. Government is at best but an expedient; but most governments are usually, and all governments are sometimes, inexpedient. The objections which have been brought against a standing army, and they are many and weighty, and deserve to prevail, may also at last be brought against a standing government. The standing army is only an arm of the standing government. The government itself, which is only the mode which the people have chosen to execute their will, is equally liable to be abused and perverted before the people can act through it.

....

The progress from an absolute to a limited monarchy, from a limited monarchy to a democracy, is a progress toward a true respect for the individual. Even the Chinese philosopher was wise enough to regard the individual as the basis of the empire. Is a democracy, such as we know it, the last improvement possible in government? Is it not possible to take a step further towards recognizing and organizing the rights of man? There will never be a really free and enlightened State until the State comes to recognize the individual as a higher and independent power, from which all its own power and authority are derived, and treats him accordingly. I please myself with imagining a State at least which can afford to be just to all men, and to treat the individual with respect as a neighbor; which even would not think it inconsistent with its own repose if a few were to live aloof from it, not meddling with it, nor embraced by it, who fulfilled all the duties of neighbors and fellow-men. A State which bore this kind of fruit, and suffered it to drop off as fast as it ripened, would prepare the way for a still more perfect and glorious State, which also I have imagined, but not yet anywhere seen.

## Reading 4

### J. Nassau William Senior: England, France, Turkey and the free trade

*From Nassau W. Senior, (1858) A Journal kept in Turkey and Greece in the Autumn of 1857 and the Beginning of 1858, London, Longman, pp108-109, a talk with Ismail Pasha, the minister of commerce in Istanbul and later comments.*

*Nassau William Senior (1790-1864), an English classical economist considered to be one of the most important founders of modern neoclassical economics by his contribution to the concept of "utility", abstinence theory of profit and his views on distribution. His interest in social and political issues helped to obtain an advisory status of the Conservative Whig Party of England. He is also the first person appointed to the chair of political economy at Oxford University. His travel account of Turkey during his visit between 1857-58 is full of interesting observations on Turkish economy and society from a point of view of Eurocentric, British "civilizator".*

He asked me what I thought most wanted in Turkey. I answered roads and pavements.

"Pavements", he answered, "we shall have". "There has been a contact for more than a year for paving Pera, and next year we begin."\*

"And when", I said, "do you begin the road to Adrianapole"?

"Never" he answered, "a macadamize road. The traffic requires a railroad. The macadamized road would be an useless expense. We shall begin by railroads, and connect them by macadamized road".

"And I hope," I said, "that you will diminish or abolish your export duties."

"I hope," he answered, "that we shall abolish them. They aggravate, if they do not create, the unfavorable balance of trade, which is ruining us. We import from Europe all but the rudest manufactures, and our export duties force us to pay for them in specie".

"As respects your import duties," I said, "you have nothing to learn. You are the best free traders in the world. I wish that you could give some lessons to France."

"I can not blame the France" he said. "If they let in your cottons their own would be ruined. The French manufacturer pays twice as much for his steam-engine as you do".

"That," I said, "is because France prohibits English iron."

"And he pays," said the Pasha, "three times as much for his coal."

"That," I said, "is because France prohibits the English coal".

"Of course she does," replied the Pasha; "she must do so Her own iron works and coal mines compete with yours."

The nature of his political economy did not induce me to prolong the discussion.

**\*Note: As you might have remarked the pavement problems of Pera (Beyoğlu) has not yet finished.**

## Reading 5

### Marx and Engels according to Engels

*Letter of Engels to J. Bloch in Königsberg, London September 21(-22), 1890 in K. Marx, F. Engels,*

*V. Lenin, On Historical Materialism, A Collection, New York, International Publishers, 1974, pp.294-295*

