SOCIAL AND CULTURAL HISTORY OF BRITAIN: HISTORY OF REVOLUTIONS AND ERA OF COLONIALISM

(HIS3C03)

COMPLEMENTARY COURSE

BA ENGLISH - III SEMESTER

(CUCBCSS)

2014 Admission onwards

UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT

SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

Calicut University PO, Malappuram, Kerala, India 673 635

951

UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT

SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

STUDY MATERIAL

COMPLEMENTARY COURSE OF

BA ENGLISH - III SEMESTER

(CUCBCSS 2014 Admission onwards)

Prepared By:

Dr.N.PADMANABHAN
Associate Professor&Head
P.G.Department of History
C.A.S.College, Madayi
P.O.Payangadi-RS-670358
Dt.Kannur-Kerala

Scrutinised by :

Sri. Ashraf Koyilothan Kandiyil

Chairman, Board of Studies- History (UG)

Lay out :
Computer Section, SDE

INDEX

SYLLABUS

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL HISTORY OF BRITAIN:
HIS3C03
HISTORY OF REVOLUTIONS AND ERA OF COLONIALISM

Module I Era of Revolutions

Glorious Revolution – the philosophy of Locke – constitutional monarchy – Hanoverian Succession – The American Revolution – Thomas Paine – Neo Classicism – Dr.Johnson – Oliver Goldsmith – Impact of French Revolution – Edmund Burke – Thomas Carlyle – Romantic Revival – William Blake – Wordsworth – Coleridge – Lord Byron –Shelley – John Keats – Charles Lamb – Walter Scot – Jane Austen

Module II The Consolidation of the British Empire

Colonialism and Imperialism – Ideology and Implementation – Major trends and Writings – Oriental Despotism – Mission of Civilities – Whiteman's Burden – Manifest Destiny– Orientalism – Utilitarianism – Jeremy Bentham – J.S.Mill – Evangelicals – Rudyard Kipling – Asiatic Society of Bengal – William Joans

Module III Age of Industrialism

New technology – Agrarian, Industrial and Commercial Revolutions – Factory System – William Pitt – Trade Unionism - Robert Owen – Chartism – Development of party system – the co-operative movement – Laissez-faire – English Economists – Methodism – Corn Laws – Gladstone and the Liberal policy – Disraeli and Conservativism

MODULE I

ERA OF REVOLUTIONS

GLORIOUS REVOLUTION

The Glorious Revolution is the name given to a series of events that took place in the late 17th century in England. It was one of the final and decisive developments in the power struggle between the parliament and the monarchy in England.

Through the Restoration, Charles II became the king of England, but the power of the king had already been reduced. Then, James II, an avowed Catholic and believer of the Devine Right, like previous Stuart kings, came into throne. Without considering the laws and public sentiment, he performed some arbitrary activities for the sake of reviving Catholicism. But time had changed. Therefore, in 1688, a revolution without bloodshed took place against James II's activities. This very revolution is known as 'Glorious Revolution'. It has proved one of the most powerful and effective events or revolutions in the history of England as well as Europe.

At first we can discuss the causes that led the situation to the revolution:

- The main cause behind the revolution was James II's attempt to revive Catholicism in England. As he was an avowed Catholic and knew that he would not get any help to fulfill his desire from the Parliament, he took steps by illegal exercise of the royal prerogative. He began a 'systematic violation' of the laws of the country and the public opinion. And he committed a series of arbitrary acts that were responsible for the revolution.
- Violation of the Test Act was the first step by James II to appoint Catholics to civil and military posts, as the act, passed in Charles II's reign, was supposed to prevent the Catholics to be appointed.
- Being angry with the refusal of the Parliament to cancel the Test Act, James abolished the parliament and used the 'Dispending Power' (power of postponing the law imposed on any one). And thus, he appointed many Catholics in military and royal posts.
- In 1686, he founded the "Court of Ecclesiastical Commission" like previous 'High Commission Court' (cancelled in 1641) in order to punish the people, opposite to his religious doctrine.
- Meddling in the governance of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, James II began to attack on protestant religion and established church. Sir Isaac Newton, V.C. of Cambridge University, having refused to give an MA degree, without oath, on a Benedictine monk selected by James, the king expelled him. Again by his dispending power, he employed many Catholics in Oxford. In addition, he expelled the fellows of Magdalene College, Oxford, for refusing to select a Roman Catholic to be a president, and

employed Catholics in the vacant posts. So this kind of activities of a king hurt the hearts of the people.

- In the same way, he issued his policy in Scotland. Roman Catholics were given full freedom and granted in the posts of 'Privy Council' and important offices.
- In 1687, James II issued the first 'Declaration of Indulgence' suspending the penal laws against both Catholics and Dissenters. But the Dissenters were not satisfied with this. They realized the cunning purpose of the king that he only wanted to use them.
- Moreover, he issued his second Declaration of Indulgence in 1688 and ordered it to be read in the Churches.
- But seven bishops led by Archbishop Sancroft did not agree to do it. They petitioned the king to be released from reading the second Declaration of Indulgence. They became very popular with the public sentiment but they were accused of libel and brought to trial. So, it spread excitement in the whole nation.
- At that very time, the most alarming matter because the giving birth to a new baby boy by the king's wife in her old age. The people were mentally satisfied with the thought that after his death (as he was old), his protestant daughter would be the next queen very soon. But now it became shuttered. Because, the new baby, son of a Catholic father, must be brought up in a Catholic circumstances, and must be like his father. So the people began to think the alternative to the king.

Finally, all these events prepared the background or field of the Revolution, but the main event happened after the seven bishops had got acquittal. G.M. Trevelyan writes –
"The trial of the seven Bishops and their acquittal by a jury brought the excitement in the nation to a head, and that night an invitation signed by seven Whig and Tory chiefs was sent over to Williams of Orange whose agents had been for some time past in close touch with various leaders of opinion in England".

Next, William with his soldiers arrived England and when marched upon London, on 5th November, 1688, "James was deserted by the offices of his own regiment as well as by his friends and so fled to France". Then, William and Mary were declared to be the king and Queen. In this the way how the Revolution happened.

EFFECTS.

The revolution has various sided **effects on politics, government and religion** of England as well as Europe. Now we can discuss the results of the revolution:

- It marked the end of long struggle between the king and Parliament. Through the Stuart reign, it was the matter of dispute that who the supreme power is, whether the king or the Parliament.
- It reduced the power of the king and established the supremacy of the Parliament. Earlier, the king summoned and cancelled or abolished the Parliament according to his own desire and need. But now the Parliament gained the power of selecting the king. So, it destroyed the Stuart doctrine of the Divine Right.
- "In short, the Revolution closed the era of monarchial despotism and introduced the era of constitutionalism."

- In religious aspect, there occurred the triumph of Protestantism in England and later the freedom of religion.
- It secured a great effect on European politics. Under Charles II and his brother, England became almost back and call of France. But under William, she became the enemy of France but the great power in Europe as well as in the world. Later, it put its influence on French Revolution as well.
- There was an effect on the relation among England, Scotland and Ireland. Supporting the revolution, Scotland became a prosperous country. On the contrary, opposing the revolution, Ireland had to remain under England for a long time.
- 'A Declaration of Rights' condemned the arbitrary acts of James II and proclaimed the conditional principles of the government.
- It was the last revolution in the history of England.

Sometimes a question is raised **"why is it called glorious?**" or "Is the revolution of 1688 a revolution at all?" On this context, the eminent historian G.M.Trevelyan writes –
"The true 'glory' of the British Revolution lay in the fact that it was blood less, that there was no civil war, no massacre, no proscription, and above all that a settlement by consent was reached of the religious and political differences that had so long and so fiercely divided men and parties. The settlement of 1689 stood the last of time. It led not only to a new and wider liberty than had ever before been known in Britain, but to a renewed vigor and efficiency in the bloody politics and in the government of the Empire."

Therefore, from the above discussion, it has been clear that the Glorious Revolutions is very important in the history from various aspects like religion, politics, constitution of government, and also foreign policy of England. And it is actually a matter of glory for England.

The Philosophy of John Locke (1632—1704)-Constitutional Monarchy

John Locke was among the most famous philosophers and political theorists of the 17th century. He is often regarded as the founder of a school of thought known as British Empiricism, and he made foundational contributions to modern theories of limited, liberal government. He was also influential in the areas of theology, religious toleration, and educational theory. In his most important work, '**the *Essay Concerning Human Understanding'***, Locke set out to offer an analysis of the human mind and its acquisition of knowledge. He offered an empiricist theory according to which we acquire ideas through our experience of the world. The mind is then able to examine, compare, and combine these ideas in numerous different ways. Knowledge consists of a special kind of relationship between different ideas. Locke's emphasis on the philosophical examination of the human mind as a preliminary to the philosophical investigation of the world and its contents represented a new approach to philosophy, one which quickly gained a number of converts, especially in Great Britain. In addition to this broader project, the *Essay* contains a series of more focused discussions on important, and widely divergent, philosophical

themes. In politics, Locke is best known as a proponent of limited government. He uses a theory of natural rights to argue that governments have obligations to their citizens, have only limited powers over their citizens, and can ultimately be overthrown by citizens under certain circumstances. He also provided powerful arguments in favour of religious toleration.

Political Philosophy

Locke lived during a very eventful time in English politics. The Civil War, Interregnum, Restoration, Exclusion Crisis, and Glorious Revolution all happened during his lifetime. For much of his life Locke held administrative positions in government and paid very careful attention to contemporary debates in political theory. So it is perhaps unsurprising that he wrote a number of works on political issues. In this field, Locke is best known for his arguments in favour of religious toleration and limited government. Today these ideas are commonplace and widely accepted. But in Locke's time they were highly innovative, even radical.

a. The Two Treatises

Locke's *Two Treatises of Government* was published in 1689. It was originally thought that they were intended to defend the Glorious Revolution and William's seizure of the throne. We now know, however, that they were in fact composed much earlier. Nonetheless, they do lay out a view of government amenable to many of William's supporters.

The *First Treatise* is now of primarily historical interest. It takes the form of a detailed critique of a work called *Patriacha* by Robert Filmer. Filmer had argued, in a rather unsophisticated way, in favour of divine right monarchy. On his view, the power of kings ultimately originated in the dominion which God gave to Adam and which had passed down in an unbroken chain through the ages. Locke disputes this picture on a number of historical grounds. Perhaps more importantly, Locke also distinguishes between a number of different types of dominion or governing power which Filmer had run together.

After clearing some ground in the *First Treatise*, Locke offers a positive view of the nature of government in the much better known *Second Treatise*. Part of Locke's strategy in this work was to offer a different account of the *origins* of government. While Filmer had suggested that humans had always been subject to political power, Locke argues for the opposite. According to him, humans were initially in a state of nature. The state of nature was apolitical in the sense that there were no governments and each individual retained all of his or her natural rights. People possessed these natural rights (including the

right to attempt to preserve one's life, to seize unclaimed valuables, and so forth) because they were given by God to all of his people.

The state of nature was inherently unstable. Individuals would be under contrast threat of physical harm. And they would be unable to pursue any goals that required stability and widespread cooperation with other humans. Locke's claim is that government arose in this context. Individuals, seeing the benefits which could be gained, decided to relinquish some of their rights to a central authority while retaining other rights. This took the form of a contract. In agreement for relinquishing certain rights, individuals would receive protection from physical harm, security for their possessions, and the ability to interact and cooperate with other humans in a stable environment.

Therefore, according to this view, governments were instituted by the citizens of those governments. This has a number of very important consequences. On this view, rulers have an obligation to be responsive to the needs and desires of these citizens. Further, in establishing a government the citizens had relinquished some, but not all of their original rights. So no ruler could claim absolute power over all elements of a citizen's life. This carved out important room for certain individual rights or liberties. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, a government which failed to adequately protect the rights and interests of its citizens or a government which attempted to overstep its authority would be failing to perform the task for which it was created. As such, the citizens would be entitled to revolt and replace the existing government with one which would suitably carry out the duties of ensuring peace and civil order while respecting individual rights.

So Locke was able to use the account of natural rights and a government created through contract to accomplish a number of important tasks. He could use it to show why individuals retain certain rights even when they are subject to a government. He could use it to show why despotic governments which attempted to unduly infringe on the rights of their citizens were bad. And he could use it to show that citizens had a right to revolt in instances where governments failed in certain ways. These are powerful ideas which remain important even today.

b. Property

Locke's *Second Treatise* on government contains an influential account of the nature of private property. According to Locke, God gave humans the world and its contents to have in common. The world was to provide humans with what was necessary for the continuation and enjoyment of life. But Locke also believed it was possible for individuals

to appropriate individual parts of the world and justly holds them for their own exclusive use. Put differently, Locke believed that we have a right to acquire private property.

Locke's claim is that we acquire property by mixing our labour with some natural resource. After currency is introduced and after governments are established the nature of property obviously changes a great deal. Using metal, which can be made into coins and which does not perish the way foodstuffs and other goods do, individuals are able to accumulate much more wealth than would be possible otherwise. So the proviso concerning waste seems to drop away. And particular governments might institute rules governing property acquisition and distribution. Locke was aware of this and devoted a great deal of thought to the nature of property and the proper distribution of property within a commonwealth. His writings on economics, monetary policy, charity, and social welfare systems are evidence of this. But Locke's views on property inside of a commonwealth have received far less attention than his views on the original acquisition of property in the state of nature.

c. Toleration

Locke had been systematically thinking about issues relating to religious toleration since his early years in London and even though he only published his *Epistola de Tolerantia* (*A Letter Concerning Toleration*) in 1689 he had finished writing it several years before. The question of whether or not a state should attempt to prescribe one particular religion within the state, what means states might use to do so, and what the correct attitude should be toward those who resist conversion to the official state religion had been central to European politics ever since the Protestant Reformation. Locke's time in England, France, and the Netherlands had given him experiences of three very different approaches to these questions. These experiences had convinced him that, for the most part, individuals should be allowed to practice their religion without interference from the state. Indeed, part of the impetus for the publication of Locke's *Letter Concerning Toleration* came from Louis XIV's revocation of the Edict of Nantes, which took away the already limited rights of Protestants in France and exposed them to state persecution.

It is possible to see Locke's arguments in favour of toleration as relating both to the epistemological views of the *Essay* and the political views of the *Two Treatises*. Relating to Locke's epistemological views, recall from above that Locke thought the scope of human knowledge was extremely restricted. We might not be particularly good at determining what the correct religion is. There is no reason to think that those holding political power will be any better at discovering the true religion than anyone else, so they should not

attempt to enforce their views on others. Instead, each individual should be allowed to pursue true beliefs as best as they are able. Little harm results from allowing others to have their own religious beliefs. Indeed, it might be beneficial to allow a plurality of beliefs because one group might end up with the correct beliefs and win others over to their side.

Relating to Locke's political views, as expressed in the *Two Treatises*, Locke endorses toleration on the grounds that the enforcement of religious conformity is outside the proper scope of government. People consent to governments for the purpose of establishing social order and the rule of law. Governments should refrain from enforcing religious conformity because doing so is unnecessary and irrelevant for these ends. Indeed, attempting to enforce conformity may positively harm these ends as it will likely lead to resistance from members of prohibited religions. Locke also suggests that governments should tolerate the religious beliefs of individual citizens because enforcing religious belief is actually impossible. Acceptance of a certain religion is an inward act, a function of one's *beliefs*. But governments are designed to control people's *actions*. So governments are, in many ways, ill-equipped to enforce the adoption of a particular religion because individual people have an almost perfect control of their own thoughts.

While Locke's views on toleration were very progressive for the time and while his views do have an affinity with our contemporary consensus on the value of religious toleration it is important to recognize that Locke did place some severe limits on toleration. He did not think that we should tolerate the intolerant, those who would seek to forcibly impose their religious views on others. Similarly, any religious group who posed a threat to political stability or public safety should not be tolerated. Importantly, Locke included Roman Catholics in this group. On his view, Catholics had a fundamental allegiance to the Pope, a foreign prince who did not recognize the sovereignty of English law. This made Catholics a threat to civil government and peace. Finally, Locke also believed that atheists should not be tolerated. Because they did not believe they would be rewarded or punished for their actions in an afterlife, Locke did not think they could be trusted to behave morally or maintain their contractual obligations.

Hanoverian Succession (1714–1901)

The Hanoverian succession came about as a result of the Act of Settlement 1701, passed by the Parliament of England, which excluded "Papists" (that is, Roman Catholics) from the succession. In return for access to the English plantations in North America and the

West Indies, the Hanoverian succession and the Union were ratified by the Parliament of Scotland in 1707.

After the death of Queen Anne with no living children, George I, the son of Sophia of Hanover, granddaughter of James VI of Scotland and I of England through his daughter Elizabeth of Bohemia, was the closest heir to the throne who was not a Roman Catholic.

The American Revolution

The American Revolution was a time when the British colonists in America rebelled against the rule of Great Britain. There were many battles fought and the colonies gained their freedom and became the independent country of the United States. The American Revolutionary War lasted from 1775 until 1783.

13 Colonies

Before the American Revolution, there were several British Colonies in the Americas. Not all of them participated in the revolution. There were 13 colonies which ended up rebelling. These were Delaware, Virginia, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, New Hampshire, New York, and Rhode Island.

Representation

One of the main reasons that the colonists rebelled against Great Britain is that they felt they were not represented in the British government. The British government was making new laws and taxes on the colonies, but the colonies had no say. They wanted to have some say in the British government if they were going to pay high taxes and have to live by British law.

War

War didn't happen right away. First there were protests and arguments. Then some small skirmishes between the colonists and the local British army. Things just got worse and worse over the course of years until the colonies and Great Britain were at war.

Independence

Each colony had its own local government. In 1774 they each elected officials to represent them at the First Continental Congress. This was the first effort of the colonies to unite and make a single government. In 1776 the Second Continental Congress declared the independence of the United States from Great Britain

.

New Government

The new government of the United States was different than the government of the colonist's homeland, Great Britain. They decided that they didn't want to be ruled by a king anymore. They wanted a government that was ruled by the people. The new government would be a democratic government with leaders elected by the people and balances of power to make sure that no one could become king.

Fun Facts about the American Revolution

- The first shot fired in the American Revolution was on April 19, 1775 and is called the "shot heard round the world".
- John Adams was the defence attorney for the British soldiers involved in the Boston Massacre. He would later become a great leader in the Revolution and the 2nd president of the United States.
- George Washington, the first President, only attended school until he was 14 years old. He became Commander of the Virginia Militia when he was just 23.
- The Battle of Bunker Hill was actually fought on Breed's Hill.
- Although the war was between the colonies and Great Britain, other countries got involved as well. The French were a major ally to the colonies and there were French, German, and Spanish soldiers who fought in the war.

Thomas Paine (1737-1809)

Thomas Paine was born in Thetford, England on January 29, 1737. His father, Joseph, was a tailor who specialized in corsets. His mother, Frances, came from a wealthy family. Thomas grew up as an only child. His only sibling, a sister, died when she was still a baby.

Religion

Thomas' parents each came from a different Christian religion. His mother, Frances, was a member of the Anglican Church. His father was a Quaker. The Quakers were looked down upon by most of English society. They fought for the rights of all people and considered all people equal before God.

Thomas' parents often argued over religion and religion would shape a large part of his life. He wrote some of his essays on the subject. Some people say that he was an atheist who did not believe in God, but he actually stated many times that he did believe there was a God. The Quaker beliefs of his father would also influence Thomas' other writings and political beliefs.

Education and Early Career

Thomas attended the Thetford Grammar School where he learned to read and write. When he turned thirteen he became an apprentice to his father. His early life and career was marred with disappointment. For a time, he ran away and became a privateer, sort of like a legal pirate. He then opened his own corset shop, but it failed. Later, he got a job as a customs officer, but before long was fired.

America

Paine was in debt and needed a change in his life. He met an American named Benjamin Franklin in London who told him he should move to America. In 1774 he sold his house to pay off his debts and took a ship to Philadelphia.

Thomas got his first job in America as the editor of the Pennsylvania Magazine. He began to write articles for the magazine as well. Many of his articles denounced injustice in the world such as slavery.

Common Sense

Thomas soon became interested in the American Revolution which began in 1775 with the first shots being fired at the Battles of Lexington and Concord. On January 10, 1776 he published the pamphlet Common Sense.

Common Sense put forth an argument that the colonies should break away from British rule. Thomas wrote in such a way that the average reader could understand his argument and would be forced to make a decision. Many people of the time were still undecided. After reading Common Sense, they became convinced that revolution and independence from Britain was the best direction for the colonies. Common Sense became a best seller. It sold over 100,000 copies in just a few short months. Through his writing Thomas Paine had convinced many undecided people to become patriots. For this reason he is sometimes called the Father of the American Revolution.

During the Revolutionary War

Paine became an assistant to General Nathaniel Green during the war. He also wrote several "crisis" papers that were distributed to the American troops in order to inspire them. He later worked as a clerk for the Pennsylvania General Assembly where he learned that the troops needed food and supplies. He began an effort to raise supplies for the troops including asking France for aid.

After the Revolutionary War

After the Revolutionary War ended, Paine went back to Europe and became involved in the French Revolution. He wrote Rights of Man in support of the French Revolution. He was even imprisoned for a time. Paine returned to the United States and died in New York City in 1809. He was not popular at the time and only a few people came to his funeral.

Neoclassicism

Neoclassicism developed as a reaction to the Renaissance. Neo-classicists drew inspiration from the ancients. They saw humans rather as imperfect beings with limited potential than as a creative and innovative force, as depicted in the previous period. Writers of the neoclassical period tried to imitate the style of the Romans and Greeks. Thus the combination of the terms 'neo,' which means 'new,' and 'classical,' as in the day of the Roman and Greek classics. This was also the era of The Enlightenment, which emphasized logic and reason. It was preceded by The Renaissance and followed by the Romantic era. In fact, the neoclassical period ended in 1798 when Wordsworth published the Romantic 'Lyrical Ballads'.

This literary movement can be divided in three parts:

1. The Restoration Age (1660-1700) introducing the comedy of manner (a play about the manners and conventions of a highly sophisticated aristocratic society.)
2. The Augustan Age (1700-1750) introducing poetry of personal exploration, and serious development of the novel, melodrama, and satire.
3. The Age of Johnson (1750- 1798) or the Age of Sensibility was a transitional period between Neo-Classicism and Romanticism introducing contrary to Age of Reason (Neo-Classicism) emotional quality.

Main Characteristics:

1. Imitation of classical form
2. Artificial and aristocratic society
3. Sophisticated sexual behaviour
4. Honour comes from reputation, not integrity
5. Style is polite, urbane, and witty
6. Instructive and entertaining
7. Distrust in innovation and invention
8. Restraint in passion and personal expression
9. Value of communication, not self-expression
10. Ideals: order, logic, accuracy, "correctness," decorum

Dr.Samuel Johnson

Samuel Johnson was born in 1709 in Lichfield, Staffordshire. The son of a bookseller, he rose to become one of the greatest literary figures of the eighteenth century, most famously compiling *A Dictionary of the English Language*.

Poverty and illness followed Johnson for much of his life. He contracted scrofula (also known as the King's Evil) as a baby, which resulted in poor hearing and eyesight and left him noticeably scarred. Johnson attended the local grammar school in Lichfield and went on to Pembroke College, Oxford. However, he was to leave after just 13 months as his parents could no longer afford the fees. In 1735, he married a widow, Elizabeth Porter, and set up a school at Edial; it failed within months. With this behind him, Johnson took one of the few remaining pupils - the soon-to-be star of the London stage, David Garrick - and walked to the capital to seek fame and fortune. Johnson worked as a hack writer for many years, writing and editing articles for Edward Cave's *Gentleman's Magazine*. He received some critical success with his early poem *London* (1738) and his biography of the wayward poet, Richard Savage (1744) but Johnson's big opportunity came in 1746 with the commission to write the *Dictionary*. Johnson lived in 17 different places in London, but moved to Gough Square in order to work on the *Dictionary*, which was finally published in 1755. From then on Johnson's fame was assured and he was known as 'Dictionary Johnson', although he still suffered some financial difficulty.

Johnson's written work was immense and varied. He completed a critical edition of the works of William Shakespeare and created biographies and critical appraisals of 52 English poets of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries for his *Lives of the Poets*. He also wrote literary criticism and was a prolific essayist, for two years being the almost sole contributor to *The Rambler*, as well as writing for *The Idler* and *The Adventurer*.

Johnson gained a pension from George III in 1762, allowing him a more comfortable lifestyle. He could now spend more time travelling and talking: Johnson was well known for his robust character and challenging and often hilarious conversation. He was a sociable man, being a member of several Clubs and his circle of friends included the painter Sir Joshua Reynolds, the literary hostess Hester Thrale and the writer Oliver Goldsmith. Johnson's life inspired many biographies, the most famous of which, by his great friend, the Scottish lawyer James Boswell, was published in 1791.

Oliver Goldsmith (1728-1774)

An essayist, novelist, poet, and playwright, Goldsmith was born in Kilkenny West, County Westmeath, Ireland. He graduated from Trinity College, Dublin, and studied medicine in Edinburgh but never received a medical degree. He travelled to Europe in 1756

and eventually settled in London. He worked as a writer and was friends with the artistic and literary luminaries of the time, including Samuel Johnson, James Boswell, Sir Joshua Reynolds, and Edmund Burke.

Goldsmith is author of the essay collection *The Citizen of the World* (1762), the novel *The Vicar of Wakefield* (1766), the plays *The Good Natur'd Man* (1768) and *She Stoops to Conquer* (1773), and the poetry collections *Traveller, or, a Prospect of Society* (1764), *An Elegy on the Death of a Mad Dog* (1766), and *The Deserted Village: A Poem* (1770).

Impact of French Revolution

The French Revolution of 1789 is the greatest event of the modern period. It influenced the whole human society. The whole world received the message of liberty, equality, and fraternity. The welfare of the common man became the paramount priority and required changes were made in their constitution by the different countries. A brief description of the effects of the French Revolution on England is as per the followings.

II. Effect on England

The immediate effects of the Revolution on England were as per the followings.

Effect on Reform Movements: - Pit, the Younger, the Prime Minister of England in 1789, praised and welcomed the events of French Revolution, when it started in May 1789. When the Britishers watched the bloodshed which followed the revolution, they turned against it. However, the main message of liberty, fraternity and equality arrested the attention of the British. They started various movements for social and political reforms.

Effect on British Politics: The social reform movements which started as a result of French Revolution divided the Whig party. The division due to ideas of French Revolution weakened the Whig party of Britain.

Economic Crises: It led to financial crises in Britain. Britain started supporting the anti-revolution parties. It also extended them the monetary help. Britain also suffered due to the economic blocked launched by Napoleon. It increased her financial liabilities and her citizens were made to suffer the load of extra taxes.

Influence on Ireland: The success of French Revolution encouraged the revolutionaries of Ireland. They increased their revolutionary activities. British government was forced to adopt oppressive measures in Ireland.

Effect on Literature: The issue of French Revolution became the subject matter of the English poets, essayists and political commentators.

British Reactions to the French Revolution

It is difficult to overemphasize the impact of the French Revolution on British thinking and, in particular, British Romanticism. As Professor Cody's brief overview of the impact of the French Revolution makes clear, the events of 1789 and the events immediately following drew disparate responses in England, as radical and conservative thinkers quickly turned to their pens to celebrate or denounce the overthrow of the French monarchy. As the French Revolution induced bloodshed, and as the French Republic declared war on England, British reactions became more complex and more polarized. Richard Price, a dissenting minister, delivered his lecture, '**A Discourse on the Love of Our Country'**, in November 1789. In this lecture, he connects the unfolding events in France with England's own Glorious Revolution of 1688 (the bloodless removal of the king by Parliament) and the American Revolution of a decade earlier as part of the march of reason, progress, and liberty. As a dissenter from the established Anglican Church, Price sees the Glorious Revolution as important for giving English people freedom of religion as well as establishing their right to choose their own leaders and to resist leaders who abuse power. At the same time, Price sees the revolution as incomplete: religious tests limit who can perform certain acts within the government and Parliament remains not truly representative of the people. With the French Revolution, he perceives the dawning of a new day of even greater freedom. Drawing on Protestant millennialism, the idea that God will usher in a new age culminating his design for humanity, Price embraces the Enlightenment promise – "a diffusion of knowledge, which has undermined superstition and error" – as leading directly to greater freedom. In this new age, according to Price, the revolutions taking place will replace monarchies with laws and religious tyranny with the rule of individual conscience and reason. At the same time that he celebrates the Glorious, American, and French Revolutions, Price warns those who support tyranny that they must reform immediately and must grant "mankind their rights," or they will be swept away.

Price's lecture and pamphlet set in motion one of the most intense and interesting political arguments, a war of ideas waged in print. The most famous work to emerge from this battle was Edmund Burke's direct response to Price, **Reflections on the Revolution in France** (1790). Burke's response, in turn, led to some of the most important late Enlightenment considerations of state power, natural rights, and human liberty, including Mary **Wollstonecraft's A Vindication of the Rights of Man** (1790) and **Thomas Paine's The Rights of Man (1791–1792)**. Price, Wollstonecraft, and Paine all viewed the French Revolution as liberating the people of France from the tyrannical institutions of traditional aristocracy and the church by allowing them to pursue their individual natural rights, as guided by their own consciences and rationality.

Burke's work, which remains a foundational text of conservative political thought, responds both to the events in France and to Price's celebration of them in the name of

natural liberty and reason. Burke has greater faith in traditional institutions than in individual reason or conscience. Against unimpeded liberty, Burke, who had supported the American Revolution and had been generally seen as a liberal, aligns time-tested institutions and the slowly evolved English constitution. According to Burke, the problem with the French Revolution is that it eschews wisdom built up over the ages and embodied in institutions for the idea that the individuals of one generation could discover and enact truth. He directly attacks Price and the Revolution Society for their understanding of the meaning of the Glorious Revolution. In particular, he argues against their contention that the king is merely a servant to the people and that people have a right to form their own government, insisting that such ideas have no foundation in the English constitution. Instead, government and rights are inherited through the state; they do not exist outside the state as abstract principles. Where Price and other radicals try to found liberty and the right to establish government in nature, Burke proclaims that the grounding of rights in inheritance is "the happy effect of following nature, which is wisdom without reflection." Traditional institutions, rather than abstract ideas, provide the best defence and only solid ground for individual rights. Burke warns that if those foundations in civil society are abandoned, nothing more than selfish motives will guide those in power, as nothing will restrain individuals from pursuing individualistic goals that will destroy the rights of others. In essence, Burke emphasizes the weaknesses of human nature, the power of undisciplined thinking and emotions, where his opponents focus on the potential of individuals to determine what is right for themselves and for their nation. These debates – and the events in France they reflected upon – deeply influenced the canonical British Romantic poets. For the generation of poets coming of age with the French Revolution, at first revolution seemed to embody the best hope for the reformation of humankind.

William Wordsworth, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, and Robert Southey all fully embraced the cause of the French Revolution in their youth, but they all swung to a much more conservative position as they grew older. Because of this shift in their political beliefs, the next generation of Romantic poets, especially Percy Bysshe Shelley and Lord Byron, would see them as apostates to the cause of humanity and to what was best in their own poetry. As Shelley would write in his sonnet "To Wordsworth," Wordsworth who had created songs "to truth and liberty" has "desert[ed]" them, leaving Shelley "to grieve" that having been, that thou shouldst cease to be" a supporter of progressive politics. Wordsworth provides his own account of his changing feelings and reactions to the French Revolution in his long autobiographical poem **'The Prelude'**.

Wordsworth began the poem in 1798, at a time when his reactions to the French Revolution were shifting, and he continued to work on the poem until his death in 1850. Written in blank verse – unrhymed lines of iambic pentameter, e.g., the verse form that Milton uses in Paradise Lost – The Prelude is primarily seen as a narrative of Wordsworth's development as a poet. Yet, it also contains his changing reflections on the

events in France in the 1790s.Coleridge addresses the poem in a letter to Wordsworth as largely reflecting on the condition of those who had come to see the French Revolution as a complete failure and as evidence of the difficulty, if not impossibility, of renovating the condition of humankind.

Some critics of Coleridge and Wordsworth have characterized their development of Romanticism, with its emphasis on the individual imagination, its engagement with nature, and its development of psychological and metaphysical insights, as a retreat from the possibility of social and political reformation into aesthetic contemplation. In the excerpts from 'The Prelude' Wordsworth provides the most famous poetic account of the French Revolution. He begins book 9 by reflecting on his memory as a meandering river before describing himself as "Free as a colt" in his youthful existence in London and then recounting his desire to journey to France. This occurred in November 1791, in the midst of the pamphlet wars over the Revolution, to which Wordsworth refers: "I had skimmed, and sometimes read/ with care, the master pamphlets of the day". As he moves across France towards his destination in the Loire Valley, he visits and describes some of the key sites of the early parts of the Revolution, including the Bastille in lines 42–81, picking up a rock from the former prison as a souvenir, yet he finds himself strangely unmoved by these sights.

Despite "their first shock", he "looked for something that I could not find" as he "Affect[s] more emotion than I felt." In other words, he pretends to feel more deeply than he truly does. Here, we begin to see his disappointment in the Revolution, particularly in his lack of deep reaction to what he had imagined as a transformative experience. After commenting on his own detachment from the Revolution – which he may be exaggerating in his remembrance – Wordsworth describes settling in the town of Orleans, where his friends are military officers, who, with one important exception, are "bent upon undoing what was done", i.e., in overturning the Revolution and returning the king to power. Although in the history of the Revolution this was a relatively quiet time, Wordsworth describes a country in turmoil: "in truth an hour / of universal ferment", "The land all swarmed with passion", and "shocks repeated day by day, / and felt through every nook of town and field".

Wordsworth then reflects on why he felt sympathy with the Revolution, even as his friends attempt to "bring me over to their cause". He comments that he was never very interested in political questions, but he was always innately repulsed by "the regal sceptre, and the pomp / of orders and degrees". In part, he simply has not been exposed too much nobility, as he comes from a "poor district", where virtually no one made "claims of wealth or blood". Further, his experience in school was of an egalitarian society, "a Republic, where all stood thus far / upon equal ground" and "Distinction lay open to all". His academic experience provides him with a foundation for valuing a meritocracy, a society in

which each person can prove himself or herself, no matter his or her background. Wordsworth also cites his experience of nature as a child – one of the central themes of the earlier parts of The Prelude – "subservience from the first/ to presences of God's mysterious power / Made manifest in Nature's sovereignty".

This experience makes him "look with awe/ upon the faculties of man" and leads to his faith in a "government of equal rights / and individual worth". He even exclaims that his enthusiasm for the Revolution is tempered by his sense that the events are "nothing out of nature's certain course". His faith in the goodness and promise of individuals was such that the Revolution did not even strike him as extraordinary. After commenting on his resistance to the officers' arguments against the Revolution and his sympathy for the patriots who would die in the wars that followed, Wordsworth introduces Michel Beaupuy, an officer, who supported the Revolution. Beaupuy was one of the greatest influences on Wordsworth, and in the lines that follow, Wordsworth details their conversation and camaraderie as they share their visions of human progress and "Man and his noble nature" as epitomized by the Revolution's overturning of aristocratic power, "a living confirmation" of their faith in "rational liberty, and hope in man, / Justice and peace". The two take more pleasure in describing the horrors of aristocratic power, "In painting to ourselves the miseries / of royal courts".

As much as Wordsworth supports the Revolution, he finds his mind wandering from politics during their walks in the woods: "A novel scene did often in his way / Master my fancy while I wandered on". When they come across an old building destroyed by the Revolution, Wordsworth bewails the destruction of the Revolution. He celebrates his imagination for restraining his patriotic fervour. When the two friends see a starving young girl leading a cow, they reflect on and justify the fight against this kind of poverty; their hope is "that poverty / Abject as this would in a little time / Be found no more, that we should see the earth/ Unthwarted in her wish to recompense / The meek, the lowly, patient child of toil". Wordsworth continues to list some of the other perversions of power that the Revolution will overcome. Early in book 9, we see Wordsworth's hopes in the Revolution – hopes that are similar to those expressed by Price and others similar to him, but are based far less in political theory than in his poetic sense in the equality of individuals and in God and Earth providing enough for all. At the same time, that he "believed / that a benignant spirit was abroad" hints at his later self's chastened view of things. In book 10, those hints of some uncertainty are borne out as Wordsworth moves from enthusiastic supporter of the Revolution to being horrified by the Reign of Terror and wary of the claims of liberty. The book begins with Wordsworth leaving Orleans and going back to Paris, where the king has been deposed.

In the meantime, the invading forces of Austria and Prussia, which had sought to restore the king, have been defeated. While Wordsworth celebrates the French victory, he hints

that the Revolution is beginning to move forward too quickly, with the proclamation of a republic and the jailing of the king and his family. Further, he reflects on the massacres that have already occurred in lines 43 and 57, but at this point he still hopes that "these were past" and that the "Earth [would be] free from them forever". The end of line 45, "as was thought," emphasizes that these were Wordsworth's and others' thoughts at the time, visions that will soon prove to be wrong. In the streets of Paris, Wordsworth hears the political attacks on Robespierre, and he reflects (from his later perspective) on the failed attempts of those he favoured to stop Robespierre's advance towards absolute power, concluding that "Heaven's best aid is wasted upon men / who to themselves are false".

Again, we see Wordsworth moving from his enthusiasm at the time of October 1792 to reflecting on his chastened sense of mankind due to all that would follow as the Revolution rolled onward. Over the next 100 lines or so, Wordsworth reflects on his desire to support the political forces he thinks will best promote the common welfare, reiterating his commitment to the ideals of the Revolution: "That nothing hath a natural right to last / But equity and reason". The lines that follow again suggest his less optimistic view as an older man. By commenting that he was "not doubting at that time", he suggests that, in fact, he does doubt now that it would be possible for the Revolution to "Have cleared a passage for just government". In this stanza, he hints at the forces that the Revolution cannot overcome: "what the People long had been and were /through ignorance and false teaching".

While Wordsworth does not explicitly state his later position, he suggests that the Revolution attempted too much and that the people themselves were incapable, due to "ignorance and false teaching," of properly ruling themselves. Wordsworth then narrates having to return to England out of "harsh necessity", noting that if he had stayed, he would have been of little use and might have perished alongside many others in the Reign of Terror that would soon come. After commenting on having been gone for two winters, he describes the political scene of England, where debates are taking place over ending the slave trade. He takes these debates as reflecting the progressive forces unleashed by the French Revolution but then is shocked when Britain joins in the war against republican France. In the lines that follow, he comments that he had never felt such a "shock" to his "moral nature".

Wordsworth describes, with shame, that he then was cheered when British forces were defeated, but uppermost are his feelings of alienation from his country and his countrymen as well as his own uncertainty. He sees the British war effort as fuelling the increasingly irrational behaviour of the leaders of France, as they "were glad / of this new enemy" and "The goaded land waxed mad". The next 30 or so lines reflect on the Reign of Terror that followed Robespierre's ascension to power in July 1793, as "Domestic carnage now filled the whole year" in France and "all perished, all-- / Friends, enemies, of all parties, ages, ranks, / Head after head" fell to the guillotine. For Wordsworth, the Reign of Terror calls into question his faith in the Revolution's ideals, for it was "A woeful time for them whose hopes survived / the shock; most woeful for those few who still / were flattered and had trust in human kind".

Wordsworth, at that time, seems to be among those who flatter themselves, meaning giving themselves false hope, in trusting humankind. As the poem continues, he recounts

how in the years that followed his dreams were consistently haunted by images of the Terror. In lines 416–436, he then contrasts the ease of the love of nature, of yielding one's self to nature's charms, with the difficulties of the "second love" of human social connections. He goes on to see the blame for human failures as lying with us, but maintaining his limited faith in humankind, he rejects those who see the Terror as "the harvest that we reap/ From popular government and equality" and instead insists that the violence comes from "a terrific reservoir of guilt/ And ignorance filled up from age to age,/ That could no longer hold its loathsome charge,/ But burst and spread in deluge through the land".

Wordsworth no longer has his youthful faith in the Revolution's ability to set everything right. He cannot share the view espoused by Price and others. Yet, he does not reject the ideals of equality and popular rights, which he believes nature underlies. His position is not as conservative as Burke's, although some scholars have demonstrated some deep connections, even as he seems to conclude that political change can only happen slowly. Book 10 concludes with him hearing the news of Robespierre's removal from power on a day when he visits the grave of his favourite teacher, news that allows him (at the time) to return to his faith in the Revolution, a faith that will fade as the years pass by.

Edmund Burke (1729 - 1797)

Burke was a hugely influential Anglo-Irish politician, orator and political thinker, notable for his strong support for the American Revolution and his fierce opposition to the French Revolution.

Edmund Burke was born in Dublin on 12 January 1729, the son of a solicitor. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin and then went to London to study law. He quickly gave this up and after a visit to Europe settled in London, concentrating on a literary and political career. He became a member of parliament in 1765. He was closely involved in debates over limits to the power of the king, pressing for parliamentary control of royal patronage and expenditure.

Britain's imposition on America of measures including the Stamp Act in 1765 provoked violent colonial opposition. Burke argued that British policy had been inflexible and called for more pragmatism. He believed that government should be a cooperative relationship between rulers and subjects and that, while the past was important, a willingness to adapt to the inevitability of change could, hopefully, reaffirm traditional values under new circumstances.

He also maintained a keen interest in India. He concluded that Indian governmental corruption had to be resolved by removing patronage from interested parties. He proposed that India be governed by independent commissioners in London, but a bill to this end was defeated, prompting impeachment proceedings against Warren Hastings, the governor-general of Bengal.

The outbreak of the French Revolution in 1789 gave Burke his greatest target. He expressed his hostility in 'Reflections on the Revolution in France' (1790). The book provoked a huge response, including Thomas Paine's 'The Rights of Man'. Burke

emphasised the dangers of mob rule, fearing that the Revolution's fervour was destroying French society. He appealed to the British virtues of continuity, tradition, rank and property and opposed the Revolution to the end of his life.

Burke retired from parliament in 1794. His last years were clouded by the death of his only son, but he continued to write and defend himself from his critics. His arguments for long-lived constitutional conventions, political parties, and the independence of an MP once elected still carry weight. He is justly regarded as one of the founders of the British Conservative tradition. He died on 9 July 1797.

Thomas Carlyle (4 December 1795 – 5 February 1881)

Thomas Carlyle was a Scottish philosopher, satirical writer, essayist, historian and teacher. Considered one of the most important social commentators of his time, he presented many lectures during his lifetime with certain acclaim in the Victorian era. One of those conferences resulted in his famous work On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and The Heroic in History where he explains that the key role in history lies in the actions of the "Great Man", claiming that *"History is nothing but the biography of the Great Man"*.

A respected historian in his day, his 1837 book The French Revolution: A History was the inspiration for Dickens' 1859 novel A Tale of Two Cities, and remains popular today. Carlyle's 1836 novel Sartor Resartus is considered one of the finest works of the nineteenth century.

In 1834, Carlyle moved to London from Craigen puttock and began to move among celebrated company. Within the United Kingdom, Carlyle's success was assured by the publication of his three-volume work The French Revolution: A History in 1837. After the completed manuscript of the first volume was accidentally burned by the philosopher John's maid, Carlyle wrote the second and third volumes before rewriting the first from scratch.

The resulting work had a passion new to historical writing. In a politically charged Europe, filled with fears and hopes of revolution, Carlyle's account of the motivations and urges that inspired the events in France seemed powerfully relevant. Carlyle's style of historical writing stressed the immediacy of action – often using the present tense.

For Carlyle, chaotic events demanded what he called 'heroes' to take control over the competing forces erupting within society. While not denying the importance of economic and practical explanations for events, he saw these forces as 'spiritual' – the hopes and aspirations of people that took the form of ideas, and were often ossified into ideologies. In Carlyle's view, only dynamic individuals could master events and direct these spiritual

energies effectively: as soon as ideological 'formulas' replaced heroic human action, society became dehumanised.

Charles Dickens used Carlyle's work as a primary source for the events of the French Revolution in his novel *A Tale of Two Cities*.

ROMANTIC REVIVAL

It is generally supposed that the English Romantic Movement began in 1798 with the publication of the "Lyrical Ballads" but it is not a sudden outburst but the result of long and gradual growth and development. The term 'Romanticism' is a literary movement which took place in Britain and throughout Europe roughly between 1770 and 1848. Politically, it was inspired by the revolutions in America and France.

Emotionally, it expressed an extreme assertion of the self and the value of the individual experience together with the sense of the infinite and the transcendental. The stylistic keyword of 'Romanticism' is intensity and its watchword is 'Imagination'. In Britain, Romantic writers of the first generation included Wordsworth and Coleridge (Lyrical Ballads, 1798), Blake and Burns, though introspective 18th century poets such as Gray and Cowper show pre-Romantic tendencies. The second generation of British Romantics- Byron, Shelley and Keats absorbed these tumultuous influences, wrote swiftly, travelled widely and died prematurely. Their life stories and letters became almost as important for Romanticism as their poetry.

Romanticism does not mean any one thing or one characteristic. It is, in fact, a collective term to mean certain features and characteristics, such as mysticism, humanism, supernaturalism, escapism, love of beauty, love of nature, love of equality, alienation, fanciful, melancholy, wonder, emotional intensity, rich imagination, subjectivism, simple diction, sensuousness, love for medievalism, etc. It wanted to free literature from tyranny of the rules of the ancients. English romanticism is both a revolt and a revival. It is a revolt against 18th century traditions and conventions; it is a revival of medievalism and old English meters and masters of poetry.

The **chief characteristics of romantic poetry** are as follows:

Subjectivity: All romantic literature is subjective. It is an expression of the inner urges of the soul of the artist. The poet gives free expression to his feelings, emotions, experiences, thoughts and ideas and does not care for rules and regulations. The emphasis is laid on inspiration and intuition.

Love of Nature: Zest for the beauties of the external world characterizes all romantic poetry. Romantic poetry carries us away from the suffocating atmosphere of cities into the fresh and invigorating company of the out of door world. All poets were lovers of nature and looked at the beautiful aspects of nature. To them, nature was a friend, a lover, a mother, sister and a teacher. To Wordsworth, nature was both mother and sister. He

spiritualizes nature, Shelley intellectualizes nature and Keats is content to observe nature through his senses.

Spontaneity: Romantic poetry is the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings. Poetry to romantic poets is not a craft but inspiration. The poet does not care for the perfection of form or clarity of expression.

Melancholy: Most of the romantic poets in English are full of melancholy and pessimism. A romantic is dissatisfied individual. He may be dissatisfied with the circumstances of his own, with his age, with literary conventions and traditions of the day, or with the general fate of humanity.