...According to the materialist conception of history, the *ultimately* determining element in history is the production and reproduction of real life. More than this neither Marx nor I have ever asserted. Hence if somebody twists this into saying that the economic element is the only determining one, he transforms that proposition into meaningless, abstract, senseless phrase. The economic situation is the basis, but the various elements of the superstructure, political forms of the class struggle and its results, to wit: constitutions established by the victorious class after a successful battle, etc., juridical forms and even the reflexes of all these actual struggles in the brains of the participants, political, juristic, philosophical theories, religious views and their further development into systems of dogmas- also exercise their influence upon the course of the historical struggles and in many cases preponderate in determining their form. There is an interaction of all these elements in which, amid all endless host of accidents (that is, of things and events whose inner interconnection is so remote or so impossible of proof that we can regard it as non-existent, as negligible), the economic movement finally asserts itself as necessary. Otherwise the application of the theory any period of history would be easier than the solution of a simple equation of the first degree.

## Reading 6

### From "The Manifesto of the Communist Party"

*English edition of 1888, edited by Friedrich Engels,  
(Selections from Chapter I: Bourgeois and Proletarians)*

.....  
Modern industry has established the world-market, for which the discovery of America paved the way. This market has given an immense development to commerce, to navigation, to communication by land. This development has, in its time, reacted on the extension of industry; and in proportion as industry, commerce, navigation, railways extended, in the same proportion the bourgeoisie developed, increased its capital, and pushed into the background every class handed down from the Middle Ages.

We see, therefore, how the modern bourgeoisie is itself the product of a long course of development, of a series of revolutions in the modes of production and of exchange.

.....  
The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation.

.....  
The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionizing the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society. ....

The need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the whole surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connections everywhere.

The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world-market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country. To the great chagrin of reactionists, it has drawn from under the feet of industry the national ground on which it stood. All old-established national industries have been destroyed or are daily being destroyed. They are dislodged by new industries, whose introduction becomes a life and death question for all civilized nations, ..... In place of the old wants, satisfied by the productions of the country, we find new wants, requiring for their satisfaction the products of distant lands and climes. In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal inter-dependence of nations. And as in material, so also in intellectual production. The intellectual creations of individual nations become common property. National one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness become more and more impossible, and from the numerous national and local literatures, there arises a world literature.

The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the most barbarian, nations into civilisation. The cheap prices of its commodities are the heavy artillery with which it batters down all Chinese walls, with which it forces the barbarians' intensely obstinate hatred of foreigners to capitulate. It compels all nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt the bourgeois mode of production; it compels them to introduce what it calls civilisation into their midst, i.e., to become bourgeois themselves. In one word, it creates a world after its own image.

## Reading 7

### Why anarchism is against the "state"

Pierre Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865) criticizes the socialist state years before the Soviet experience!  
*Source: Guerin, D. (1970). Anarchism. Translated by M. Klopfer. Introduction by N. Chomsky. New York: Monthly Review Press.*

Fonctionnairisme [legalistic rule by civil servants]...leads toward state communism, the absorption of all local and individual life into the administrative machinery, and the destruction of all free thought.

Everyone wants to take refuge under the wing of power, to live in common. It is high time to call a halt. Centralization has grown stronger and stronger . . . , things have reached the point where society and government can no longer coexist.

From the top of the hierarchy to the bottom there is nothing in the State which is not an abuse to be reformed, a form of parasitism to be suppressed, or an instrument of tyranny to be destroyed. And you speak to us of preserving the State, and increasing the power of the State! Away with you - you are no revolutionary!

...  
The authoritarian socialists call for a "revolution from above." They "believe that the State must continue after the Revolution. They preserve the State, power, authority, and government, increasing their scope still further. All they do is to change the titles . . . as though changing the names were enough to transform things! ....Government is by its nature counter-revolutionary.