Supernaturalism and Mysticism: Romanticism was a revival of medievalism. The romantic is extraordinarily alive to the wonder, mystery and beauty of the universe. The unseen world is more real for him than the world of the senses. Romantic poetry is mystical and is removed from the everyday experiences of life.

A Revolt: Romantic Movement in literature is a revolt. It was a revolt against the 18th century poetic style of artificiality.

Imagination and Emotion: The romantic poets laid emphasis on imagination and emotion. The 18th century neo-classical poets had emphasized on reason and intellect.

For example, we can take Wordsworth's romantic poem "I Wandered Lonely as a Cloud" which deals with subjects of creative imagination, childhood memories, beauty of nature, the role of nature as a guiding spirit .The poem "I Wandered Lonely as a Cloud" is not only a typical romantic poem, but it also tells us how a poem is written in the romantic sense. This poem is romantic is in its subject and theme, and in its expression and word game. The subject is that of the poet's personal experience in nature. The expression is emotive and imaginative. The nature is personified. The poet felt that the daffodils were dancing better than the sea waves. They were happy like the children. Now, as the poet is sitting at home, the daffodils revisit him in his mind's eye, and he writes the poem. The poem is, therefore, not only romantic, but also satisfies Wordsworth's idea of what poetry is and how it is written. This is typically as a poem based on the poet's emotions recollected in tranquillity.

William Blake (28 November 1757 – 12 August 1827)

William Blake was an English poet, painter, and printmaker. Largely unrecognised during his lifetime, Blake is now considered a seminal figure in the history of

the poetry and visual arts of the Romantic Age. His prophetic poetry has been said to form "what is in proportion to its merits the least read body of poetry in the English language". His visual artistry led one contemporary art critic to proclaim him "far and away the greatest artist Britain has ever produced". Although he lived in London his entire life (except for three years spent in Felpham), he produced a diverse and symbolically rich oeuvre, which embraced the imagination as "the body of God" or "human existence itself".

Although Blake was considered mad by contemporaries for his idiosyncratic views, he is held in high regard by later critics for his expressiveness and creativity, and for the philosophical and mystical undercurrents within his work. His paintings and poetry have been characterised as part of the Romantic Movement and as "Pre-Romantic". Reverent of the Bible but hostile to the Church of England (indeed, to all forms of organised religion), Blake was influenced by the ideals and ambitions of the French and American Revolutions. Though later he rejected many of these political beliefs, he maintained an amiable relationship with the political activist Thomas Paine; he was also influenced by thinkers such as Emanuel Swedenborg. Despite these known influences, the singularity of Blake's work makes him difficult to classify.

William Wordsworth

On April 7, 1770, William Wordsworth was born in Cocker mouth, Cumbria, England. Wordsworth's mother died when he was eight—this experience shapes much of his later work. Wordsworth attended Hawks head Grammar School, where his love of poetry was firmly established and, it is believed, he made his first attempts at verse. While he was at Hawks head, Wordsworth's father died leaving him and his four siblings' orphans. After Hawks head, Wordsworth studied at St. John's College in Cambridge and before his final semester, he set out on a walking tour of Europe, an experience that influenced both his poetry and his political sensibilities. While touring Europe, Wordsworth came into contact with the French Revolution. This experience as well as a subsequent period living in France brought about Wordsworth's interest and sympathy for the life, troubles, and speech of the "common man." These issues proved to be of the utmost importance to Wordsworth's work. Wordsworth's earliest poetry was published in 1793 in the collections *An Evening Walk* and *Descriptive Sketches*. While living in France, Wordsworth conceived a daughter, Caroline, out of wedlock; he left France, and however, before she was born. In 1802, he returned to France with his sister on a four-week visit to meet Caroline. Later that year, he married Mary Hutchinson, a childhood friend, and they had five children together. In 1812, while living in Grasmere, two of their children—Catherine and John—died.

Equally important in the poetic life of Wordsworth was his 1795 meeting with the poet Samuel Taylor Coleridge. It was with Coleridge that Wordsworth published the famous *Lyrical Ballads* in 1798. While the poems themselves are some of the most influential in Western literature, it is the preface to the second edition that remains one of the most important testaments to a poet's views on both his craft and his place in the world. In the preface Wordsworth writes on the need for "common speech" within poems and argues against the hierarchy of the period which valued epic poetry above the lyric.

Wordsworth's most famous work, *The Prelude* (1850), is considered by many to be the crowning achievement of English romanticism. The poem, revised numerous times, chronicles the spiritual life of the poet and marks the birth of a new genre of poetry. Although Wordsworth worked on *The Prelude* throughout his life, the poem was published posthumously. Wordsworth spent his final years settled at Rydal Mount in England, travelling and continuing his outdoor excursions. Devastated by the death of his daughter Dora in 1847, Wordsworth seemingly lost his will to compose poems. William Wordsworth died at Rydal Mount on April 23, 1850, leaving his wife Mary to publish *The Prelude* three months later.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge (21 October 1772 – 25 July 1834)

Samuel Taylor Coleridge was an English poet, literary critic and philosopher who, with his friend William Wordsworth; was a founder of the Romantic Movement in England and a member of the Lake Poets. He wrote the poems The Rime of the Ancient Mariner and Kubla Khan, as well as the major prose work Biographia Literaria. His critical work, especially on Shakespeare, was highly influential, and he helped introduce German idealist philosophy to English-speaking culture. Coleridge coined many familiar words and phrases, including suspension of disbelief. He was a major influence on Emerson and American transcendentalism.

Throughout his adult life Coleridge had crippling bouts of anxiety and depression; it has been speculated that he had bipolar disorder, which had not been defined during his lifetime.[1] He was physically unhealthy, which may have stemmed from a bout of rheumatic and other childhood illnesses. He was treated for these conditions with laudanum, which fostered a lifelong opium addiction.

Lord Byron

George Gordon Byron (22 January 1788 – 19 April 1824), commonly known as Lord Byron, was an English poet and a leading figure in the Romantic Movement. Among

Byron's best-known works are the lengthy narrative poems Don Juan and Childe Harold's Pilgrimage and the short lyric She Walks in Beauty.

Byron is regarded as one of the greatest British poets, and remains widely read and influential. He travelled widely across Europe, especially in Italy where he lived for seven years. Later in life, Byron joined the Greek War of Independence fighting the Ottoman Empire, for which many Greeks revere him as a national hero. He died one year later at age 36 from a fever contracted while in Messolonghi in Greece. Often described as the most flamboyant and notorious of the major Romantics, Byron was both celebrated and castigated in life for his aristocratic excesses, including huge debts, numerous love affairs with people of both sexes, rumours of a scandalous liaison with his half-sister, and self-imposed exile.

Percy Bysshe Shelley (1792-1822)

A major figure among the English Romantic poets, Shelley led an unconventional life and died tragically young. He was born on 4 August 1792 near Horsham in Sussex. His father was a member of parliament. Shelley was educated at Eton and at Oxford University. There he began to read radical writers such as Tom Paine and William Godwin. In 1811, he was expelled for his contribution to a pamphlet supporting atheism.

Shelley then eloped to Scotland with 16-year-old Harriet Westbrook. The resulting scandal caused a serious rift with his family. Harriet and Shelley had two children, but soon separated. In 1813, Shelley published his first serious work, 'Queen Mab'.

In 1814, Shelley fell in love with Mary, the 16-year-old daughter of writers William Godwin (a friend of Shelley's) and Mary Wollstonecraft. The couple travelled together in Europe and spent the summer of 1816 at Lake Geneva with Lord Byron. Shelley wrote poetry and Mary conceived the idea for her novel 'Frankenstein'.

In December 1816, Shelley and Mary were married; just a few weeks after Harriet had drowned herself. In 1818, Shelley took his family to Italy where they moved from city to city. Two of the Shelley's children died and Mary herself suffered a nervous breakdown. Nonetheless, this was the most productive period of Shelley's life. Poems included 'Prometheus Unbound' (1818-19) and 'Adonais' (1821), inspired by the death of his friend and fellow poet John Keats.

In April 1822, Shelley settled on the bay of Lerici on the north-western Italian coast. On 8 July, Shelley was returning from visiting his friends Lord Byron and James Leigh Hunt when his boat overturned and he was drowned. He was cremated and his ashes placed in the Protestant Cemetery in Rome, where Keats was also buried.

John Keats (1795-1821)

Despite his death at the age of 25, Keats is one of the greatest English poets and a key figure in the Romantic Movement. He has become the epitome of the young, beautiful,

*doomed poet.*John Keats was born on 31 October 1795 in London. His father worked at a livery stable, but died in 1804.His mother remarried, but died of tuberculosis in 1810.

Keats was educated at a school in Enfield. When he left at 16, he was apprenticed to a surgeon. He wrote his first poems in 1814. In 1816, he abandoned medicine to concentrate on poetry. His first volume of poetry was published the following year.

In 1818, Keats nursed his brother Tom through the final stages of tuberculosis, the disease that had killed their mother. Tom died in December and Keats moved to his friend Charles Brown's house in Hampstead. There he met and fell deeply in love with a neighbour, the 18-year old Fanny Browne.

This was the beginning of Keats' most creative period. He wrote, among others, 'The Eve of St Agnes', 'La Belle Dame Sans Merci', 'Ode to a Nightingale' and 'To Autumn'. The group of five odes, which include 'Ode to a Nightingale', are ranked among the greatest short poems in the English language.

From September 1819, Keats produced little more poetry. His financial difficulties were now severe. He became engaged to Fanny Browne, but with no money there was little prospect of them marrying.

Early in 1820, Keats began to display symptoms of tuberculosis. His second volume of poetry was published in July, but he was by now very ill. In September, Keats and his friend Joseph Severn left for the warmer weather of Italy, in the hope that this would improve Keats' health. When they reached Rome, Keats was confined to bed. Severn nursed him devotedly, but Keats died in Rome on 23 February 1821. He was buried in the Protestant Cemetery in Rome.

Charles Lamb (1775-1834)

Charles Lamb was an English writer and essayist, best known for his Essays of Elia and for the children's book Tales from Shakespeare, which he produced with his sister, Mary Lamb (1764–1847).

He also wrote a number of poems, and was part of a literary circle in England, along with Samuel Taylor Coleridge and William Wordsworth, whom he befriended. He has been referred to by E. V. Lucas, his principal biographer, as "the most lovable figure in English literature".

Sir Walter Scott (15 August 1771 – 21 September 1832)

Sir Walter Scott was a Scottish historical novelist, playwright and poet with many contemporary readers in Europe, Australia, and North America. Scott’s novels and poetry are still read, and many of his works remain classics of both English-language literature and of Scottish literature. Famous titles include Ivanhoe, Rob Roy, Old

Mortality, The Lady of the Lake, Waverley, The Heart of Midlothian and The Bride of Lammermoor.

Although primarily remembered for his extensive literary works and his political engagement, Scott was an advocate, judge and legal administrator by profession, and throughout his career combined his writing and editing work with his daily occupation as Clerk of Session and Sheriff-Depute of Selkirkshire.

A prominent member of the Tory establishment in Edinburgh, Scott was an active member of the Highland Society and served a long term as President of the Royal Society of Edinburgh (1820–32).

Jane Austen *(16 December 1775 –18 July 1817)*

Jane Austen was an English novelist whose works of romantic fiction, set among the landed gentry, earned her a place as one of the most widely read writers in English literature. Her realism, biting irony and social commentary as well as her acclaimed plots have gained her historical importance among scholars and critics.

Austen lived her entire life as part of a close-knit family located on the lower fringes of the English landed gentry. She was educated primarily by her father and older brothers as well as through her own reading. The steadfast support of her family was critical to her development as a professional writer. From her teenage years into her thirties she experimented with various literary forms, including an epistolary novel which she then abandoned, wrote and extensively revised three major novels and began a fourth. From 1811 until 1816, with the release of Sense and Sensibility (1811), Pride and Prejudice (1813), Mansfield Park (1814) and Emma (1815), she achieved success as a published writer. She wrote two additional novels, Northanger Abbey and Persuasion, both published posthumously in 1818, and began a third, which was eventually titled Sanditon, but died before completing it.

Austen's works critique the novels of sensibility of the second half of the 18th century and are part of the transition to 19th-century realism. Her plots, though fundamentally comic, highlight the dependence of women on marriage to secure social standing and economic security. Her works, though usually popular, were first published anonymously and brought her little personal fame and only a few positive reviews during her lifetime, but the publication in 1869 of her nephew's A Memoir of Jane Austen introduced her to a wider public, and by the 1940s she had become widely accepted in academia as a great English writer. The second half of the 20th century saw a proliferation of Austen scholarship and the emergence of a Janeite fan culture.

MODULE II

THE CONSOLIDATION OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE

Colonialism vs. Imperialism

Colonialism and imperialism are often used interchangeably, but they are two different words having different meaning. As both colonialism and Imperialism means political and economic domination of the other, scholars often find it hard to differentiate the two.

Though both the words underline suppression of the other, Colonialism is where one nation assumes control over the other and Imperialism refers to political or economic control, either formally or informally. In simple words, colonialism can be thought to be a practice and imperialism as the idea driving the practice.

Colonialism is a term where a country conquers and rules over other regions. It means exploiting the resources of the conquered country for the benefit of the conqueror. Imperialism means creating an empire, expanding into the neighbouring regions and expanding its dominance far.

Colonialism is termed as building and maintaining colonies in one territory by people from another territory. Colonialism can altogether alter the social structure, physical structure and economics of a region. It is quite normal that in the long run, the traits of the conqueror are inherited by the conquered.

Colonialism is a term used to describe the settlement of places like India, Australia, North America, Algeria, New Zealand and Brazil, which were all controlled by the Europeans. Imperialism, on the other hand is described where a foreign government governs a territory without significant settlement. The scramble for Africa in the late 19th century and the American domination of Puerto Rico and the Philippines can be cited as examples of Imperialism.

In Colonialism, one can see great movement of people to the new territory and living as permanent settlers. Though they lead the life as permanent settlers, they still maintain allegiance to their mother country. Imperialism is just exercising power over the conquered regions either through sovereignty or indirect mechanisms of control.

Coming to the origin of the two, Imperialism has a longer history than Colonialism. While the history of colonialism dates back to 15th century, Imperialism has its origins dating back to the Romans.

Colonialism has its origins when Europeans started to look outside their country, pursuing trade with other nations. Though colonialism can be attributed to the trade pursuits of a country, Imperialism is just not like that and it involves individual pursuits only.

Coming to the etymology, colony comes from the Latin word colonus, which means farmers. Imperialism also comes from Latin word imperium, which means to command.

Imperial and colonial history-Major Trends and Writings

A seemingly minor linguistic curiosity has marked study of imperial and colonial history. Between the 1980s and 2001, the concepts of empire and imperialism were in apparent steady decline, that of colonialism and its 'posts' on the rise, across all sectors of this pre-eminently global and trans-disciplinary territory. Since then, the trend has been reversed. Empire, imperial history, and indeed supposed 'lessons' from that history for the global present, are back in fashion.

All this represents a remarkable reversal of even longer-standing trends. For decades, imperial history was seen as fusty, hidebound, backward-looking – and it appeared too many that studying empires necessarily meant being in favour of or nostalgic for them. Studying formerly colonised countries or regions, their peoples and cultures, was 'in'; and this usually meant doing so within national or regional frameworks, and often (especially in the 1960s and 1970s) taking anti-colonial nationalism as one's main object of study. Studying empires as such – which, it was felt, most often meant studying (and identifying or sympathising with) imperialists, and doing so via the procedures of top-down, old-fashioned political, diplomatic or strategic – was 'out'.

The turning of that tide and the new atmosphere of optimism and dynamism in imperial history are surely good news to anyone interested in the field. Meanwhile the number of those who *are* interested has obviously also shot up, as ideas and arguments about empire, especially the notion of American empire, have been driven into ever greater prominence by contemporary world events. After an extended period in which 'area studies' and national(ist) histories had apparently usurped much of the ground on which imperial history previously stood, a concerted attempt seems to be underway (in David Field house's words) to 'put Humpty Dumpty together again'. Writing about empires and colonialism is today more varied and exciting than ever before. And important, innovative work is emerging in 'traditional' circles devoted to diplomatic, high-political or military

history as well as in 'newer' feminist or ecological ones. Indeed the rhetorics of temporality so widely employed in recent years, of 'old' and (or versus) 'new' imperial histories, may obstruct rather than further genuinely innovative endeavours, both scholarly and political.

Maybe above all, the current scene is both more fully transnational and more trans-disciplinary than ever before. The virtually complete political decolonisation of the old European empires; the persisting and mutating forms of less formal influence both by the former colonial powers and by others; the ever-increasingly important presence of people of non-European origin in the advanced industrial countries – of migration, diazotisation, multi-ethnicity, cultural syncretism; the rise to global significance of 'postcolonial' literatures and other cultural and intellectual productions; maybe above all, since 2001, the often febrile focus on ideas of American empire and a 'colonial present': all have combined to make the imperial legacy and its contemporary resonances ever more important in every intellectual and political sphere.

Yet not everything is quite so cheering – even apart from the gravity and the menace of some of the contemporary world events which have helped to give the field its current salience. The renewed, polymorphous vigour has been accompanied by new kinds of tension and schism, often ones where interpretative disputes are shot through with intense political or ethical differences. In the remainder of this short article I wish to focus on some of these – necessarily only a small and perhaps idiosyncratic selection from among them, and on the whole without attempting some would-be authoritative adjudication of them, though naturally many of my own prejudices will be on display.

The very core terminology of the subject(s) is deeply contested. Keith Hancock, seen by many as the greatest of all historians of the British empire, famously proclaimed that imperialism is 'no word for scholars'. A distinguished historian of early modern Ireland, Steven Ellis, suggests that whether the British-Irish relationship was a colonial one is merely 'a matter of opinion, since colonialism as a concept was developed by its modern opponents and constitutes a value-judgement which cannot be challenged on its own grounds.'

If Stephen Howe agreed fully, he wouldn't have the chutzpah to engage in this field at all. But a kind of permanent vigilance and self-questioning about the very nature, even the validity, of the titular subject seems to him utterly necessary. What – if anything – is generically colonial about all the various situations labelled thus? What if anything does empires have in common across history? What is at stake in arguing over whether a particular mode of rule, cultural phenomenon, ideological formation

> or indeed bit of landscape is 'colonial' or 'imperial', or whether particular modes of behaviour constitute 'imperialism', 'colonialism', 'anti-colonialism', 'resistance' or 'collaboration'? Behind these arguments lie others, which revolve around radically divergent evaluations of the strength or weakness of imperial and colonial states, their relationships with cultural formations and identity-claims, and – most sweepingly – the historical significance or otherwise of systems of alien rule.

Much colonial and post-colonial theory has exhibited a tendency to see colonial power as an all-embracing, trans-historical force, controlling and transforming every aspect of colonised societies. The writings and attitudes of those involved with empire are seen as constituting a system, a network, a discourse in the sense made famous by Michel Foucault. It inextricably combines the production of knowledge with the exercise of power. It deals in stereotypes and polar antitheses. It has both justificatory and repressive functions. And, perhaps above all, it *is* a singular 'it': colonial discourse and by extension the categories in which it deals (the coloniser, the colonised, the subject people, etc.) can meaningfully be discussed in unitary terms.

Some current writing in this vein thus treats colonialism as homogeneous and all-powerful, and also often uses the term to denote patterns of domination, or even merely of trans-regional contact, which preceded, succeeded or indeed were substantially disengaged from periods of actual conquest, possession and rule. Calling all these sorts of things 'colonial' or 'imperial' at worst systematically denies or underrates historical variety, complexity and heterogeneity.

How, for instance, by what criteria of judgement, can we decide what features of British culture are 'imperial'? It has proved extraordinarily difficult to formulate such criteria and set limits, despite the mass of recent historical work in the field, and despite the seemingly elaborately organised, sometimes officially sponsored nature of the putatively relevant British cultural production. Assessment of the historical place of empire in British life is still marked by stark polarity between silent assumptions about its utter marginality and vociferous ones about its centrality or ubiquity.

In some quarters there is a danger of overcompensating for previous neglect of the interpenetration of domestic and imperial, failing to recognise that in many spheres of British life and thought, there really were powerful kinds of insulation between them. To a somewhat lesser but rapidly increasing extent, similar questions are being posed – and sometimes similarly polarised positions taken – by historians and historical geographers of France, Germany, Belgium and other European former imperial powers – and indeed those of Russia and America.

The kind of vigilance Stephen Howe is preaching – though no doubt often fail to practice – requires of course a considerable degree of explicit conceptual or indeed theoretical self-consciousness. Yet the role of such things in imperial history and colonial studies has also been notably contentious. In the study of empire, there have been comparatively few big ideas and, by comparison with many other spheres both of historical and of social scientific research, relatively little theory-building. One need only think of how much debate still revolves around the century-old theories of J. A. Hobson, or the 50-year-old ones of Ronald Robinson and Jack Gallagher. The most widely influential 'new wave' of the past few decades, Saidian cultural analysis, has been spurned or scorned by at least as many students of empires as have embraced it. *Very* few historians have been at all attracted by Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri's eloquent and suggestive but also impressionistic or even internally inconsistent arguments, or think that these offer fruitful 'leads' for historical research.

Yet this relative dearth of theoretical elaboration coexists with a remarkable effervescence of controversy and – especially, perhaps, since the 1980s – with influences coming from numerous academic disciplines, milieu and indeed theoretical traditions. If theory-building *within* imperial history as such has been sparse, the impact of various kinds of theory drawn from elsewhere *on* it has been ever more substantial and contentious.

A further and closely linked problem lies in the relative lack, still, of interaction between political, economic and strategic studies of global power, on the one hand, and work by literary and cultural studies scholars interested in the cultures and discourses of imperialism, on the other. These spheres of research have operated largely in an atmosphere of mutual indifference or even antagonism – and although here too a growing body of recent work seeks to close the gaps, they remain very wide. The post-1980s wave of cultural histories of colonialism and nationalism developed in large part out of literary studies, and has continued to bear the marks of its origin. It has also diverged sharply from much earlier work on related issues in its fundamental 'take' on the nature of imperial power.

One could over-simply; say that one camp sees the crucial relationships for analysing colonial and indeed postcolonial histories as being those between knowledge and power, whereas the other views them as being those between *interest* and power. The focus on a knowledge-power nexus involves not merely a stress on the centrality, power and purposefulness of colonial discourses (or ideologies: those two concepts are, disconcertingly often, used as synonyms) but on colonialism's capacity in a strong sense to create that which it claimed to find in colonised societies. Arguments doubting this, ones seeing colonial knowledge either as essentially neutral 'information' or as being created by

colonised as well as colonising subjects, ones denying that Orientalism in Said's sense was a coherent system of thought, ones stressing the weakness of colonial power and the degree of agency retained by the colonised, all amount (in Nicholas Dirks's terms) to an abject 'disavowal of colonial power and prejudice' or, yet more starkly, to 'blam[ing] the victim again'.

Colonialism, as classically conceived, is very specifically a political phenomenon, a matter of the state. In Stephen Howe's view any coherent analysis or even definition of it must bear this constantly in mind, retaining the recognition that its core is a juridical relation between a state and a territory; one in which the colonising state took complete power over the government of the territory which it had annexed. This clearly distinguishes colonial polities from those which have internal self-government, such as British Dominions, and from formally sovereign states subject to various forms and degrees of influence or control from outside.

Much contemporary theory silently abandons this focus, and inexplicitly (indeed, most often unknowingly) substitutes at best a notion of a colonialism of civil society, at worst a purely discursive conception of colonial power. The former focuses on interest groups, religious bodies, and educational institutions and so on, while almost invariably failing to specify the relationship of their projects to colonial state power. Insofar as it is at all theoretically explicit, other than about its relations to earlier *literary* theory, it takes much of its inspiration from the later Foucault, with his rejection of attention to the state as privileged source or instance of power.

Much post-structuralist theory, of course, goes further, spurning not only the state but society as an object of analysis. Here colonial discourse analysis connects with the 'linguistic turn' in social and historical studies more generally in its rejection of social explanation and very often of totalising explanation *tout court.* Or rather, it's ostensible rejection; for in fact very sweeping kinds of general claim, often unsupported by any evidence and indeed premised on glib denial of the necessity for any coherent criteria as to what might constitute evidence for the propositions advanced, are characteristic of the genre. At the extreme, as for Timothy Mitchell, it seems that colonialism is modernity and vice versa: 'Colonising refers not simply to the establishing of a European presence but also to the spread of a political order that inscribes in the social world a new conception of space, new forms of personhood, and a new means of manufacturing the experience of the real'.

Another sphere of contention is that over appropriate levels and units of analysis. The British 'new imperial history' has included a sharp critique of nation-centred historical

models, with sometimes a suggestion that notions of imperial cultures as global networks should be put in their place. British history could form the centre of a worldwide web of interconnecting stories; but in tracing those connections, the centre itself would be decentred. Some others – including some who would in this over-polarised debate be characterised as 'old' historians, like A. G. Hopkins – also urge that important trends in the contemporary world both give the history of empire a renewed relevance, and enable new perspectives on it. If the great historiographical shift of the 20th century's second half was from imperial to national history, there are strong grounds for this now to be reversed. Yet the resistances against such a move will be substantial: not only among those committed, whether on scholarly or political grounds, to narratives of a national past in Britain, Ireland and other European states, but from their counterparts in many former colonies too.

The key questions here often revolve around how far or in what ways – if, indeed, at all – notions of themselves as 'being imperial' enter into, or even become in some strong sense constitutive of, collective identities among both colonisers and colonised, their relationship to ideas about 'race' and ethnicity – and of course, though Stephen Howe is shamefacedly conscious of adding this in utterly tokenistic style, ideas about gender. If relationships to ideas of Britishness among a wide range of people in different parts of the empire, for instance, were complex, contested and rapidly changing (as clearly they were), and if they often included 'feeling British' in some sense and among other things, then evidently it follows that the colonialness of colonial rule was also a complex and variable thing. Maybe we need to talk, unfamiliarly and following the important recent arguments of Ann Laura Staler, in terms of degrees of coloniality. This is so also in a different sense where (unlike the British or indeed any modern European-imperial case) the ruling elites of empires were themselves ethnically diverse, as with the later Roman Empire or the Ottoman one.

The whole idea of colonial 'collaboration' is also intensely contested. A key argument in much modern scholarship on European empire – perhaps especially that rather loosely identified by critics as a conservative 'Cambridge School' of imperial historiography – is that colonialism depended crucially on it. Collaborative bargains were not only inherent in the imperial relationship, but the nature of these bargains determined the character, and the longevity, of colonial rule. Again, ideas and ideology had little to do with it. Conversely, the social bases of anti-colonial nationalism lay in a web of particularistic relationships which linked locality, province and nation. Nationalist politics in India was crucially formed by local patron-client networks, by the ways in which resources were fought over or bargained for, and thus by the very structures of the Raj, as the biggest controller of such resources. All this implies great scepticism about the claims of Congress either to represent a unified national will or to be driven by high principles of national liberation. We are thus

left with the question: Was the colonial state typically so weak in powers of coercion, so dependent on the politics of collaboration, that social conflict took place within the forms of colonial rule rather than, or more than, against it?

There is, then, an inescapably parallel contest over the historical legitimacy or integrity of anti-colonial nationalism. The view thus sketched is, in critics' eyes, in itself colonialist, according the colonised no will of their own, no meaningful role other than collaboration, no politics other than that structured by the imperial system itself. In a somewhat different, more overtly present-minded and indeed more strident vein, some current writers – the best known, perhaps most extreme case in the Anglophone world would be Niall Ferguson – see those who resist imperial power, past and present, as typically doing so in the name of deeply unattractive, inward- or backward-looking ideologies, and the post-colonial states they created a disaster for most poor countries. The continuation or renewal of some form of imperial governance might be better than independence for many.

That last claim in its turn rests, of course, on the viability, both as historical reconstruction and as present programme, of a model of 'liberal empire' such as that which Ferguson sketches. Such a model inevitably provokes not only analytical but political and emotional resistance, perhaps well encapsulated in the great Indian historian Ranajit Guha's remarkable admission that even sixty years after the end of the Raj: 'Whenever I read or hear the phrase colonial India, it hurts me. It hurts like an injury that has healed and yet has retained somehow a trace of the original pain linked to many different things – memories, values, sentiments'.

Stephen Howe's last theme is perhaps still more emotive and contentious. This is the role of violence, repression and atrocity in empire, and in its representations and memories. In Britain right now, some politicians urge that it is time to 'stop apologising' for the imperial past and instead celebrate its positive achievements and the abiding virtues of Britishness: several recent statements by Gordon Brown are striking cases in point. Countering this, critics press for renewed attention to past British colonial atrocities, drawing above all just now on important books about 1950s Kenya which reveal patterns of abuse and massacre far wider than previously acknowledged. Repeatedly and inescapably, the historical arguments are linked with images of Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib.

Arguments over the relationship between alien rule and violence – including stark claims that colonialism is inherently bound up with extreme, pervasive, structural and even genocidal violence, whose most famous early proponents were the French-Antillean thinkers Frantz Fanon and Aimé Césaire – have today a vigorous new lease of life. Some

historians suggest that most episodes of genocide and mass murder in world history have been associated with empire-building: and in a particularly thought-provoking and disturbing twist, Michael Mann has recently argued that ‘democratic’ colonisers are the most likely to be genocidal.

Oriental Despotism

The idea of Oriental despotism has an old and diversified history in European culture. It was a conceptual model in different interacting cultural contexts, it assumed various functions and meanings, and it waned with the decline of the Eurocentric preconception on which it was deeply grounded ever since its origins in Greek thought. Many agents, not only philosophers or political theorists but also travellers, diplomats, missionaries and administrators, have shaped, spread and applied the idea of Oriental despotism. The classical scheme was not merely reproduced, but enriched with particular articulations and specific values which were connected to different exigencies and contexts. Hence the story of Oriental despotism is not only that of a unique philosophical and political idea, it is also a story of cultural attitudes, representations, concrete interests, interactions and direct experiences. This offers plenty of interesting variations on the same theme of the confrontation with and interpretation of an Oriental alterity .

We could say that the theoretical force of this concept has vanished nowadays, if we mainly considered the development of post-colonial approaches or the methodological perspectives opened up by world or global history. Inside the general framework of the contemporary analysis of 'Orientalism', in particular, the stereotype of the arbitrary power of Asiatic princes and sovereigns and its political, social and cultural consequences have been pointed out, showing the strong implications of an ideology of domination which was inherent in colonial and imperial European power. Although Oriental despotism as a conceptual tool is not as common and accepted as it has been in the past, its influence on European culture has been considerable. In particular, it has shaped the modern European mind and its consciousness of civic identity and responsibility, which played a critical and controversial role in the course of many centuries of international relationships.

The Classical Roots of a Eurocentric Concept

Like many other key concepts of philosophical and political European culture, Oriental despotism is deeply rooted in Greek thought. The words "despot" and "despotism" clearly come from a classical Greek context, where this concept became an effective tool of automatic recognition of Greek identity and superiority over other "barbarous" nations, mainly the great Persian enemy. Although the idea of a radical opposition between the

Greek and Persian nations, grounded on the Greek assumption that Persians were subordinate slaves, was expressed by several authors, such as Aeschylus or Isocrates, it was Aristotle who formulated the first solid theoretical foundation of this idea, codifying despotism as a *topos* of political philosophy.

In Book III of his *Politics*, Aristotle identified a particular form of monarchy – which, with aristocracy and the state, is one of the three possible forms of government. These three forms may degenerate and thus become tyranny, oligarchy and democracy. He explained the despot's authority in terms which correspond to the power of a master over his servant. Despotic monarchy is precisely distinguished from tyranny, which is exercised over people against their will and consequently is illegitimate, whereas despotism is exercised over people who voluntarily or passively accept this kind of power. Despotic government as such is not unlawful or arbitrary; it is a special form of monarchy which can be confused with tyranny because its power is exercised in similar ways. However, it is substantially different, because despotic monarchy is both legitimate and hereditary.

In many respects, this was a crucial distinction which enabled the Greeks to theoretically justify their future attitudes towards Asiatic societies and political systems. First, Aristotle's theory clearly qualified despotism as incompatible with the natural character of the Greek people, who were free and could only temporarily be subject to tyranny because they would revolt against it as soon as possible. Instead, despotism was said to be the most suitable form of government for barbarous nations, mainly the Persians, who were thought to have a natural tendency towards subordination and would thus accept authorities which would be intolerable for the Greeks without opposition or apparent pain. Despotism, for Aristotle, was therefore not degeneration, but a proper and possibly durable system in radical opposition to the Greek world and mind. This judgment followed from the idea that different ethnic groups were naturally compatible with different systems of government, which is an important element of Aristotle's political thought.

From another point of view, this ancient Greek stereotype of Persians being naturally inclined to accept despotic power introduces an historical and geographical determination of despotism which has no connection with the Aristotelian concept of tyranny – any monarchy may degenerate into tyranny, in every place and time. This establishes the "Oriental" character as a constitutive value for the notion of despotism.

The history of the relationship between Greece and the Asiatic world, especially while Alexander the Great was expanding his empire, is full of interactions and contaminations. A prominent example is Alexander's way of adopting Oriental concepts of conceiving and exercising power. It was criticized by his opponents because it was contrary to the idea of a

necessary separation between different forms of society and government, which was stressed in Aristotelian political thought. However, it thus opened the way for a variety of attitudes towards the Oriental world in Alexander's empire, both empirical and theoretical, which was typical of the Hellenistic era. Nevertheless, the previously established stereotypes about the Persians continued to have a strong influence. After the foundation of the Byzantine Empire and of the so-called *New Rome*(Constantinople), the Greek cultural and political identity found in this *topos* an important ideological support against the threats of the Sassanid Persian Empire, which was founded by Ardashir I in 224. Thus the idea of the anthropological and political otherness of the Persian people was not rejected but enriched and articulated in various ways by several authors in this new context. In particular, moral judgments of the Eastern enemy now played an important role alongside the emphasis on geographical and anthropological diversity which had until then been predominant.

We can observe that by this time the Aristotelian classification of governments was no longer the only theoretical foundation of these debates. For example, the term *despots* were used with a connotation that is not negative – in the late ancient language it was mainly an equivalent for *emperor*. On the other hand, the term tyranny was now employed more frequently for classifying the Persian government. Only after Aristotelian thought had been rediscovered and appreciated in late medieval culture, mainly after the translation of Aristotle's works by William of Moerbeke, the influence of his classification and attributes of Oriental despotism grew and developed. Again, the Aristotelian terms were not simply reproduced; a significant variety of attitudes can be found in the writings of authors such as Thomas Aquinas, Tolomeo da Lucca, Nicholas Oresme, William of Ockham and Marsilius of Padua Generally, they were less interested in interpreting and judging Oriental societies and governments than in using Asiatic examples of tyrannical government in order to support the struggle between imperial and popish power. Still, the geographical identification of Asiatic areas, where the existence of a *principatus despoticus* was supposed to be naturally consistent with the character of the people, remained a mark of a qualitative difference between European and Asiatic society and politics and a confirmation of Oriental otherness in many works – especially in Marsilius's *Defensor pacis* or in the commentary of Aristotle's *Politics* by Nicholas Oresme.

Theoretical Developments in the Early Modern Age

The classical heritage and the various implications of the Aristotelian model were of great importance for the early modern European approach towards Eastern societies and governments. Nevertheless, important new ideas emerged which gave the category of Oriental despotism fresh connotations from a theoretical point of view. Niccolò

Machiavelli distinguished between two essential forms of states, thus uniting Aristotle's classifications of Aristocratic and Democratic governments in a single category called republics, which he opposed to the category of principalities. The notion of a despotic power, notwithstanding the fact that Machiavelli did not use terms like *despot* or *despotism*, was explained as the absolute power of a monarch ruling over a nation of slaves instead of free citizens. This power was thought to be the most difficult kind to achieve, but the easiest to preserve because, in his view, the subordinates did not even know the meaning of freedom.

What is particularly important with regard to Oriental despotism is the fact that the traditional geographical delimitation of Oriental despotism changed in reaction to the emergence of the Ottoman Empire at the end of the 13th century. However, Machiavelli's approach placed the fear of Islamic expansion, which was common in European Christian thought and culture, in a different context. He was more interested in analysing the characteristics of the Ottomans' particular form of monarchical government than in portraying the Islamic enemy.This state form is ruled by the Sultan, who is simultaneously the Caliph, the religious head of state, since he is considered to be a descendant of the prophet Muhammad, with the assistance of his most powerful minister, the Grand Vizier. It is therefore radically opposed to European monarchies, which are led by a prince and his lords, as was the case in France at the time. Therefore Machiavelli saw the governance techniques of France and Turkey as two opposite ways of conceiving and practising power and authority, thus proposing a new outline for the traditional confrontation between East and West.

The reference to the Ottoman example for qualifying Oriental despotism is important for the political theories of the French author Jean Bodin as well. Bodin further developed the thoughts of his predecessors by describing a *monarchie seigneuriale* in which the authority of a prince over his subjects is limitless and similar to that of a master over slaves in the Aristotelian sense. The word despot or despotism, however, was not included in Bodin's political vocabulary. The essential difference between a *monarchie seigneuriale* and what Bodin called *monarchie royale* consists in the fact that the absolute nature of a king's power – *legibus solutus* – has some essential limits, that is property rights, divine and natural laws as well as the fundamental laws of the kingdom. As a consequence, the king of France, whose power is in fact absolute because there are no opponent authorities, does not have the same position, according to Bodin, as the kind of sovereign who, for example, rules the Ottoman Empire. In the latter case, neither property nor fundamental laws are respected; the king is the only proprietor of his subjects' possessions. In Bodin's thought, this is not the consequence of a particular nature of the Ottoman people, as Aristotle believed, but the effect of war and conquest, which is the only origin of slavery. For this reason, not only Oriental monarchies were supposed to be despotic, but also the colonial

empire of Charles V of Spain. Any monarch can incur the arbitrary power of a prince who does not respect the system of a*monarchie royale* and will thus be a tyrant, but his power must always be temporary because rebellion is an unavoidable consequence of his illegal authority. Despotism, that is, *monarchie seigneuriale*, on the other hand, is a political and social system which may have great stability and whose duration can be very long. In fact, according to Bodin it was the most ancient and primitive form of monarchy in world history.

By stressing conquest as the origin of despotic power and pointing out the absence of property rights as a characteristic of despotic government, Bodin introduced important new aspects into the theoretical debate about despotism. As a result, significant developments in the works of major philosophers like Thomas Hobbes or John Locke and in the general political and ideological European debate were possible. Nevertheless, not only the theoretical side of the issue is of interest here, because the evolution of the concept of Oriental despotism, as we said, is the result of a complex interaction of factors. The early modern interest in discoveries and voyages and the collection of new experience and knowledge in travel literature and encyclopaedic works also influenced the idea of an Oriental political otherness whose typical character was despotism. On this empirical basis a new comparative analysis of various Oriental societies and cultures was attempted. There were, for instance, the*Relazioni Universali* by Giovanni Botero, who made use of a large amount of primary sources and, above all, travel literature, describing the political relations of Venetian ambassadors and many others. He geographically extended the idea of a despotic form of government beyond the Ottoman Empire, including a whole variety of Oriental governments, from Turkey to Persia, from Mughal India to China and Siam. This extension of the boundaries of Oriental despotism, in addition to previous philosophical and political ideas concerning the substantial difference of Asiatic governments, significantly enhanced the concept by offering a synthesis of empirical experience and theory.

Travel writings played a major role in this process, and their importance, sometimes underestimated in comparison to philosophical and political theory, deserves particular attention. For example François Bernier, a traveller in the Mughal Empire proposed a comparison between Mughal India and Europe in which the socio-economic situation in the country was profoundly analysed. Bernier painted a negative picture of the Empire by emphasizing the economically disastrous consequences of despotic government, the ruinous effects of a lack of private ownership, and the shocking contrast between the extreme wealth of the princes and the poverty of their people, who were oppressed by the taxation system and by rapacious peripheral administrators. His writings had a major influence on European attitudes towards India and, more generally, towards Asiatic politics

and governments. All this was the result of an empirical approach and direct experience, and not of mere theoretical speculation, although Bernier was also a philosopher and an original thinker.

Another example would be Jean Chardin, who was not a philosopher but "qui a voyagé comme Platon", as Jean-Jacques Rousseau said of him. During his travels in Persia he empirically experienced a state shaped by Oriental despotism. His observations in the Safavid monarchy at the end of the 17th century led him to describe the Persian despotic government as a result of incidental and historical circumstances which provided the prince with strength and extreme authority for controlling the aristocratic opposition. Chardin did not consider despotism as a result of the natural character of the people nor of Islamic religion, which could in fact produce different political systems, as the examples of Turkey and Persia show. He therefore took care to describe the different varieties and forms of Oriental despotism in detail, and his writing is a remarkable example of how empirical experience could not only confirm but also question the use of a uniform interpretation scheme applied to every Asiatic government.

Oriental Despotism in Enlightenment culture

When Charles Louis de Secondat de Montesquieu published his *Lettres Persanes* in 1721, France had already been debating on Oriental despotism for many years in a highly intellectual way, mainly in connection with the political and ideological struggle against the authoritarian trend of the French monarchy. The new term emerged during the age of the Fronde and was elaborated in an intensive pamphlet war, in which the similarities between the power of Louis XIV and that of the *Grand Seigneur* or the *Grand Mogol* were often hinted at; for instance, in the celebrated *Soupirs de la France esclave* by Michel Le Vassor. Obviously the tensions in the critical period of transition after the Sun King's death and the worries about the authoritarian turn of the French monarchy played an important role in the *Lettres Persanes* and in Montesquieu's treatment of Oriental despotism as well. It would be misleading, however, to reduce Montesquieu's important contribution to this subject, which was later elaborated in his *Esprit des Lois* (1748), to a mere polemical or ideological exploitation of the concept for contingent political purposes.

What distinguished Montesquieu's approach was his analysis of a particular authoritarian form of government which he may have rejected but whose predominance in the ancient and modern world, especially in Eastern countries, urged him to study its causes and conditions of existence. It led him, therefore, to define Oriental despotism as an autonomous form of government beyond its accepted categorization as a particular form of monarchy coming from the Aristotelian tradition. His analysis of despotism, of its nature – a concentration of authority that leaves no place to liberty –, and the principle of

intimidation it is grounded on, as well as his systematic study of its various connections with climate, religion, manners, economy and laws, made Montesquieu's work the most important contribution to this debate in the 18th century and beyond.

Asia – referring to all Eastern countries, from the Islamic world to the Far East – was for Montesquieu the natural milieu of despotism. He accordingly proposed a contrast between Europe and the Orient that was based on his scientific approach. *L'Esprit des Lois* was immediately recognized by his contemporaries as an important work and was extremely influential not only from a theoretical but also, maybe more, from a more general cultural point of view. Its success may be connected with the fact that Montesquieu based his conclusions not only on philosophical and political speculations, but also on a variety of empirical experience.

Travel literature was an essential source for Montesquieu's approach, as his careful readings and summaries of the works by Bernier, Chardin, and many others show. They inspired his interest in the particularities of despotic governments and their varieties in the context of the nature and principle of despotism, which had not always been analysed as closely as they deserved. Islam is proposed, in this view, as a perfect ally of despotism because of the strong interaction between political and religious matters, even if the respect for religion can have a stabilizing effect, since it imposes rules that everybody must accept. Montesquieu thus emphasized the importance of religion from a political point of view and showed that it could act as a moderating force in despotic realities as well.

At the same time, although he highlighted the radical geographical and political differences between Europe and Asia – the large plains of the Asiatic natural milieu were an essential condition for despotism, in Montesquieu's view, whereas the fragmented territory of Europe gave natural support to political liberty –, he did not deny that historical events and political situations could produce despotism in Europe as well. For example, such a situation could have occurred after the territorial and political extension of a sovereign's authority and the weakening of its checks, even though, in Montesquieu's eyes, it would not have been typical. All these reflections hint at a political criticism that is strongly linked to the sociological or scientific analysis of despotism in Montesquieu's work.

Although Montesquieu considerably influenced European attitudes towards Oriental despotism in the 18th century and beyond, a variety of approaches can be observed that sometimes diverged from and sometimes directly opposed Montesquieu's thesis. The fundamental connection of despotism with religion was a central element of Nicolas-Antoine Boulanger's *Recherches sur l'origine du despotisme oriental* as well, in which

theocracy was established as the essential basis of despotism. However, he did not believe climate or natural environment to be a cause of Oriental despotism, as Montesquieu did. Other authors, Claude Adrien Helvétius for instance, made the same point.

Besides, Boulanger did not define religion as socially useful but as the anthropological source of a fundamental mystification that creates power. Its political consequence, reinforced by superstition and idolatry, would then be despotism. In Boulanger's analysis, the link between religion and despotism was strongly emphasized. A similar approach was present in the writings of various other authors of that time. This can be seen as the expression of a struggle against ecclesiastical power in which the negative model of Asiatic governments was systematically employed. At the end of the century, Jean-Antoine-Nicolas de Caritat, marquis de Condorcet gave this idea a concise and vigorous form in his *Esquisse*, observing the marked contrast between Orient and Occident. He thus urged all enlightened European countries to energetically help foster the emancipation of a large part of humanity which was, according to him, still living in a system of oppression producing economic, cultural and civic backwardness and stagnation.

The political relevance of the concept of Oriental despotism in the 18th century is also evident in writings that directly opposed Montesquieu's analysis but used the same methodological premise, which is empirical evidence. For example, Voltaire accused Montesquieu of incorrectly using his sources and thus shaping a concept of Oriental despotism that had no matches in history and the real world, as he proved by the example of Turkey. Although this attitude was mainly due to the substantial difference between Voltaire's political ideas on government and limiting monarchic power and Montesquieu's thought, criticism also came from other scholars. Abraham-Hyacinthe Anquetil-Duperron tried to demonstrate, supported by his vast experience as an orientalist that an unlimited authority without regard to property rights had never existed in Asiatic countries or the Islamic world. In Anquetil-Duperron's thought, it was even more necessary to oppose the notion of Oriental despotism because of Europe's growing economic and political interest in Asia, particularly in India, whose complex and ancient civilization would have been wronged by the use of this concept.

In the Physiocratic school which was founded in France by François Quesnay, despotism had other theoretical and political connotations, on the basis that scientific knowledge of the economic and social laws should have imposed the despotism of *evidence*. A good and well-ordered government could, for this economic school, politically be managed by a strong central authority, which justified a virtuous despotism. They frequently referred to the empire of China as an example, revealing an appreciation of China which can be connected to Jesuit sources. The Physiocratics proposed China as a model because of its economic regulations and its social, political and administrative rules as well as its religion,

Confucianism, which efficiently cooperated with political order. They thus created a different and more positive image of Oriental despotism.