## Reading 8

### A Report on Mesopotamia by T.E. Lawrence, 22 August, 1920

*The Sunday Times, 22 August 1920 [Editorial: Mr. Lawrence, whose organization and direction of the Hedjaz against the Turks was one of the outstanding romances of the war, has written this article at our request in order that the public may be fully informed of our Mesopotamian commitments.]*

The people of England have been led in Mesopotamia into a trap from which it will be hard to escape with dignity and honor. They have been tricked into it by a steady withholding of information. The Baghdad communiqués are belated, insincere, incomplete. Things have been far worse than we have been told, our administration more bloody and inefficient than the public knows. It is a disgrace to our imperial record, and may soon be too inflamed for any ordinary cure. We are to-day not far from a disaster.

The sins of commission are those of the British civil authorities in Mesopotamia (especially of three 'colonels') who were given a free hand by London. They are controlled from no Department of State, but from the empty space which divides the Foreign Office from the India Office. They availed themselves of the necessary discretion of war-time to carry over their dangerous independence into times of peace. They contest every suggestion of real self-government sent them from home. A recent proclamation about autonomy circulated with unction from Baghdad was drafted and published out there in a hurry, to forestall a more liberal statement in preparation in London, 'Self-determination papers' favorable to England were extorted in Mesopotamia in 1919 by official pressure, by aeroplane demonstrations, by deportations to India.

The Cabinet cannot disclaim all responsibility. They receive little more news than the public: they should have insisted on more, and better. They have sent draft after draft of reinforcements, without enquiry. When conditions became too bad to endure longer, they decided to send out as High Commissioner the original author of the present system, with a conciliatory message to the Arabs that his heart and policy have completely changed.

Yet our published policy has not changed, and does not need changing. It is that there has been a deplorable contrast between our profession and our practice. We said we went to Mesopotamia to defeat Turkey. We said we stayed to deliver the Arabs from the oppression of the Turkish Government, and to make available for the world its resources of corn and oil. We spent nearly a million men and nearly a thousand million of money to these ends. This year we are spending ninety-two thousand men and fifty millions of money on the same objects.

Our government is worse than the old Turkish system. They kept fourteen thousand local conscripts embodied, and killed a yearly average of two hundred Arabs in maintaining peace. We keep ninety thousand men, with aeroplanes, armored cars, gunboats, and armoured trains.

We have killed about ten thousand Arabs in this rising this summer. We cannot hope to maintain such an average: it is a poor country, sparsely peopled; but Abd el Hamid would applaud his masters, if he saw us working. We are told the object of the rising was political, we are not told what the local people want. It may be what the Cabinet has promised them. A Minister in the House of Lords said that we must have so many troops because the local people will not enlist. On Friday the Government announce the death of some local levies defending their British officers, and say that the services of these men have not yet been sufficiently recognized because they are too few (adding the characteristic Baghdad touch that they are men of bad character). There are seven thousand of them, just half the old Turkish force of occupation. Properly officered and distributed, they would relieve half our army there. Cromer controlled Egypt's six million people with five thousand British troops; Colonel Wilson fails to control Mesopotamia's three million people with ninety thousand troops.

... Meanwhile, our unfortunate troops, Indian and British, under hard conditions of climate and supply, are policing an immense area, paying dearly every day in lives for the willfully wrong policy of the civil administration in Baghdad. General Dyer was relieved of his command in India for a much smaller error, but the responsibility in this case is not on the Army, which has acted only at the request of the civil authorities. The War Office has made every effort to reduce our forces, but the decisions of the Cabinet have been against them.

The Government in Baghdad have been hanging Arabs in that town for political offences, which they call rebellion. The Arabs are not at war with us. Are these illegal executions to provoke the Arabs to reprisals on the three hundred British prisoners they hold? And, if so, is it that their punishment may be more severe, or is it to persuade our other troops to fight to the last?

We say we are in Mesopotamia to develop it for the benefit of the world. All experts say that the labor supply is the ruling factor in its development. How far will the killing of ten thousand villagers and townspeople this summer hinder the production of wheat, cotton, and oil? How long will we permit millions of pounds, thousands of Imperial troops, and tens of thousands of Arabs to be sacrificed on behalf of colonial administration which can benefit nobody but its administrators?