All these various attitudes towards Oriental despotism should, however, be considered as the theoretical side of a more complex debate; the real development of the relation between Europe and Asia must not be overlooked. Since European powers became more involved in Asia during the 18th century and British colonial interest in India was growing especially fast, Europeans could gain empirical experience much more easily and extensively. Administrators, diplomats and political staff employed in colonial government were much more involved in Asia and became the main source on this topic, whereas authors in earlier centuries had mainly had to rely on travel literature. The lack of proprietary rights in India and the idea of the prince as the owner of everything, one of the central elements of the modern idea of Oriental despotism, became a more urgent question in the colonial age. One of the most important consequences in British India was that the *zamindars*, that is, the tax-collecting tenants in the Mughal administration, were granted proprietary rights. This had unexpected negative effects on the society and economy of British India and clearly shows the practical effects of the European idea of Oriental despotism when it was directly applied by colonial administrators, opening new and various debates. In other words, the concept of Oriental despotism is shaped by different languages, approaches and actors, and should not be seen uniquely from the theoretical side. The cultural problem of this Eurocentric category and its evolution should be analysed in all its varieties and implications.

From Oriental Despotism to the Asiatic mode of production

The Eurocentric representation of the relationships between the East and Europe, from a philosophical point of view, becomes most interesting at the beginning of the 19th century when Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel used the concept of Oriental despotism in his *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte*. The quality of his interpretation is comparable to that of Aristotle's and Montesquieu's contributions to the debate. Elements of Montesquieu's analysis were in fact present in Hegel's interpretation – above all, he focused on despotism as a particular form of government. What distinguished Hegel's approach is that he placed despotism within a dialectical scheme which is chronological and logical at the same time, since it is the first phase of the historical and universal movement of the spirit. Despotism, which for Hegel was represented by Asiatic societies and governments, was conceived of as the first of four stages in the dialectics of the universal spirit, because it departs from the state of nature but does not yet permit the individual to be autonomous. A despotically ruled society cannot articulate itself, and the universal spirit is concentrated in a single free person, embodied by the despot himself. The

logical analysis of the spirit's development implies an historical movement, and in Hegel's view "the History of the World travels from East to West, for Europe is absolutely the end of History."

This movement also has a geographical dimension, because the universal spirit can only be achieved by peoples with the corresponding natural constitution (*Volksgeist*). A link with Montesquieu's approach is clearly visible here, as well as the influence of more recent authors, in particular Carl Ritter, who believed geographical factors to be natural, conditions for the evolution of people's spirit. Geographical factors interact with the logical development of the spirit, which Hegel divided into four great stages, that is, the Oriental, Greek, Roman and, finally, Germanic stage. The particular history of each people's spirit is also influenced by geographic factors such as the different lifestyles in the uplands or in the plains of the Eastern world. The Eastern world represents the first stage of the universal spirit's movement – "the childhood of History" – since it remains locked in a condition which, by restricting the role of the individual, does not permit any evolution.

This, for Hegel, is most evident in the Mongolian and Chinese Empires. They may be characterized as systems of "theocratic despotism", for which the connection with Enlightenment ideas on Eastern societies and governments is particularly clear and in which religious and political authorities are strongly linked. In India, the situation is similar and the caste system is a different expression – "theocratic aristocracy" – of the same unarticulated dimension of the spirit. The same could be observed in ancient Persia – "theocratic monarchy" – where the interaction with the West and sea trade, however, produced more heterogeneous elements. In this general context, the sea – in the case of the Phoenicians, for instance, and their maritime commerce – particularly acted as an effective force against the undifferentiated dimension of the spirit. In Western Asiatic countries, it opened up the way to a different scenario, defined by Hegel as the second stage of universal history, that is, the Greek one. In this geographical area, therefore, despotism is no longer the main political category.

The extraordinary theoretical strength of Hegel's thought reinforced the idea of an inexorable connection between despotism and immobility and an essential difference between the Eastern and the European world which had already been discussed in the Age of Enlightenment. Its influence, from a theoretical but also from a political and ideological point of view, was considerable. If Asia was located at the origin of the universal spirit's movement, its lack of dynamics placed it outside the development of civilization.

The parallels between Hegel's interpretative scheme and Karl Marx's thought have often been pointed out. At the same time, the connection of Marx's interpretation of Asiatic societies with 17th and 18th century observations on the specific nature of their economy, particularly the idea of the precarious status of proprietary rights in Asia, is clearly visible

in his writings, mainly in his journal contributions on India and China. According to Marx, the entire Asiatic economic system was based on the absence of individual proprietary rights, due to the sovereign's being the sole proprietor, and to the organization of economic life in autonomous village communities. Marx believed that the geographical conditions of Asiatic countries reinforced this political system, for example, because only a strong and centralized authority could provide the required agricultural watering systems. The Asiatic "mode of production" which prevailed in India and other Eastern countries like China and parts of Russia was, for Marx, the real foundation of Oriental despotism, and these two concepts are strictly linked in Marx's thought. In the general framework of Marx's ideas on the development of society and its future perspectives, this system marked a stoppage. For this reason, Marx thought the European domination of the colonies – particularly the British involvement in India – to be a necessary measure or, in his words, a "double mission […]: one destructive, the other regenerating the annihilation of old Asiatic society, and the laying of the material foundations of Western society in Asia".

This shift from the "Oriental despotism" concept to the "Asiatic mode of production" opened a fresh discussion and proposed new methodologies of investigation. It also had political implications which were related to the international social and political contexts of the late 19th and 20th centuries. The connection between irrigation systems and the nature of Asiatic political structures also played a major role in Max Weber's interpretation of the differing development of Mediterranean and Asiatic societies. Weber claimed that different geographical conditions caused this fundamental divergence, pointing out the contrast between coastal Mediterranean regions and the essential importance of rivers and the managing of irrigation in Egypt or in Middle Eastern areas in the ancient world. He wrote: "The crucial factor which made Near Eastern development so different was the need for irrigation systems, as a result of which the cities were closely connected with building canals and constant regulation of waters and rivers, all of which demanded the existence of a unified bureaucracy."

The political and ethical consequence was "the subjugation of the individual" in the East, and, on the Mediterranean side, the rise of a "purely secular civilization which characterized Greek society and caused capitalist development in Greece to differ from that in the Near East". The economic foundation of Asiatic monarchies and the existence of a 'patrimonial' bureaucracy personally depending on the monarch, such as existed in China, thus seemed to prevent political development and the modernization of the social and institutional structure. Weber gave the old concept of Oriental despotism a fresh impetus by interpreting various materials and judgments from the history of European culture. He thus supported the core idea of a European singularity and predominance in the history of

world civilization which he clearly exposed in *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*.

In the 20th century, Karl August Wittfogel; a German sociologist recovered the term "Oriental despotism" in his provocative work *Oriental Despotism* in 1957. His approach was strongly related to the thought of Marx and particularly that of Weber. He developed the idea of the economic necessity of supporting irrigation systems as the foundation of a model of society and government whose main characteristic was the absolute power of a central bureaucracy. On these grounds, Wittfogel diagnosed a clear contrast between polycentric societies like those that developed in Europe and monocentric ones as in Asia. There, he observed a transition from the old despotic governments to a new form of despotism represented by communist Russia, which could be considered as a new version of industrial-bureaucratic despotism. Wittfogel's controversial and stimulating work was clearly influenced by the ideological and political tensions of its time, but it also shows a remarkable methodological and theoretical insight. Accordingly, it proves the long life of an ancient concept and cultural attitude which has for many centuries shaped the European perception of the clash of Eastern and Western civilizations.

Mission Civilisatrice

The *mission civilisatrice* (the French for "civilizing mission") is a rationale for intervention or colonization, proposing to contribute to the spread of civilization, mostly in reference to the Westernization of indigenous peoples.

It was notably the underlying principle of French and Portuguese colonial rule in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. It was influential in the French colonies of Algeria, French West Africa, and Indochina, and in the Portuguese colonies of Angola, Guinea, Mozambique and Timor. The European colonial powers felt it was their duty to bring Western civilization to what they perceived as backward peoples. Rather than merely govern colonial peoples, the Europeans would attempt to westernize them in accordance with a colonial ideology known as "assimilation".

Intellectual origins

The intellectual origins of the *mission civilisatrice* can be traced back the Christian tradition dating from the middle Ages. European thinkers had naturalized social change by using the development metaphor. In the eighteenth century history became to be seen as a unilinear unending inevitable process of social evolutionism with the European nations running ahead. Racists saw the "backward" nations as intrinsically incapable but the more "progressive" thinkers like the Marquis de Condorcet postulated a holy duty to help those

peoples "which, to civilize themselves, wait only to receive the means from us, to find brothers among Europeans and to become their friends and disciples".

Evolutionist views survived colonialism. Modernization theorists declared that traditional customs had to be destroyed; traditional societies had to adapt or to disappear.

Development criticism sees development therefore as continuation of the colonial civilizing mission. To become civilized has always meant to become 'like us', therefore "Civilizing" now meant that in the long run all societies had to become consumer societies and renounce their native traditions and habits.

French colonial era

The civilizing mission was initially championed by French Republican political leader Jules Ferry. Equal rights and citizenship were extended to those peoples who adopted French culture, including primary use of the French language in their lives, wearing Western clothes, and conversion to Christianity. Despite granting French citizenship to the residents of the "Four Communes" (Dakar, Saint-Louis, Gorée, and Rufisque), most West Africans did not adopt French culture or Christianity. After World War I, "association" replaced assimilation as the fundamental tenet of the colonial relationships. It was thought that French culture might exist in association with indigenous societies and that these autonomous colonies might freely associate with France in the French Union.

Britain and Civilising Mission

The rise of the British empire in the late eighteenth and early 19th centuries resulted in new challenges to a people who had only recently attempted to grapple with their new identity as a “British nation”, instead of separate communities with English, Scottish and Welsh origins. Britain’s colonialism, as argued by Linda Colley, evoked a sense of “British patriotism” through the domination over, and in distinction from, the millions of colonial subjects beyond their own boundaries”. Accordingly, a sense of “Britishness” went along hand in hand with the empire that was in the making. This evoked a “civilising” belief that England should assist in advancing “backward peoples” towards greater refinement, just as the early Romans were believed to have brought civility to England. The mission originated with the conquest of Ireland, and the desire to become the “new Romans” of Europe, which justified the Irish conquest and the subjugation of foreign peoples from America to India.

In exploring the motivations behind British colonialism in India, an underlying trend can seen in the “civilising mission” that sought to establish British institutions and ideas in place of the local political culture, through the ideological hegemony inherent in such a mission. Consequently, in examining the British colonial legacy and “civilising mission” in India, this paper proposes that although colonialism significantly transformed the political culture in India, it did not establish ideological hegemony in the country.

In order to examine the extent of political change initiated in India, it is first important to understand the reasons behind the British "civilising mission" in India. As Metcalf explains, the initial British attempts to change India's political culture stemmed from a belief that it was in a state of **"Oriental despotism**", with the legitimate royal power similar to that of a "master over a slave". Although the ideas of "despotism" were later replaced by notions that India had been possession of laws since antiquity, the British still sought measures to successfully govern India, through imposing changes in its political culture, a desire which could be traced to the fundamental belief that it was bringing improvement to the people in India. According to the liberal John Stuart Mill, this was because British dominion of India could rapidly carry its people through "several stages of progress", and "clear away obstacles to improvement". Consequently, the liberal transformation of India meant the assimilation of central British institutions onto Indian soil. Among the most important of these, were private property, the rule of law, education in Western knowledge and the liberty of the individual.

The concept of private property was introduced by the British in 1793, which differed significantly from pre-colonial days, during which land was held communally and a percentage of the produce remitted to the state. By introducing private property to India, British liberals hoped to eliminate the "parasitic" intermediaries of communal property, vesting all property rights in the actual cultivators of the soil. Moreover, as expressed by Eric Stokes, the introduction of private property was fundamental in that property rights in land were now secured and maintained by a Western law system, thereby altering the traditional modes of land tenure, which were the "heart of Indian society".Accompanying these policy shifts were the socioeconomic changes that resulted, as can be seen in the modifications within the class structure, which transformed former revenue-collecting officials such as the zamindars and thetaluqdars into a landowning gentry. More importantly, the property laws also profoundly affected India's power distribution, as whoever controlled the land could now control those who had no land. Consequently, the British could now rely on the new landed class to perform domestic administrative duties such as the collection of revenue.

The rule of law was another important effect of British colonialism. Led by officials such as Warren Hastings and William Jones, efforts were made to put into place a legal system that would effectively govern India through the utilisation of the ancient Sanskrit texts as the basis of Hindu Civil Law. Fuelled by a belief in India's ancient laws rather than in its "despotic" nature, these officials sought to govern India through its own laws, which were translated into English from their original form. However, as Cohn argues, the 1864 judicial system reforms resulted in a transformation of Hindu law into a form of English case law, which was because of the establishment of authoritative decisions in English. These changes instituted the authority of precedence in making law, based on the Anglo-Saxon legal system. Consequently, the intentions of Hastings and Jones to govern India by

its own laws had been supplanted by the ruling of India with English law as the law of the land. In a sense, this codification of "procedural" rather than "substantive" law enabled the British to incorporate the "spirit" of its "civilising mission". This was achieved by preserving the Indian difference expressed in the substantive codes, while at the same time assimilating utilitarian desires for precision and simplicity in law, as seen in the liberal insistence on procedural codes.

Another British institution that of Western-style education, was deemed crucial towards the British desire to reshape India in its image.This was because English-based education served to intermingle the codes of power and culture, in that it both brought prestige and status to those who had "even a slight command of the language", as well as imparted the culture of the coloniser onto that of the colonised. As coherently explained by Guha, Western-style education served to teach the colonised an interpretation of the past in terms of the colonisers' interests. This was especially since the control of knowledge served as a way to retain power in the hands of those who possessed such knowledge, establishing a relationship of authority between educators and educated. As a result, the education process sought to achieve, as articulated by Thomas Macaulay, the growth of a class that was "Indian in blood and colour, but English in tastes, in opinions, in morals and intellect". This would then enable the efficient administration of India by local educated elite, loyal to the dictates of the British Crown.

In instituting the key changes of property reforms, the rule of law and providing Indians with a Western-style of education, the British "civilising" mission hoped to impart its fourth political legacy of ensuring the liberty of the individual. This could be achieved by ensuring property rights for the individual, enacting laws to provide for the protection of the individual and making available Western-style education as a means to "improve" the quality of life of the individual. Although it can also be argued that these changes to India were effected for the British interests of efficient administration and governance, the impact of these reforms were nonetheless important towards ensuring the liberty of the individual.

In addition to the effects of British institutions on Indian political culture, colonial rule also introduced governance structures to effectively administer to the needs of the Indian economy. These resulted in the introduction of concepts of government and foreign exchange that significantly transformed India's political culture. Of these, the most important avenues of change can be seen in the rise of the modern economy and the bureaucracy.

The roots of the modern Indian economy can be traced to changes that occurred as a result of the British introduction of private property, the rule of law, modern education and a laissez-faire economy. These changes included the free circulation of capital, productive enterprise and a system of large-scale production. In addition, British infrastructure development in the 1850s stimulated the growth of local industrial development, which laid the "foundation" for capitalist enterprise in India. Related to the development of the economy was the ascension of an Indian business class, which evolved into a powerful bourgeois class by the post-colonial era. This new class was therefore crucial in India's formative independent years, as it attempted to define a new society free from direct British influence.

The modern Indian bureaucracy, like the modern economy, developed as a result of the introduction of private property, the rule of law and modern education, as these three changes facilitated the efficient government and administration of India by the British rulers. Consequently, in the attempt to manage India, British colonialism set in place a system of government radically different from the pre-colonial Mughal era, exercising direct control over certain parts of India, while at the same time being bound in a series of sanads or agreements with more than five hundred princely states. This dual system of government, while serving to marginal the princes from political power, also created an intricate system of government that the British used in controlling India. In this manner, the princely states served as "royal instruments without political power", with the ability to defend India militarily and at the same time checking against other states and against threats from below.

Consider the ideological effect of Britain's "civilising mission". On the surface, it can be argued that because the British were able to change India's political culture significantly, this served as the premise that ideological supremacy had been established. However, a closer examination of the "civilising mission" and its impact reveals that ideological hegemony was not established by the British. On the contrary, the British influence in India had instead conformed to the very political culture it had sought to control.

Hegemony, as defined by Gramsci, refers to the "predominance" obtained by consent rather than force through the "diffusion" and "popularisation" of its world view. Consequently, Gramscian hegemony involves the expansion of a ruling class ideology so that it is propagated throughout society. Applying this concept to India, British colonialism would be able to gain ideological hegemony only if it was able to expand its own ideas and propagate it throughout Indian society, replacing local beliefs with British concepts. However, this proposition did not apply to the "civilising mission" in India in all four aspects of its liberal legacy.

In considering the British efforts towards reforming property laws, it can be argued that by ordering the distribution of land in a manner similar to that in Britain, colonialism had perpetuated its ideological dominance on India, especially since concepts of private property remain in post-colonial India. However, contrary arguments, such as that of the "village community", have been proposed to refute such claims. This theory, as articulated by Charles Metcalfe, suggest that Indian villages exist like "little republics" which are self-sufficient and remain inert to warfare or devastation. While such ideal "village communities" are unlikely to have existed in the exact manner described by Metcalfe, the idea is credible in establishing that communalism was and is present in India. Hence, private property per se might have been a British institution established towards the achievement of control in India, but it did not disrupt the strong local networks inherent in the socioeconomic relationships of the Indian people.

The judicial system reforms, while establishing the primacy of British-style legislation and the rule of precedence-based case law in India, established merely a procedural hegemony on Indian legislation, separate from local substantive codification. Moreover, the British separation of "Hindu" and "Muslim" law, although initially instituted as a product of administrative convenience, recognised inherent differences within the Indian population. As there were no notions of distinct "Hindu" or "Muslim" communities in the pre-colonial era, British categorisation of such distinctions in law resulted in policy changes which ironically accentuated the differences of the two "communities", especially due to the British perception that Hindus were "passive" and "indolent" as compared to the general suspicions imposed on Muslims, who were believed to be "violent" and "despotic". This set the stage for factional rivalry that culminated in the post-colonial separation of the territory into India, Pakistan and Bangladesh. While it cannot be argued that the British were directly responsible for the Hindu-Muslim factionalism and conflict, they can be held responsible at least in the sense that they formalised such differences through the legal changes, allowing a heightened sense of identity within each community. On a similar note, the inter-caste rivalry in Indian culture was amplified through the categorisation of society under the judicial system reforms. While this promoted the legal rights of the various castes, it also raised new questions on the existing caste system, as can be seen by the debate on introducing a separate political identity for the "untouchables". Consequently, the ideological hegemony embodied by an orderly Indian society through the rule of British-style law failed to become reality as it instead accentuated divisions within Indian society, impervious to preconceived British notions of law and order.

On the surface, British educational reforms seemed to create an ideological hegemony through its creation of educated Indian elite who had appeared receptive to ideas of British control through performing local administrative functions. This was because an education

in English was believed to "deposit" Western values into the "soul of the educated", and at the same time detach from Western-educated individuals discourses of traditional scholarship, thereby alienating them from their traditional way of life. However, as Guha articulates, Western-style education and the instruction of English in India were confined to "word-book knowledge", which, while sufficient for the daily administrative functions of government, could not assimilate the values and ideas of British liberalism well enough to justify the notions of British ideological hegemony.

Concurrently, when the local educated elite were able to seriously study Western scholarship of liberty, democracy and nationalism, it provided an additional difficulty for the British. This was because such educated individuals not only sought to occupy the administrative posts once exclusively reserved for Europeans, but also began to provide a direct opposition to British rule by their propagation of "hostility to the established order". In addition, because the British was compelled to provide Indian education of a non-religious nature, unlike the situation in Victorian England, this reflected a compromise in the British "civilising mission", therefore reaffirming the lack of British total ideological control over Indian education.

British ideology has failed in its "civilising mission" of obtaining hegemonic control through its characteristic institutions, as can be seen in the areas of private property, the rule of law and Western-style education. Similarly, this concept also holds true to the British liberal ideas of individual liberty. To the extent that these three institutions were created to ensure the liberties and rights of the Indian individual, the lack of ideological control over these three institutions also reflects the inability of British ideology to dominate the fourth aspect of India's political culture, as expressed in the liberty of the individual. Consequently, it can be argued that the project of transforming India into an ideological image of Britain has also not been achieved in advancing the rights of the Indian individual.

Unlike the distinct manner in which ideological hegemony can be studied in the attempts to impose British institutions on India, an examination on how ideology affects other key political concepts is more difficult. This is because there is no distinct "civilising mission" in the British attempts to create the governance structures of the modern economy and bureaucracy. Hegemony, in these instances, can be seen in the indirect manner by which the British attempted to create governance structures so as to enable the efficient colonial rule of India.

In considering British control over the modern Indian economy, this can be perceived as an ideological project with the intention of establishing a local Indian economy capable of

supplementing the British economy through trade and other economic enterprises. To this extent, there is a considerable hegemony over the nature of the Indian economy, as can be argued because the roots of the local enterprise were embedded in colonial policies. In addition, the colonial government utilised a system of "bits and pieces" to develop Indian industry, as can be seen by railway developments as used to transport agriculture, commerce and troop movement rather than to promote local industry. Moreover, most of the complex machinery was manufactured in England, including the heavy machinery of India's highly developed cotton textile industry. These developments, as well as the consolidation of expertise in British hands through establishing key management positions, and the British ownership of most of India's foreign trade, left no questions as to the centrality of the British role in shaping the Indian economy.

However, it must be noted that while the British government believed that profits were important, it also believed in the vitality of not arousing local sentiments against British practises. Consequently, a laissez-faire ideology was adhered to in British economic policy. This resulted in Indian traders having a certain degree of leeway in their trade practises. Consequently, the "predominance" of the British ideological project can no longer be strictly adhered to, as Indian influences were also important in shaping the direction of its industry. This is especially since the development of the bourgeois class remained "embryonic" until the post-colonial land reforms of the 1950s.

British notions of Indian bureaucratic control were inherent in the idea that through its institutions, there could be the creation of a local educated elite capable of maintaining the day to day functions of Indian administration, and at the same time preserving the supervisory role of the British government. In addition, the princely system of governance allowed the British to establish at worst a tolerant body of rulers who did not object violently to colonial rule by force of arms. In this sense, ideological control over the bureaucracy can be argued to have created a system of governance which allowed the British to rule over India in a consensual contract of ruler and ruled. However, as argued by Anthony Appiah, British indirect rule and the use of "native administrations" resulted in the preservation of local elitism throughout the colonial era. This resulted in the promotion of local traditions and "customary law[s]", which were a legacy of the pre-colonial state and innately distinct from British colonial practises. Consequently, the prevailing practise of pre-colonial culture implied that the British, while retaining control of the macro situation in India, did not and could not influence the micro situation in the country, an idea inherent in the very nature of British colonial rule itself. In this sense, there was therefore no ideological hegemony implicit in the indirect manner of control established by the British.

As can be seen, the British imperial experience in India transformed significantly the country's political culture, and shaped its transition from the fragmented remains of an empire to a modern parliamentary democracy. In playing an integral role towards such a political transformation of the country, British colonialism left behind a legacy of institutions and governing structures that profoundly modified the Indian political landscape, considerably altering it towards a new stage of its political life. However, this political legacy, despite the motivations of the British "civilising mission", failed to establish ideological hegemony over the Indian political culture. This was because the British colonial practises, being themselves symbiotic in nature, attempted to impose an indirect rule on India through the maintenance of local administrative elite. It was this failure to completely abolish elements of the pre-colonial culture, assimilating it completely to the British image that identified the failure of British ideological hegemony. Consequently, the failure of colonial rule to expand its own ideas and propagate them throughout colonised society marked its hegemonic failure in that local beliefs ultimately prevailed over those imposed by British colonialism, shaping to a substantial extent, the post-colonial political culture of Indian society.

White man's burden

A phrase used to justify European imperialism in the nineteenth and early 20th centuries; it is the title of a poem by Rudyard Kipling. The phrase implies that imperialism was motivated by a high-minded desire of whites to uplift people of colour."The White Man's Burden" is a poem by the English poet Rudyard Kipling.

It was originally published in the popular magazine McClure's in 1899, with the subtitle The United States and the Philippine Islands. The poem was originally written for Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee, but exchanged for "Recessional"; Kipling changed the text of "Burden" to reflect the subject of American colonization of the Philippines, recently won from Spain in the Spanish–American War. The poem consists of seven stanzas, following a regular rhyme scheme. At face value it appears to be a rhetorical command to white men to colonize and rule other nations for the benefit of those people (both the people and the duty may be seen as representing the "burden" of the title).

Although Kipling's poem mixed exhortation to empire with sombre warnings of the costs involved, imperialists within the United States of America understood the phrase "white man's burden" as justifying imperialism as a noble enterprise. Because of its theme and title, it has become emblematic both of Eurocentric racism and of Western aspirations to dominate the developing world. A century after its publication, the poem still rouses strong emotions, and can be analyzed from a variety of perspectives.

It was the claim of Kipling and other European imperialists that whites had a duty to uplift and civilize the rest of the world. It's racist in several ways. It assumes that white

Europeans are inherently superior to everyone else. It assumes that every other group on the planet had no civilization and was savage.

Manifest Destiny

Manifest Destiny is the thinking that the United States was created to push westward and to gain all the territories in North America. Many Americans believed that it was God's will to have the United States expand westward. Manifest Destiny was encouraged by newspapers and many magazine articles. Many Americans supported the annexation of Texas. The annexation of Texas opened up much more territory for Americans to migrate to. It can be said that the United States did not come up with the philosophy of manifest destiny. The concept of manifest destiny was enforced by both England and France. England and France expanded into territory to gain more social and political power. The United States was not the first to use manifest destiny as an excuse to expand. The concept of countries believing that they had a specific purpose was not new in the world. Many other countries had their own versions of "manifest destiny."

Orientalism

Orientalism is a term that is used by art historians, literary and cultural studies scholars for the imitation or depiction of aspects in Middle Eastern, South Asian, and East Asian cultures (Eastern cultures). These depictions are usually done by writers, designers and artists from the West. In particular, Orientalist painting, depicting more specifically "the Middle East", was one of the many specialism of 19th-century Academic art, and the literature of Western countries took a similar interest in Oriental themes.

Since the publication of Edward Said's Orientalism in 1978, much academic discourse has begun to use the term "Orientalism" to refer to a general patronizing Western attitude towards Middle Eastern, Asian and North African societies. In Said's analysis, the West essentializes these societies as static and undeveloped—thereby fabricating a view of Oriental culture that can be studied, depicted, and reproduced. Implicit in this fabrication, writes Said, is the idea that Western society is developed, rational, flexible, and superior.

Characteristics of Orientalism

Orientalism is a term used to define the representation of the eastern cultures and practices by the Western discourse. Broadly defined; Orientalism is the representation of the Eastern world by the Western world usually in disparaging tones. These representations or depictions are present in the form of writings, figurative arts and designs.

One of the prominent scholars and the author of the popular book "Orientalism", Edward Said, have put forth certain views on the subject. He refers to the myths and the ideas that were shaped in the post colonial era by the Western discourse and the orientalists. Placing a

special emphasis on the depiction of the Orient put forth by the Franco-British empires of the 18th and 19th centuries, Said puts forth this concept in lucid terms when he says that, "The concept of the Orient is in essence a construct of these academic and literary discourses".

Thus one of the most prominent characteristics of Orientalism is the prejudiced interpretations by scholars. In addition to this there are three characteristics which Said has used to define the assumptions that shape the concept of Orientalism.

Distinguishing Occidental and Oriental Cultures

This is linked to the first characteristic of Orientalism wherein the term occident is used to define the Western culture. Said argues that there existed a negative inversion between the two concepts where the "Orient" is characterized as opposite of the "good western culture". Thus, there is a formation of a myth wherein the prototypical "Orient" is viewed as eccentric, backward, sensual, and passive. Its progress in comparison with the Occidental culture was always inferior and conquerable.

Power Relations

Said defined the power relations between the two cultures as "the relation of the West and the Orient was a relationship of power and of complicated dominance". According to him this relationship of power existed as political, intellectual, cultural and moral power. This power relation is said to be the fuelling force behind the myths and suppositions surrounding the "Oriental" culture. Thus, the discourse was created and employed by the Western colonial power to dominate, restructure and control the Orient.

Criticisms of Orientalism

Critics of the concept of Orientalism have pointed out that most of Said's work contains many factual and conceptual errors. The most common critique against the concept is that the study of the Middle Eastern cultures by the English and the French existed much before any colonial regime was in place. His assumptions regarding Foucault's work was also criticized as the philosopher had never included capitalist and pre-capitalist authors in the same group. However, Said contradicted this by saying that "he used Foucault's method as far as he deemed necessary to defend and organize his cultural assumptions".

While some may call it as excessively westernized or relates it with a possible increase in the fundamentalist interpretation of Islam, the importance of notion and the characteristics Orientalism in this era of globalization, and corporate profit-mongering in developing countries cannot be ignored. In fact, this colonial concept still holds true and can be a valuable way of measuring the relations between the Eastern and the Western cultures in this century.

Utilitarianism

Utilitarianism is a theory in normative ethics holding that the best moral action is the one that maximizes utility. Utility is defined in various ways, but is usually related to the well-being of sentient entities. Classically, Jeremy Bentham defined utility as the aggregate pleasure after deducting suffering of all involved in any action. John Stuart Mill expanded this concept of utility to include not only the quantity, but quality of pleasure. Others have rejected that pleasure has positive value and have advocated negative utilitarianism, which defines utility only in terms of suffering. In contrast to this hedonistic view, some define utility with relation to preference satisfaction whereas others believe that a range of values can be included in its definition.

Utilitarianism is a form of consequentialism, which states that the consequences of any action are the only standard of right and wrong. This view can be contrasted or combined with virtue ethics which holds virtue as a moral good. Some believe that one's intentions are also ethically important. Utilitarianism is distinctly different from other forms of consequentialism such as egoism as it considers all interests equally. Proponents of utilitarianism have been split about whether individual acts should conform to utility (act utilitarianism) or whether agents should conform to ethical rules (rule utilitarianism). Utilitarians additionally remain split about whether utility should be calculated as an aggregate (total utilitarianism) or an average (average utilitarianism).

Historically, hedonism can be traced back to Aristippus and Epicurus who viewed happiness as the only good. Bentham is, however, credited with founding utilitarianism when he wrote An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation. Since Bentham, prominent utilitarians have included John Stuart Mill, Henry Sidgwick, R.M. Hare and Peter Singer. The philosophy has been applied to modern issues including the suffering of non-human animals. Specifically, utilitarianism has been applied to the ethics of raising animals for food and the ethics of wild animal suffering. Effective altruism is a philosophy aimed at improving the world through evidence based means, which has been supported on utilitarian grounds.

Opponents of utilitarianism have criticized it for many reasons. Some have said that utilitarianism ignores justice while others contend that utilitarianism is impractical. Specific criticisms have included the mere addition paradox and the utility monster. Others have said that pleasure is not commensurable across people with varying identities and thus the idea of aggregating utility is impossible.

Jeremy Bentham (1748—1832)

Jeremy Bentham was an English philosopher and political radical. He is primarily known today for his moral philosophy, especially his principle of utilitarianism, which evaluates actions based upon their consequences. The relevant consequences, in particular, are the overall happiness created for everyone affected by the action. Influenced by many

enlightenment thinkers, especially empiricists such as John Locke and David Hume, Bentham developed an ethical theory grounded in a largely empiricist account of human nature. He famously held a hedonistic account of both motivation and value according to which what is fundamentally valuable and what ultimately motivates us is pleasure and pain. Happiness, according to Bentham, is thus a matter of experiencing pleasure and lack of pain.

Although he never practiced law, Bentham did write a great deal of philosophy of law, spending most of his life critiquing the existing law and strongly advocating legal reform. Throughout his work, he critiques various natural accounts of law which claim, for example, that liberty, rights, and so on exist independent of government. In this way, Bentham arguably developed an early form of what is now often called "legal positivism." Beyond such critiques, he ultimately maintained that putting his moral theory into consistent practice would yield results in legal theory by providing justification for social, political, and legal institutions.

Bentham's influence was minor during his life. But his impact was greater in later years as his ideas were carried on by followers such as John Stuart Mill, John Austin, and other consequentialists.

J. S. Mill (1806—1873)

John Stuart Mill profoundly influenced the shape of 19th century British thought and political discourse. His substantial corpus of works includes texts in logic, epistemology, economics, social and political philosophy, ethics, metaphysics, religion, and current affairs. Among his most well-known and significant are *A System of Logic*, *Principles of Political Economy*, *On Liberty*, *Utilitarianism*, *The Subjection of Women*, *Three Essays on Religion*, and his *Autobiography*. Mill's education at the hands of his imposing father, James Mill, fostered both intellectual development (Greek at the age of three, Latin at eight) and a propensity towards reform. James Mill and Jeremy Bentham led the "Philosophic Radicals," who advocated for rationalization of the law and legal institutions, universal male suffrage, the use of economic theory in political decision-making, and a politics oriented by human happiness rather than natural rights or conservatism. In his twenties, the younger Mill felt the influence of historicism, French social thought, and Romanticism, in the form of thinkers like Coleridge, the St. Simonians, Thomas Carlyle, Goethe, and Wordsworth. This led him to begin searching for a new philosophic radicalism that would be more sensitive to the limits on reform imposed by culture and history and would emphasize the cultivation of our humanity, including the cultivation of dispositions of feeling and imagination (something he thought had been lacking in his own education).

None of Mill's major writings remain independent of his moral, political, and social agenda. Even the most abstract works, such as the *System of Logic* and his *Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy*, serve polemical purposes in the fight against the German, or *a priori*, school otherwise called "intuitionism." On Mill's view, intuitionism needed to be defeated in the realms of logic, mathematics, and philosophy of mind if its pernicious effects in social and political discourse were to be mitigated.

In his writings, Mill argues for a number of controversial principles. He defends radical empiricism in logic and mathematics, suggesting that basic principles of logic and mathematics are generalizations from experience rather than known *a priori*. The principle of utility—that "actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness; wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness"—was the centrepiece of his ethical philosophy. *On Liberty* puts forward the "harm principle" that "the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others." In *The Subjection of Women*, he compares the legal status of women to the status of slaves and argues for equality in marriage and under the law.

Evangelicals

Evangelicals take the Bible seriously and believe in Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord.The term "evangelical" comes from the Greek word *euangelion*, meaning "the good news" or the "gospel." Thus, the evangelical faith focuses on the "good news" of salvation brought to sinners by Jesus Christ.

Evangelicals are a vibrant and diverse group, including believers found in many churches, denominations and nations. Our community brings together Reformed, Holiness, Anabaptist, Pentecostal, Charismatic and other traditions.

Our core theological convictions provide unity in the midst of our diversity. The NAE Statement of Faith offers a standard for these evangelical convictions.

Historian David Bebbington also provides a helpful summary of evangelical distinctives, identifying four primary characteristics of evangelicalism:

- Conversionism: the belief that lives need to be transformed through a "born-again" experience and a lifelong process of following Jesus.
- Activism: the expression and demonstration of the gospel in missionary and social reform efforts
- Biblicism: a high regard for and obedience to the Bible as the ultimate authority
- Crucicentrism: a stress on the sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the cross as making possible the redemption of humanity

These distinctive and theological convictions define us — not political, social or cultural trends. In fact, many evangelicals rarely use the term “evangelical” to describe themselves, focusing simply on the core convictions of the triune God, the Bible, faith, Jesus, salvation, evangelism and discipleship

Rudyard Kipling (30 December 1865 – 18 January 1936)

Joseph Rudyard Kipling was an English short-story writer, poet, and novelist. He wrote tales and poems of British soldiers in India and stories for children. He was born in Bombay, in the Bombay Presidency of British India, and was taken by his family to England when he was five years old.

Kipling's works of fiction include The Jungle Book (1894), Kim (1901), and many short stories, including "The Man Who Would Be King" (1888). His poems include "Mandalay" (1890), "Gunga Din" (1890), "The Gods of the Copybook Headings" (1919),and "The White Man's Burden" (1899). He is regarded as a major innovator in the art of the short story; his children's books are classics of children's literature; and one critic described his work as exhibiting "a versatile and luminous narrative gift".

Kipling was one of the most popular writers in England, in both prose and verse, in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Henry James said: "Kipling strikes me personally as the most complete man of genius (as distinct from fine intelligence) that I have ever known." In 1907, he was awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature, making him the first English-language writer to receive the prize, and its youngest recipient to date. Among other honours, he was sounded out for the British Poet Laureateship and on several occasions for a knighthood, all of which he declined.

Kipling's subsequent reputation has changed according to the political and social climate of the age and the resulting contrasting views about him continued for much of the 20th century. George Orwell called him a "prophet of British imperialism". Literary critic Douglas Kerr wrote: "He [Kipling] is still an author who can inspire passionate disagreement and his place in literary and cultural history is far from settled. But as the age of the European empires recedes, he is recognised as an incomparable, if controversial, interpreter of how empire was experienced that, and an increasing recognition of his extraordinary narrative gifts, make him a force to be reckoned with."

Asiatic Society of Bengal

In 1784 the “Asiatic Society of Bengal” (Calcutta) was founded by Sir William Jones under the patronage of Warren Hastings. The Society was formed with thirty Europeans assembled on the invitation of Sir William Jones. In his inaugural speech he told the aims of the Society in the following words, *“The bounds of its (Society’s) investigation will be the geographical limits of Asia, and within these limits its enquiries will be extended to whatever is performed by man or produced by nature.”* All the thirty European men

accepted the membership of the new Society. This included Sir Robert Chambers (1737-1803), Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and Sir John Shore (1771-1834) a high official of the government, H.H. Wilson, J.D. Peterson, H.T. Colebrook, and F. Wilford, etc.

Inspired by the establishment and success of the Asiatic Society in Calcutta, Societie Asiatique was formed in Paris in 1822. A year later in 1823, Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland was formed in London. In 1842 the American Oriental Society was founded in the USA. In 1844 the German Oriental Society was formed. Branches of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland were also formed in Bombay, Ceylon, China and Malaysia.

Jones was made the President of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (Calcutta). He held the post until he died. The Society's general meeting was held every year in the month of February. Jones used to deliver a speech on some topic. From 1784 -1793 he gave ten lectures.

One of the main activities of the Asiatic Society was to collect the old manuscripts of India. There was an enormous collection of Sanskrit manuscripts with the Society. By 1849 the Society had its own museum consisting of inscriptions in stone and metal, icons, old coins and manuscripts etc. The Society's new building was inaugurated by S. Radhakrishnan, the President of India on February 2, 1965.

In 55 years a total of 20 volumes were published that contained the essays of its writers. Apart from that, since 1832 'Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal' was published every year, and the Society has also published well-edited old texts of Sanskrit and Bengali etc. The Society's Library today contains more than 200,000 volumes related to Indology.

Behind all those amazingly voluminous activities of the Asiatic Society there was a hidden aim of the English people which was expressed by Jones himself in the writings of his first essay of 1784. Accordingly, in that essay he condemned the Divinity of all the forms of Hindu God and tried to his fullest to destroy their religious image. In his presidential speech of 1786 he tried to destroy the ancient supremacy of the Sanskrit language, and in his tenth speech of 1793 he tried to destroy the authenticity of the ancient history of the Puranas. Thus, trying to paralyze the total structure of the Hindu religion, he established certain fallacies which were made the guidelines for the activities of the Asiatic Society, its members and its associates. They wrote and worked in that specified direction while keeping an outside image that they were doing some kind of geographical and religious research.

William Jones (1746–1794)

Sir William Jones was an English philologist, Orientalist, and jurist. While serving as a judge of the high court at Calcutta, he became a student of ancient India and founded the Asiatic Society of Bengal. He is best known for his famous proposition that many

languages sprang from a common source. His scholarship helped to generate widespread interest in Eastern history, language and culture, and it led to new directions in linguistic research.

MODULE III

AGE OF INDUSTRIALISM

The Agrarian Revolution

The Agricultural Revolution occurred between the 18th and 19th centuries in the United Kingdom. It was a period marked by rapid advancements in agricultural productivity and developments in farming technology—the most influential of these changes involved the mechanization of farm work, the introduction of four-year crop rotation farming, selective breeding of livestock, and the enclosure of land. These developments in the agricultural industry also corresponded with and were important to the rise of the Industrial Revolution.

For the first time enough food was available to people living in the cities. More food also led to a decline food prices providing people with more income to buy other consumer goods. Abundance in food meant a healthier population. Death rates began to fall especially among infants. In the U.K. the population exploded from 5 to 10 million by the end of the 18th century. Many peasants, turned off the land through enclosure, supplied a ready workforce for employment in the cities factories. In the U.K. as well, the implementation of better agricultural practices and techniques led to a greater surplus of wool at a lower cost for the textile industry.

Enclosure

Agricultural practices and developments virtually stayed the same from the 8th century to the 18th century. During the Middle Ages land was granted to peasants by a landowner. The landowner would provide the land for each peasant to grow the food they needed for subsistence and in exchange, peasants would pledge allegiance to the landowner. Each peasant was usually assigned up to 30 strips of land—around 12 hectares—divided between three large open fields. A three-year strip crop rotation was used to cultivate crops such as wheat and barley into two of three fields with the third field being left fallow. This type of shared **"open-field" system** not only produced wasted, unused land every four years but resulted in the spread of animal disease and uncontrolled breeding.

Land reform in the United Kingdom of common village fields into enclosed individual land holdings was the direct result of improved farming techniques from 1700 to 1845 in. Land started being enclosed as early as the 15th century. Nobleman, short of money, also began selling their land. Under the reign of Henry VIII, land belonging to monasteries, were seized and sold. Growth in England's wool trade required the enclosure of land to graze sheep. The Church attempted to denounce the practice of enclosure by the 16th and 17th centuries and even drew up legislation against it. However such action was thwarted by the mechanization of farm work that demanded larger areas of land be cultivated.

Enclosure literally meant that fields were enclosed by a fence. Most fields were enclosed by way of agreement but eventually parliamentary reform led to the reorganization of land through enclosure. The advantage of enclosed land was the ability of landowners to have complete control to farm entire enclosed fields. This led to the growth of larger farms and increased agricultural productivity. One of the criticisms of enclosure was that many peasants were turned off the land and left homeless with no income. Some were forced to beg and others fled to the cities to find work. In 1801 the government introduced a series of acts called the General Enclosure Act which sanctioned large scale land reform. By the end of the 18th century the process of enclosure in England was largely complete—about 600,000 acres of land in the UK had been enclosed.

Four-Crop Rotation Method

Another significant development was the switch from a three-year crop rotation cycle to the four-field or four-crop rotation system. The person credited for developing this new method of crop rotation was **Viscount Townshend** of Raynham on his Norfolk farm. Viscount Townshend, a politician, retired in 1730 to work the land on his estate.

Townshend came up with the ingenious idea of planting crops on four different fields on his estate and then rotating the crops in each field each year. In the first field, he grew wheat, clover or rye grass in the second, oats or barley in the third, and turnips and Swedes in the fourth. Such a system had already been devised and used by farmers in Holland. The cultivation of clover and grass was used for livestock grazing. Livestock could now be fed turnips through the wintertime. Townshend proved that under his system, more crops could be grown enabling a better yield from the land.

Another benefit of the four-field system was it provided an opportunity for the land to be rested. This improved the nutrient content of the soil allowing different crops to be planted in different fields throughout the year rather than leaving land unused and fallow. The growth of turnips and other root vegetable as wintertime feed also led to an increase in the livestock population on farms. More animals naturally created more manure that could be used to fertilize the soil and improve its nutrient content. By the early 19th century many farmers had fully adopted the four-field crop rotation system.

During the 17th to 18th centuries, new crops from Europe such as clover, alfalfa, small grains, and fruits and vegetables were also introduced to the U.S.

Mechanization

New types of farming equipment were introduced in both the United Kingdom and in the United States during the Agricultural Revolution and continued to evolve throughout. The first two key inventions that aided farmers were a seed drill and a threshing machine.

Seed drill – one of the earliest developments in agricultural technology was the invention of the seed drill by Jethro Tull in 1701. His mechanical seed drill enabled seeds to be evenly distributed more efficiently over a field. It involved a horse-drawn wheeled device that consisted of rotating drills and runners that would plant seeds at a depth. There was a wheel driven ratchet that sprayed the seed out over the ground. Before Tull's seed drill, most planting was done by hand by carrying seeds in bags and broadcasting the seed onto onto ploughed and harrowed ground. Tull's drill was not very quickly adopted in England. Many were resistant to his ideas. In 1714 he perfected both his system and machinery. He learned that by pulverizing the soil between each strip and row, essentially believing this released nutrients in the soil serving as a replacement for manure. His methods proved successful for he was able to plant wheat in the same field for 13 successive years. His seed drill was later improved with the addition of gears to the distribution mechanism—the rotary mechanism of the drill provided the foundation for all future sowing technology. He also invented a horse-drawn hoe that included a plough with blades set in such a manner that grass and roots were pulled up out of the earth and left to dry on the surface. In 1731 Tull published a book, 'The New Horse Hoeing Husbandry' detailing his agricultural methods and equipment.

Reaper - the reaper was developed as a tool for cutting grain. The scythe was the earliest incarnation of a reaper introduced in Europe by the Romans. Many Europeans however used a sickle for the same task until limited labour forced people to use the scythe which was in comparison, more efficient. Eventually labour shortages in both the U.S. and Europe led farmers to develop less time-consuming methods for harvesting crops with new tools. The first successful reaper was invented by a man named Rev. Patrick Bell during the early 1800s. His horse-drawn reaper, designed with shears that cut the wheat in front, was able to cut ten acres of wheat per day. The most widely used early reaper was invented by Cyrus H. McCormick. It was widely accepted in both the US and England though the rest of Europe was slower to adopt. In 1877, McCormick started mass-producing reapers that could reap and bound sheaves.

Plough – was developed as a farm tool with one or more have blades that was used to break up the soil and cut a small ditch called a furrow for sowing seeds. The self-polishing cast steel plough was invented by John Deere. It marked a substantial improvement over the iron plough.

Moldboard – was a wedge formed by the curved part of a steel plough that turns the furrow.

Selective Breeding

From 1700 to 1770 farmers started experimenting with selective breeding as a result better quality and higher yield harvests. Most cattle or sheep that were once slaughtered before wintertime were feed turnip fodder through the wintertime. The number of animals on farms began to increase providing an opportunity to experiment with selective breeding.

Livestock experts such as Robert Bake well and Thomas Coke were the first to introduce selective breeding programs to improve the quality of their livestock. Bake well was the most prolific in selective breeding techniques. He crossed different breeds of sheep based on their best characteristics. Called "breeding in and in," his selective breeding experiments led to new breeds of sheep. He was also the first farmer to breed both sheep and cattle for their meat value. Bake well even kept very elaborate genealogical records of his most prized animals. Near the end of the 18th century selective breeding practices had evolved increasing the market value of livestock. Bake well's principles in particular for stock breeding were widely followed.

(See also the following points):

Agrarian Revolution refers to the time when sudden and radical change in agricultural practices took place.

Agrarian revolution involved changes in:-

1. Use of machines

2. Enlargement of farms

3. Scientific methods of farming

4. Scientific methods of processing foods including preservation and refrigeration

Agrarian revolution in Britain

Agrarian Revolution began in Britain then spread to the rest of the world. Before the revolution, agriculture was practiced on small scale using simple tools like sticks, wooden shoes and wooden ploughs. They mainly practiced mono cropping, i.e. they grew only one type of crop in the same place every year.

Factors that influenced Agrarian evolution in Britain

The agrarian revolution in Britain was caused the following factors.

1. Demand for food by the growing urban population
2. Demand for agricultural raw materials for textile industry

3. The invention of horse drawn seed drill by Jethro Tull

4. Land consolidation and enclosure system

5. Selective bleeding of livestock which led to increased animal products

6. Introduction of new farming tools

7. Use of fertilizers and crop rotation in farming

Land enclosure had various disadvantages:-

1. Landlessness among peasants

2. Rural Urban migration as peasants went to towns in search of alternative livelihood

3. Led to emigrants to other new lands such as USA, Australia and New Zealand

4. Exploitation of poor farmers.

Establishment of the Royal Agricultural Society in 1838 was another factor that led to agrarian revolution in Britain. This society published journals which disseminated new ideas and techniques of farming.

Effects of Agrarian revolution

1. Improved methods of farming that led to increased food production

2. Those who lost land became landless. Landlessness led to unemployment and migration to other parts of the world.

3. Mechanization of farming led to unemployment. As a result, jobless people moved to towns to get jobs

4. Establishment of large scale farming to replace subsistence farming created a class of landless people as some became farm labourers while others moved to towns and mines to look for employment.

5. It led to improvement of transport system for example road and railways

6. It enhanced research and scientific innovations to cater for the increased needs of farmers

7. It promoted industrialization as it provided the required raw materials to the industries. Machines were used to process agricultural produce

8. It led to the rise of a class of rich people who specialized in agriculture

9. It promoted both local and international trade

10. The price of the land in Britain increased considerably

11. It resulted to improved standards of living

INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

The Industrial Revolution was the transition to new manufacturing processes in the period from about 1760 to sometime between 1820 and 1840. This transition included going from hand production methods to machines, new chemical manufacturing and iron production processes, improved efficiency of water power, the increasing use of steam power, and the development of machine tools. It also included the change from wood and other bio-fuels to coal. Textiles were the dominant industry of the Industrial Revolution in terms of employment, value of output and capital invested; the textile industry was also the first to use modern production methods.

The Industrial Revolution marks a major turning point in history; almost every aspect of daily life was influenced in some way. In particular, average income and population began to exhibit unprecedented sustained growth. Some economists say that the major impact of the Industrial Revolution was that the standard of living for the general population began to increase consistently for the first time in history, although others have said that it did not begin to meaningfully improve until the late 19th and 20th centuries.

The Industrial Revolution began in Great Britain, and spread to Western Europe and North America within a few decades. The precise start and end of the Industrial Revolution is still debated among historians, as is the pace of economic and social changes. GDP per capita was broadly stable before the Industrial Revolution and the emergence of the modern capitalist economy, while the Industrial Revolution began an era of per-capita economic growth in capitalist economies. Economic historians are in agreement that the onset of the Industrial Revolution is the most important event in the history of humanity since the domestication of animals, plants and fire.

The First Industrial Revolution evolved into the Second Industrial Revolution in the transition years between 1840 and 1870, when technological and economic progress continued with the increasing adoption of steam transport (steam-powered railways, boats

and ships), the large-scale manufacture of machine tools and the increasing use of machinery in steam-powered factories

Etymology

The earliest recorded use of the term "Industrial Revolution" seems to have been in a letter of 6 July 1799 written by French envoy Louis-Guillaume Otto, announcing that France had entered the race to industrialise. In his 1976 book Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society, Raymond Williams states in the entry for "Industry": "The idea of a new social order based on major industrial change was clear in Southey and Owen, between 1811 and 1818, and was implicit as early as Blake in the early 1790s and Wordsworth at the turn of the [19th] century." The term Industrial Revolution applied to technological change was becoming more common by the late 1830s, as in Jérôme-Adolphe Blanquidescription in 1837 of la révolution industrielle. Friedrich Engels in The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844 spoke of "an industrial revolution, a revolution which at the same time changed the whole of civil society". However, although Engels wrote in the 1840s, his book was not translated into English until the late 1800s, and his expression did not enter everyday language until then. Credit for popularising the term may be given to Arnold Toynbee, whose 1881 lectures gave a detailed account of the term

Why did the Industrial Revolution occur in Britain?

The Industrial Revolution began in Britain for a number of different reasons which are as follows.

1. Enormous Expansion in Overseas Trade of Britain.

Enormous expansion in Britain's trade in overseas markets was one of the major causes of Technological Revolution. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries Britain had carved out an extensive colonial empire and successfully excluded the other powers like Spain, Holland and France from their markets. As a result, she acquired a sort of monopoly in these markets.

The growing demand for the British goods in these markets gave a stimulus to the British manufacturers to take to machine methods. It is well known that the mechanical inventions of the eighteenth century such as spinning, jenny of Hargreaves, the water-frame of Arkwright, the mule of Crompton and the power-loom of Cartwright etc. were invented to increase the production of cotton cloth which was in great demand in India. According to Bernie, "These inventions are sometimes spoken of as the primary cause of the Industrial Revolution.

In reality, they were a secondary cause only. Machines for turning out cheap goods in large quantities are useless unless there is a market capable of absorbing the increased output. The market must come first; the inventions follow. Mechanical discoveries have often the appearance of being due to accident, but unconsciously the successful inventor works within limits laid down for him by the changing needs of society."

2. Availability of Capital.

The vast amount of capital which England had accumulated out of profits of her growing trade enabled her to make large outlays on machinery and buildings, which in turn contributed to new technological developments.

In addition England also possessed a large amount of loanable capital obtained by the Bank of England from the rich trade of other countries. This capital also helped England to steal a march over other European countries.

3. Practical bent of mind of the English Researchers.

Another factor which contributed to England's lead in the technological revolution was that the English scientists and engineers had a very practical bent of mind. They made inventions keeping in view the needs of the time.

They concentrated mainly on those inventions of science which had practical utility. This was in complete contrast to the continental scientists who concentrated on research in electricity; chemicals etc. which were not of immediate applied relevance.

4. Small population.

The small size of England's population, which could not cope with England's growing trade, also necessitated that new devices should be found out to keep production in line with the growing demand.

This is best exemplified by the changes in the textile industry as well as the coal industry. The shortage of the labour force compelled the owners to encourage and apply new mechanical devices.

5. Social and political stability.

Britain not only enjoyed complete freedom of trade but also an insular position which saved her from the disastrous consequences of war, which ravaged the countries of Europe.

This social stability prevailing in England encouraged the people to invest in sectors where they could hope to receive high dividend in future. This led to adoption of new techniques and promotion of new industries.

6. The availability of coal and iron mines close to each other.

The location of the coal and iron mines close to each other encouraged the English to evolve new techniques for the manufacture of iron and utilization of the coals. It is well known that the availability of coal and iron ores in large quantities greatly helped the growth of numerous industries in England.

The need for large quantities of coal for smelting of iron ores, transportation etc necessitated improvement in the techniques of coal mining. Metal cages and tubs were used to lift coal. Even the use of wire ropes for lifting of coal was started a little later. Engines were invented to pump out the water from the mines.

7. The agricultural revolution.

In Britain the agricultural revolution had already taken place which greatly transformed the English society.

It not only made available necessary raw materials to run the new industries but also provided a large number of agricultural labourers for employment in the new factories.

8. Presence of enterprising people.

Finally, the technological changes in England were made possible because of the presence of a sizable section of people who possessed enterprising spirit and requisite technical qualities.

Further this class of people also possessed organizing abilities and was accustomed to the handling of large enterprises and labour force. These people were willing to invest money for the discovery of new techniques and give a fair trial to these techniques.

9. Risk-taking Private Sector.

The presence of a sizable private sector in the country with great capacity of the individual businessmen to take risks also greatly contributed to the industrial revolution. These businessmen were willing to take a chance on new things. In this way they were also supported by the government.

10. Better means of transport.

England possessed a far better network of means of transportation than any other country of Europe which greatly helped the industrial revolution. In this task the government played an important role which spent considerable amount on the improvement of roads and construction of canals.

11. Geographical location.

The geographical location of England also greatly helped in industrial revolution. Being cut-off from the mainland of Europe, England remained immune from wars and upheavals of Napoleonic conflicts and conditions remained quite stable in the country. These stable conditions enabled England to develop their industrial capacity without fear of battle, damage or loss of life.

12. Flexibility of English social and political system.

Above all the flexibility of the English social and political system also greatly contributed to industrial revolution in England.

The members of the upper classes in Britain, unlike their counterparts in the continent, pursued their wealth in the new industrial framework with great enthusiasm. They worked in close co-operation with the middle classes and artisans which greatly facilitated the industrial revolution.

In short, we can say that in comparison to other European countries England was more favourably placed in many respects and no wonder stole lead over them in the field of technological revolution and industrialization.

Effects of the Industrial Revolution.

Now that we have looked at how and why the Industrial Revolution occurred, it's time to consider its effects on people. We learned that industrial production increased tremendously, bringing wealth and power to Great Britain throughout the 19th century. But we have yet to explore the effects of industrialization on society, on the daily living and the working conditions of common people. What was life like for the average industrial worker? Was living in a new industrial city and working in a factory an improvement over life in the countryside? Did the new factory life change for the better the roles of family members, including women and children? Were people healthier? In general, did the Industrial Revolution improve life for most people?

Since the Industrial Revolution was so new at the end of the 18th century, there were initially no laws to regulate new industries. For example, no laws prevented businesses from hiring seven-year-old children to work full time in coal mines or factories. No laws regulated what factories could do with their biohazard waste. Free-market capitalism meant

that the government had no role in regulating the new industries or planning services for new towns. And those who controlled the government liked it that way—only a small minority of people, the wealthiest, could vote in England at this time. So during the first phase of the Industrial Revolution, between 1790 and 1850, British society became the first example of what happens in a country when free-market capitalism has no constraints. You will learn about the effects of the Industrial Revolution on living and working conditions, urbanization (the growth of cities), child labour, public health, working class family life, the role of women, the emerging middle class, and economic growth and income.

Working conditions

What were the working conditions like during the Industrial Revolution? Well, for starters, the working class—who made up 80% of society—had little or no bargaining power with their new employers. Since population was increasing in Great Britain at the same time that landowners were enclosing common village lands, people from the countryside flocked to the towns and the new factories to get work. This resulted in a very high unemployment rate for workers in the first phases of the Industrial Revolution. Henry Mayhew, name his title or role, studied the London poor in 1823, and he observed that "there is barely sufficient work for the regular employment of half of our labourers, so that only 1,500,000 are fully and constantly employed, while 1,500,000 more are employed only half their time, and the remaining 1,500,000 wholly unemployed". As a result, the new factory owners could set the terms of work because there were far more unskilled labourers, who had few skills and would take any job, than there were jobs for them. And since the textile industries were so new at the end of the 18th century, there were initially no laws to regulate them. Desperate for work, the migrants to the new industrial towns had no bargaining power to demand higher wages, fairer work hours, or better working conditions. Worse still, since only wealthy people in Great Britain were eligible to vote, workers could not use the democratic political system to fight for rights and reforms. In 1799 and 1800, the British Parliament passed the **Combination Acts,** which made it illegal for workers to unionize, or combine, as a group to ask for better working conditions.

Many of the unemployed or underemployed were skilled workers, such as hand weavers, whose talents and experience became useless because they could not compete with the efficiency of the new textile machines. In 1832, one observer saw how the skilled hand weavers had lost their way and were reduced to starvation. "It is truly lamentable to behold so many thousands of men who formerly earned 20 to 30 shillings per week, now compelled to live on 5, 4, or even less".

For the first generation of workers—from the 1790s to the 1840s—working conditions were very tough, and sometimes tragic. Most labourers worked 10 to 14 hours a day, six days a week, with no paid vacation or holidays. Each industry had safety hazards too; the process of purifying iron, for example, demanded that workers toiled amidst temperatures as high as 130 degrees in the coolest part of the ironworks. Under such dangerous conditions, accidents on the job occurred regularly. A report commissioned by the British House of Commons in 1832 commented that "there are factories, no means few in number, nor confined to the smaller mills, in which serious accidents are continually occurring, and in which, notwithstanding, dangerous parts of the machinery are allowed to remain unfenced". The report added that workers were often "abandoned from the moment that an accident occurs; their wages are stopped, no medical attendance is provided, and whatever the extent of the injury, no compensation is afforded". As the Sadler report shows, injured workers would typically lose their jobs and also receive no financial compensation for their injury to pay for much needed health care.

Life in the factory was most challenging for the first generation of industrial workers who still remembered the slower and more flexible pace of country life. Factory employers demanded a complete change of pace and discipline from the village life. Workers could not wander over to chat with their neighbours or family as they would have done while working in the country. They could not return to the village during harvest time to help their families, unless they wanted to lose their jobs. Instead, they were no longer their own bosses; foremen and overseers supervised a new working culture to insure that workers' actions were focused and efficient. A few workers were able to improve their lot by going into business for themselves or winning a job as a supervisor, but the majority saw very little social mobility.

Living conditions

Working in new industrial cities had an effect on people's lives outside of the factories as well. As workers migrated from the country to the city, their lives and the lives of their families were utterly and permanently transformed.

For many skilled workers, the quality of life decreased a great deal in the first 60 years of the Industrial Revolution. Skilled weavers, for example, lived well in pre-industrial society as a kind of middle class. They tended their own gardens, worked on textiles in their homes or small shops, and raised farm animals. They were their own bosses. One contemporary observer noted, "their dwelling and small gardens clean and neat, —all the family well clad, —the men with each a watch in their pocket, and the women dressed in their own fancy, —the Church crowded to excess every Sunday, —every house well furnished with a clock in elegant mahogany or fancy case. . . . Their little cottages seemed

happy and contented. . . . it was seldom that a weaver appealed to the parish for a relief. . . . peace and content sat upon the weaver's brow". But, after the Industrial Revolution, the living conditions for skilled weavers significantly deteriorated. They could no longer live at their own pace or supplement their income with gardening, spinning, or communal harvesting. For skilled workers, quality of life took a sharp downturn.

In the first 60 years or so of the Industrial Revolution, working-class people had little time or opportunity for recreation. Workers spent all the light of day at work and came home with little energy, space, or light to play sports or games. The new industrial pace and factory system were at odds with the old traditional festivals which dotted the village holiday calendar. Plus, local governments actively sought to ban traditional festivals in the cities. In the new working-class neighbourhoods, people did not share the same traditional sense of a village community. Owners fined workers who left their jobs to return to their villages for festivals because they interrupted the efficient flow of work at the factories. After the 1850s, however, recreation improved along with the rise of an emerging the middle class. Music halls sprouted up in big cities. Sports such as rugby and cricket became popular. Football became a professional sport in 1885. By the end of the 19th century, cities had become the places with opportunities for sport and entertainment that they are today.

During the first 60 years of the Industrial Revolution, living conditions were, by far, worst for the poorest of the poor. In desperation, many turned to the **"poorhouses"** set up by the government. The Poor Law of 1834 created workhouses for the destitute. Poorhouses were designed to be deliberately harsh places to discourage people from staying on "relief" (government food aid). Families, including husbands and wives, were separated upon entering the grounds. They were confined each day as inmates in a prison and worked every day. One assistant commissioner of the workhouses commented, "Our intention is to make the workhouses as much like prisons as possible." Another said, "Our object is to establish a discipline as severe and repulsive as to make them a terror to the poor and prevent them from entering". Yet, despite these very harsh conditions, workhouse inmates increased from 78,536 in 1838 to 197,179 in 1843. This increase can only be viewed as a sign of desperation amongst the poorest of the poor.

Urbanization

One of the defining and most lasting features of the Industrial Revolution was the rise of cities. In pre-industrial society, over 80% of people lived in rural areas. As migrants moved from the countryside, small towns became large cities. By 1850, for the first time in world history, more people in a country—Great Britain—lived in cities than in rural areas. As other countries in Europe and North America industrialized, they too continued along this

path of urbanization. By 1920, a majority of Americans lived in cities. In England, this process of urbanization continued unabated throughout the 19th century. The city of London grew from a population of two million in 1840 to five million forty years later.

The small town of **Manchester**, England also grew rapidly and famously to become the quintessential industrial city. Its cool climate was ideal for textile production. And it was located close to the Atlantic port of Liverpool and the coalfields of Lancashire. The first railroads in the world later connected the textile town to Liverpool. As a result, Manchester quickly became the textile capital of the world, drawing huge numbers of migrants to the city. In 1771, the sleepy town had a population of 22,000.Over the next fifty years, Manchester's population exploded and reached 180,000. Many of the migrants were destitute farmers from Ireland who were being evicted from their land by their English landlords. In Liverpool and Manchester roughly 25 to 33% of the workers were Irish.

This process of urbanization stimulated the booming new industries by concentrating workers and factories together. And the new industrial cities became, as we read earlier, sources of wealth for the nation.

Despite the growth in wealth and industry urbanization also had some negative effects. On the whole, working-class neighbourhoods were bleak, crowded, dirty, and polluted. Alexis de Tocqueville, a French traveller and writer, visited Manchester in 1835 and commented on the environmental hazards. "From this foul Drain the greatest stream of human industry flows out to fertilize the whole world; from this filthy sewer pure gold flows. Here humanity attains its most complete development and it's most brutish, here civilization works its miracles and civilized man is turned almost into a savage."

Public Health and Life Expectancy

In the first half of the 19th century, urban overcrowding, poor diets, poor sanitation, and essentially medieval medical remedies all contributed to very poor public health for the majority of English people.

The densely packed and poorly constructed working-class neighbourhoods contributed to the fast spread of disease. As we read in Engels' firsthand account of working-class areas in Manchester, these neighbourhoods were filthy, unplanned, and slipshod. Roads were muddy and lacked sidewalks. Houses were built touching each other, leaving no room for ventilation. Perhaps most importantly, homes lacked toilets and sewage systems, and as a result, drinking water sources, such as wells, were frequently contaminated with disease. Cholera, tuberculosis, typhus, typhoid, and influenza ravaged through new industrial towns, especially in poor working-class neighbourhoods. In 1849, 10,000 people died of

cholera in three months in London alone. Tuberculosis claimed 60,000 to 70,000 lives in each decade of the 19th century.

People who received medical treatment in the first half of the 19th century likely worsened under the care of trained doctors and untrained quacks. Doctors still used remedies popular during the Middle Ages, such as bloodletting and leeching. They concocted toxic potions of mercury, iron, or arsenic. They also encouraged heavy use of vomiting and laxatives, both of which severely dehydrated patients and could contribute to early death, especially among infants and children whose bodies would lose water dangerously fast. Even though there were more doctors in the cities, life expectancy was much lower there than in the country.

Poor nutrition, disease, lack of sanitation, and harmful medical care in these urban areas had a devastating effect on the average life expectancy of British people in the first half of the 19th century. The Registrar General reported in 1841 that the average life expectancy in rural areas of England was 45 years of age but was only 37 in London and an alarming 26 in Liverpool *(*Haley). These are life-long averages that highlight a very high infant mortality rate; in the first half of the 19th century, 25 to 33% of children in England died before their 5th birthday.

Child Labour

Child labour was, unfortunately, integral to the first factories, mines, and mills in England. In textile mills, as new power looms and spinning mules took the place of skilled workers, factory owners used cheap, unskilled labour to decrease the cost of production. And, child labour was the cheapest labour of all. Some of these machines were so easy to operate that a small child could perform the simple, repetitive tasks. Some maintenance tasks, such as squeezing into tight spaces, could be performed more easily by children than adults. And, children did not try to join workers unions or go on strike. Best of all, they were paid 1/10 of what men were paid. It's not surprising, then, that children were heavily employed in the first factories in history. In 1789, in Richard Arkwright's new spinning factory, two-thirds of 1,150 factory workers were children.

The tedious and dangerous factory work had negative effects on the health of children. Doctor Turner Thackeray described the children leaving the Manchester cotton mills as "almost universally ill-looking, small, sickly, barefoot and ill-clad. Many appeared to be no older than seven. The men, generally from sixteen to twenty-four, and none aged, were almost as pallid and thin as the children" Observations such as these slowly made their way to the British government.

In the 1830s, the British Parliament began investigating the conditions in factories for children. One Member of Parliament, Michael Sadler, started a committee, in 1832, to send investigators out to factories to interview children and gather evidence about their working conditions. Sadler sought to pass a bill through Parliament to decrease child labour and regulate all factories to have a 10-hour work day. The transcripts from these investigations survive today as some of the best primary source evidence of child labour.

Working Class Families and the Role of Women

The Industrial Revolution completely transformed the role of the family. In traditional, agricultural society, families worked together as a unit of production, tending to fields, knitting sweaters, or tending to the fire. Women could parent and also play a role in producing food or goods needed for the household. Work and play time were flexible and interwoven. Industrialization changed all that. The same specialization of labour that occurred in factories occurred in the lives of working-class families, and this broke up the family economy. Work and home life became sharply separated. Men earned money for their families. Women took care of the home and saw their economic role decline. While many factory workers were initially women, most of them were young women who would quit working when they married. In stark contrast to the various changing tasks that a farmer performed in pre-industrial society, factory workers typically completed repetitive and monotonous tasks for 10 to 14 hours each day.

Industrial working-class families, though not working together, did serve an economic purpose of raising money to support each other. As we have seen, children often worked to earn some income for the family. In difficult circumstances, mothers struggled to make ends meet and keep the family out of the poorhouses. Jane Goode, a working-class mother, testified before the British Factory Commission in 1833. The history of her family shows the worries and stresses of a mother struggling to survive. Her life shows the unfortunately common death rate of infants. Jane Goode had twelve children, but five died before the age of two.

The Emerging Middle Class

Gradually, very gradually, a middle class, or “middling sort”, did emerge in industrial cities, mostly toward the end of the 19th century. Until then, there had been only two major classes in society: aristocrats born into their lives of wealth and privilege, and low-income commoners born in the working classes. However new urban industries gradually required more of what we call today “white collar” jobs, such as business people, shopkeepers, bank clerks, insurance agents, merchants, accountants, managers, doctors, lawyers, and teachers.[Middle-class people tended to have monthly or yearly salaries rather than hourly

wages.] One piece of evidence of this emerging middle class was the rise of retail shops in England that increased from 300 in 1875 to 2,600 by 1890. Another mark of distinction of the middle class was their ability to hire servants to cook and clean the house from time to time. Not surprisingly, from 1851 to 1871, the number of domestic servants increased from 900,000 to 1.4 million. This is proof of a small but rising middle class that prided themselves on taking responsibility for themselves and their families. They viewed professional success as the result of a person's energy, perseverance, and hard work.

In this new middle class, families became a sanctuary from stressful industrial life. Home remained separate from work and took on the role of emotional support, where women of the house created a moral and spiritual safe harbour away from the rough-and-tumble industrial world outside. Most middle-class adult women were discouraged from working outside the home. They could afford to send their children to school. As children became more of an economic burden, and better health care decreased infant mortality, middle-class women gave birth to fewer children.

Wealth and Income

Historians disagree about whether life improved for the working class in the first phase of the Industrial Revolution, from 1790 to 1850. E.P. Thompson argued in *The Making of the English Working Class* that life clearly did not improve for the majority of British people: "The experience of immoderation came upon them in a hundred different forms; for the field labourer, the loss of his common rights and the vestiges of village democracy; for the artisan, the loss of his craftsman's status; for the weaver, the loss of livelihood and of independence; for the child the loss of work and play in the home; for many groups of workers whose real earning improved, the loss of security, leisure and the deterioration of the urban environment".

Historians do not even agree if real wages increased for workers during this time period. E.P.Thompson argues that they did not. However, most agree that real wages adjusted for inflation stayed basically steady from 1790 to 1840. Thompson argues that this fails to account for the vast numbers of unemployed. But, after 1840 or 1850, as England entered the second phase of the Industrial Revolution, it appears that real wages began to increase. For example, one study showed that real wages, adjusted for inflation, increased 50% between 1830 and 1875.

Inventions of the Industrial Revolution

One of the most important and productive periods of history was the Industrial Revolution. Many of the inventions made during this time make our everyday life possible. Below is a list of some of the most important.

The Industrial Revolution was the period of time during the 18th and 19th centuries when the face of industry changed dramatically. These changes had a tremendous and long lasting impact on the economies of the world and the lives of the average person. There were hundreds of inventions during this time period. Below are a few of the most important.

Spinning Jenny

James Hargreaves developed the spinning jenny in 1764. This machine allowed workers to spin more wool at one time greatly increasing productivity. This invention was necessary for the industrialization of the textile industry.

Steam Engine

James Watt created the first truly reliable steam engine in 1775. Other, less efficient models had been developed in the 1600s. Watt's version included a crankshaft and gears and is the foundation for modern steam engines. This invention made locomotives and many of the textile machines possible.

Power Loom

Edmund Cartwright invented the power loom in 1785. It dramatically changed the way cloth was woven by making it much easier. It would take almost another fifty years and several alterations by other inventors before it would become commonly used.

Cotton Gin

Eli Whitney patented the cotton gin (short for cotton engine) in 1794. Prior to the invention of the cotton gin, cotton seeds had to be removed from the cotton fibre by hand. This invention made cotton a much more profitable crop for farmers. With this invention, many more farmers turned to cotton as their main crop, greatly increasing the amount of cotton plantations in the South. These expanding farms needed cheap labour, which also resulted in an increased use of African slaves.

Telegraph

Samuel F. B. Morse created the telegraph in 1836. This invention changed the face of communication. Instant communication became possible between the east and west coasts and allowed people to know what were happening almost as it happened. This would revolutionize media and personal communication.

Sewing Machine

Elias Howe created the sewing machine in 1844. This forever changed the way clothes were made and allowed the mass production of clothing. Before this it was most common for women to make all of the clothes for their families. Only the very wealthy could afford to have a tailor or seamstress make custom clothing of the latest fashion. It was later improved upon and patented by Isaac Singer in 1855.

Internal Combustion Engine

Jean Lenoir invented the internal combustion engine in 1858. Eventually this engine was used in mass transportation.

Telephone

Alexander Graham Bell created the telephone in 1876. The telephone further improved communications and eventually led to the various communications devices used today.

Phonograph
Thomas Edison created the phonograph in 1877. Prior to the creation of the phonograph the only option for entertainment was for live musicians or actors to perform. This allowed people to listen to music anywhere.

Airplane
Brothers Orville and Wilbur Wright created the first airplane in 1903. The ability to fly had long been a dream of the human race. Within a few decades planes had changed the face of personal and business travel and had dramatically altered warfare.

Commercial revolution: The period Commercial Revolution was a of European economic expansion, colonialism, and mercantilism which lasted from approximately the late 13th century until the early 18th century. It was succeeded in the mid-18th century by the Industrial Revolution. Beginning with the Crusades, Europeans rediscovered spices, silks, and other commodities rare in Europe. This development created a new desire for trade, and trade expanded in the second half of the Ages. European states, through voyages of discovery, were looking for new trade routes in the 15th and 16th centuries, which allowed the European powers to build vast, new international trade networks. Nations also sought new sources of wealth. To deal with this new-found wealth, new economic theories and practices were created. Because of competing national interest, Europeans had the desire for increased world power through their colonial empires. The Commercial Revolution is marked by an increase in general commerce, and in the growth of financial services such as banking, insurance, and investing.

The factory system

The factory system is a mode of capitalist production that emerged in the late eighteenth century as a result of England's Industrial Revolution. Preindustrial England was largely organized around localized forms of production. Goods were produced on family-centred farms, and items such as yarn and other textiles were contracted for larger distribution or produced independently to be sold at a market. After technological innovations created the ability to produce textiles using waterpower, production became centralized in a single place: a factory owned in many cases by members of the former aristocratic class and staffed by workers who were paid a wage (see E. P. Thompson's 1963 book, *The Making of the English Working Class*). While this mode of production began with the cotton and textile industries, it was the development of the steam engine that fully established the shift from craftspeople and localized production into production under the factory system.

There are several interconnected factors beyond technological innovation that created the factory system in England in its particular moment in history. One was the development of banking institutions, which were able to channel investments into the establishment of factories, and which were also able to facilitate economic exchange. Similarly, landowners

were able to take advantage of the banking industry's low interest rates to facilitate and finance the development of transit systems, created to move goods produced under this new system. At the same time, a rise in the British population not only increased demand for goods, but also created a large pool of labourers who would eventually work for a wage after the development of the factory system. Finally, social changes in Britain at the time both facilitated the training of upper-middle-class men who would administrate the factory system and also the development of British persons as free workers, as opposed to serfs, who could sell their labour power in exchange for a wage.

As such, the development of the factory system was central to the eventual entrenchment of capitalism on a world scale. It was this very shift in production and landownership, combined with the legal backing of free individuals who may enter into a state-sanctioned contractual relationship, that created what Karl Marx (1818–1883) would identify as the two classes in capitalist society: those who own the means of productions and those who own labour power, which they exchange for a wage in the marketplace. Although both workers and owners share the distinction of equality under the law, it was the old aristocrats who were able to develop the infrastructure and purchase the land to develop factories, and the old serfs who had nothing to sell and exchange but their capacity for labour. This system, whereby the owners of the factories could, through the labour process, transfer the value of the worker's productivity into the value of a commodity, established the efficient yet exploitative mode of capitalist production that is still with us today.

The factory system was not only the foundation for the development of capitalism; it also radically shifted many aspects of social organization and daily life. Agricultural families were largely disenfranchised by this process, and in many cases were required to move to industrial centres in order to survive. They were thrust into the system of wage labour, fundamentally changing relationships between men and women. Whereas in preindustrial societies, all members of the family were involved in production work, the advent of the factory system created a gendered division of labour for middle- and working-class families, whereby men went to work for a wage and women were relegated to household work. In poor and non-white families, women worked for a wage outside the home in both formal and informal settings. Men were nearly always wageworkers, while women were either relegated to unpaid work to support the work of the men in their families or themselves worked for wages as a means of survival.

The link of the wage system to factory production created not only a different work process and a gendered division of labour, but also a new form of work. Whereas work under preindustrial forms of organization was often exploitative, particularly under systems of slavery and feudalism, the development of the factory system as a defining feature of capitalism created *alienated* work for the first time. Work is said to be alienated when the worker is in a relationship of production whereby he or she has no autonomy or control over what he or she is producing, where the goods being produced belong exclusively to the owner of the factory, and whereby this process makes the worker alien to himself or herself and his or her community. Marx, in his book *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy* (1867) argued that workers are alienated to the same extent that they are subject to livelihood exclusively through the wage labour market. This same process has created a

social life whereby workers are more fundamentally tied to the workplace than to their homes in terms of livelihood and dependence. This process has also created levels of bureaucracy that divide labour into segmented, de-skilled tasks.

There has been tremendous resistance to the organization of work and social life under the factory system of production. Historically, that resistance has resulted in the abolition of child labour, the creation of the eight-hour workday, and various other labour laws regulating the extent to which owners of the means of production may exploit their workers. Moral arguments about whose labour is fair to exploit, and under which conditions that labour power may be extracted, have resulted in change. Many of the first nations to develop the factory system are now seeing a decline in factory production, as its mode of efficiency under capitalism seeks ever-cheaper ways to produce goods outside the limits of environmental and labour laws. These same nations have seen a shift from factory production to a service economy. However, the fundamental form of factory production, and the inherent link to exploitative relationships under capitalism, is as yet unaltered.

William Pitt (1757-61, 1766-68)

William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, known as 'the Great Commoner', dominated the political scene influencing government from within and without. He is remembered for his vocal criticism of harsh British policy levied against the American colonies and his skills as a wartime leader during the Seven Years' War.

Pitt was the son of a Member of Parliament and the grandson of Thomas Pitt who had helped to build British trade in India. He entered Parliament in 1735 at the age of 27 after attending Oxford. He gained attention by leading the Patriot faction in opposition to Prime Minister Sir Robert Walpole, but his skills at oratory did not establish for him a power base. His first office was as paymaster-general, 1746, where he made a name for himself by his honesty and failure to take financial advantage of the office. Discouraged by his lack of progress within government, he turned to criticizing the Duke of Newcastle, and his government's war policy, resulting in his dismissal in 1755. After Newcastle resigned in 1756, Pitt formed a government with George Grenville and the Duke of Devonshire. Pitt and Grenville argued over the administration of the war and in April, 1757, King George II dismissed Pitt. After several months with virtually no government, Pitt was recalled to government at the outbreak of the Seven Years' War to form a coalition government with Newcastle.

Pitt served very effectively as a wartime prime minister with Newcastle attending to domestic affairs. He sent a strengthened British fleet to blockade French ports and provided supplies to Frederick the Great of Prussia. His policies resulted in victory over the French in India and Canada and on the seas. He sought to continue the war until France was completely defeated, and broaden the war by declaring against Spain. He met with opposition by other ministers and disagreement by George III. He resigned in 1761 and spent the next five years criticizing the government. He called the 1763 Peace of Paris "too

lenient", encouraged criticism of the House of Commons and denounced British policy toward the American colonies gaining him a following both at home and in the colonies.

Second Ministry (1766-68)

In July, 1766, Pitt was recalled to form and lead another coalition government. This time, he met with little success as prime minister. He entered the House of Lords as Earl of Chatham which proved a disaster. His government was unable to deal with the problems in America; he supported the Americans against the king, but was not for independence; and in fact, proved incapable of governing at home as well. His most loyal ministers resigning around him, Pitt fell into depression and resigned his office October 1768.

Pitt did not leave the political arena. He continued to speak out against British policy in the colonies and fight for parliamentary reform, but he gained little following. He was a statesman, not a politician. He collapsed in the Lords speaking out against the withdrawal of troops from the colonies and died a month later in 1778 at the age of 70.

TRADE UNIONISM

A trade union is an organisation made up of members who are workers. The main aim of a trade union is to protect and advance the interests of its members. But the activities of a trade union - such as securing a pay rise - benefits all workers in a workplace, not just those who are members of the union. Going beyond particular workplaces, the campaigning and lobbying work that trade unions do can help change laws in the whole country and gain new rights for workers. In doing this, a strong trade union movement benefits all workers in a country. Most trade unions in the UK are independent of any employer.

Trade unions undertake the following activities:

- Negotiate agreements with employers on pay and conditions;
- Discuss major changes to the workplace such as large scale redundancy;
- Discuss their members' concerns with employers;
- Accompany their members in disciplinary and grievance meetings;
- Provide their members with legal and financial advice.

Employers who recognise the rights of a particular union to represent its workforce will negotiate with that union over members' pay and conditions. This is known as 'collective bargaining'. Most employers recognise a trade union voluntarily. But if an organisation that employs more than 20 people refuses to do so, trade unions can seek recognition through a legal process. According to the Employment Relations Act 1999, the union can approach the Central Arbitration Committee, which can grant recognition on the basis that a majority

of the workers concerned are members of the union or that a (qualified) majority support recognition in a ballot.

History of trade unions in the UK (18th century to the present)

The rights that British workers enjoy today have been gained over many years, and in some cases reflect more than two centuries of collective action by workers and their unions.

The 18th century

The origins of the trade union movement can be traced to the time of the industrial revolution, which transformed Britain in the 18th and 19th century from an agrarian and rural society to one which was based on industrial production in factories, textile mills and mines. The conditions in these new industries were often harsh, with men, women and even children forced to work long hours for very low wages. The workers did not accept these conditions passively - there were a number of trade disputes during the 18th century where workers came together to resolve one-off problems at work. The factory owners, the government (which at that time was elected by only 3% of the adult population - the landowning men) and the media were hostile towards any ‘combination’ of workers to defend their rights. The Combination Acts, passed in 1799 and 1800, made any sort of strike action illegal. Striking was punishable with up to three months' imprisonment or two months' hard labour.

The 19th century

Following widespread protests, the Combination Acts were repealed in 1824 and 1825. But labour unrest reached new levels during the 1830s, and the government responded through draconian measures to prevent workers from getting together to form trade unions. In March 1834, six agricultural labourers who had formed a trade union in the Dorset shire village of Tolpuddle were arrested and found guilty of 'administering illegal oaths' in what was a show trial. Their sentence of transportation to Australia for seven years led to a mass campaign, which led to their sentences being dropped.

The 1871 Trade Union Act recognised unions as legal entities entitled to protection under the law. However, it was only in 1875 that it was legal for trade unions to take effective strike action by picketing (Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act 1875).

By the 1880s, trade unions were active in the cotton, coal, iron and (later) steel and engineering industries. Many trade unions later joined the Labour Representation Committee (LRC), which formed the basis for today's Labour Party. There are still links between the Labour Party and trade unions in the UK.

Between 1888 and 1918 trade unions grew very quickly, and began to reach out to unskilled workers and to women workers. There was an unprecedented wave of strike action during this period. This included the strike by the women workers at the Bryant & May match factory in the East End of London, in July 1888. Another famous strike from this period was the Dockers' strike in 1889 for a minimum wage of 6 pence an hour, which they won after a five-week strike.

The 20th century: 1900-1946

Although the number of women in trade unions had increased by 1914, 90% of all trade unionists were men. Trade unions supported the campaign for extending the vote to women, but on the whole, trade unions still tended to represent the interests of their male members.

Between the end of First World War in 1918 and the outbreak of Second World War in 1939, there was a period of decline in industrial growth in the UK and elsewhere (known as the 'great depression'). In Britain, official unemployment rates reached 20% by the end of 1930. The high rate of unemployment also resulted in declining rates of union membership. This was also the period of the biggest strike in Britain so far - the General Strike of 1926. In response to the General strike, the government made general strikes and other solidarity action illegal and placed restrictions on picketing through the Trade Disputes and Trade Union Act 1927. The Act remained in force until 1946. The restrictions on trade unions continued during Second World War.

Robert Owen (1771-1858)

Robert Owen was a businessman and social activist who sought to bring in new utopian ideals for business and local communities. His New Lanark textile factory in Scotland was an influential experiment in improving the conditions of factory workers. Owen was an early socialist, co-operative and utopian thinker and is often termed the 'father of British socialism'.

Robert Owen (1771-1858), British socialist, was born at Newtown, Montgomeryshire,Wales. He began to influence social thought in 1799, when he acquired at New Lanark, Scotland, the cotton mills which he made famous. His mills became a showplace of enlightened management, and Owen's reputation as a philanthropist spread throughout Europe.

When he entered upon the "government of New Lanark" as he called it, Owen's object was not to be a "mere manager of cotton mills, but to introduce principles in the conduct of the people." These principles had to do with character formation. Owen rejected the competitive business system through which he had made his money and urged the merits of a cooperative system in which "one man's gain" would not be "another man's loss". In a cooperative community, he believed, a healthy and happy environment would shape individual character along the right social lines. Factories were nurseries of bad habits which only social controls, particularly education, could eliminate. It was necessary, moreover, to educate not only children but also adults.

Having expressed these views even before the end of the Napoleonic Wars in 1815, Owen was all the more convinced of the urgent need to apply them when the years following the wars brought economic discontent and distress to Britain. From his original interest in the effects of industrial working conditions on character he moved naturally to a concern with the state of the unemployed. He advocated "villages of co-operation" where work would be carried on collectively; these he considered not only a necessary remedy for unemployment but also a contribution to "social regeneration," a remodelling of society on cooperative lines with no reliance on the profit motive.

When Owen failed to convince the rich and influential of the wisdom of his plans and the practicability of his vision of a new order, he turned to other sectors of society, particularly the middle and working classes. He broke sharply with the churches in 1817, and thereafter his cooperative philosophy became markedly anticlerical in tone. He also began to formulate more definitely communitarian ideals and, finding British opinion reluctant to support him, left Britain for the United States in 1824. There he set up a system of community living at New Harmony, Indiana, an attempt to realize "the new moral world." The community fared ill from the first and soon swallowed up most of Owen's fortune.

Owen returned to Britain in 1829 and again was forced to plot a new course. He discovered that many of his ideas on labour as a source and standard of value and on cooperative production had been accepted by working-class groups of Owenites, and he was increasingly drawn into British working class politics. This phase of his experience reached its high point when in 1833 the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union was

conceived. Although the Trades Union had over half a million members early in 1834, it disintegrated within a few months.

Owen's greatest dream was even further from reality: it was a "Grand National Moral Union of the Productive Classes," a pyramid of producers' power with trade-union lodges at its base and a national labour exchange at its apex. Society would be quickly transformed—indeed, at a single blow—by the operation of the union. Like his previous schemes, this one also failed. Yet, still believing in the possibility of social redemption, Owen turned to the development of a secular religion and in 1839 to the development of a new community experiment at Harmony Hall (Queenwood), Hampshire.

As working-class cooperation developed in the 1840s under the leadership of the Rochdale Pioneers, it depended much on Owenite ideals, but soon thereafter became more practical in its emphasis. Owen was frequently dismissed as a "Utopian socialist"; it was even denied that he was a socialist at all. In fact, however, he had done much to develop a constructive critique of industrialism, to fashion the socialist vocabulary and to stimulate working-class action by offering a new vision of society as it might be.

Chartism - A Historical Background

Why did the Chartists campaign to reform the electoral system?

The electoral system in the early nineteenth century was radically different from the parliamentary democracy we have today. The system was not representative of the population in terms of wealth or region, and elections were open to corruption. Before 1832, just ten per cent of British adult males were eligible to vote – and this portion of the population was the richest.

There were many efforts to reform this outdated system by people who used methods such as corresponding societies, pamphlets and mass meetings to spread their messages. The most notorious of the mass meetings occurred at St. Peter's Fields in August 1819. Eleven people were killed and 400 wounded when a group of soldiers on horseback charged on the crowd. This event soon became known as the Peterloo Massacre and remained in people's memories for many years to come, intensifying support for reform.

Reform of the electoral system finally arrived with the 1832 Reform Act, which increased the proportion of eligible voters in England and Wales to 18 per cent of the adult-male population and 12 per cent in Scotland. Although the working classes had high hopes for the Reform Act, they eventually felt betrayed as despite the new legislation, the poor ultimately remained voiceless in the way their country was run. In the years following the Reform Act, the Chartists would begin to plan their campaign to try to effect real electoral change in Britain.

What were the aims of the Chartists?

In 1836 Cornish cabinet-maker William Lovett formed the London Working Men's Association, along with publisher Henry Hetherington and printers John Cleave and James Watson. Besides disseminating information for the good of the working classes, the

association wanted 'To seek by every legal means to place all classes of society in possession of their equal, political, and social rights.' With the help of Francis Place, Lovett composed The People's Charter, which demanded the following changes to the British electoral system:

- Universal suffrage (the right to vote)
- Abolition of property qualifications for members of parliament
- Annual parliamentary elections
- Equal representation
- Payment of members of parliament
- Vote by secret ballot

Although The People's Charter did not advocate any new ideas, it created a central doctrine for radicals wishing to reform the political system. Support for the Charter spread rapidly and its advocates became known as the Chartists.

Although all Chartists believed in and campaigned for the six points of The People's Charter, they were not an entirely unified group of people, and certain members pursued other aims to try and improve the life of working class people in Britain. One Chartist, **Fergus O'Connor** even tried, unsuccessfully, to relocate the working classes from the cities to his rural utopia, O'Connorville.

Who took part in the Chartist campaign?

Chartism was a mass movement that attracted a following of millions. Hundreds of thousands of people were sometimes reported to have attended their meetings and their three petitions amassed millions of signatures, although some were proved to be fake. Friedrich Engels wrote that '...in Chartism it is the whole working class which rises against the bourgeois', but it was more than simply a working-class movement it attracted some rural support as well as more radical elements of the middle classes.

Although the People's Charter did not advocate votes for women, Chartism was far from a male-only movement. **William Lovett**, the author of the People's Charter, wrote in his autobiography that he was in favour of female suffrage. However, it was decided that calls for female suffrage would damage the prospects for the Charter's success. Women may not have spoken publicly like the male Chartist orators, but many did attend meetings and mass demonstrations, and formed Female Charter Associations. Others actively challenged the Chartists to campaign for female suffrage.

How did the Chartists run their campaign?

The Chartist movement was not a completely unified organisation and its leadership was often fragmented. All members were decided on the end purpose of Chartism, but there were radical differences in opinion over the means to achieve it.

'Moral force' Chartists such as William Lovett believed that tactics such as holding public meetings, publishing pamphlets and newspapers, and taking petitions to government would succeed in convincing those in power of the moral right of electoral reform. However, many people believed that electoral reform would not be achieved through the use of 'moral force' alone. 'Physical force' Chartists, such as Feargus O'Connor, advocated the use of violence to demand the six points of the Charter be granted, should that not be achieved by peaceful means.

The more radical Chartists took part in riots in Newcastle, Birmingham and elsewhere round the country, at which leading members of the movement were arrested. The most infamous episode in the history of Chartism was the disastrous Newport Rising, which took place on 4th November 1839. A group of Chartists stormed a hotel and 22 of the protestors were killed by waiting troops. For a while the energy went out of the movement, though the National Charter Association was established in 1840 to co-ordinate its work across the country.

Eventually, the Chartists split into several factions and the movement's influence declined. The last big protest was at Kennington Common in April 1848, which was followed by a procession to Westminster to present another petition. The Chartist leaders claimed this petition had over 5 million signatures, but many were proved to be fake. There was a massive police and military presence, but the meeting was peaceful, with a crowd estimated by some at 150,000. The petition was defeated heavily.

How successful were they?

Although the Chartists gathered enormous support in the form of signatures for their petitions, their demands were rejected by Parliament every time they were presented. By the time Chartism ended in 1858, not a single demand from the People's Charter had become law. Although the Chartists failed to achieve their aims directly, their influence persisted and reformers continued to campaign for the electoral reforms advocated by the People's Charter.

A new Reform Bill was passed in August 1867 that gave the vote to all male heads of households over 21, and all male lodgers paying £10 a year in rent. Further reform arrived with the Ballot Act in 1872, which ensured that votes could be cast in secret – a key demand of the People's Charter. In 1884 the Third Reform Act extended the qualification of the 1867 Act to the countryside so that almost two thirds of men had the vote. Eventually, only one of the Chartists' demands – for annual parliamentary elections – failed to become part of British law. At the time, Chartism may have been judged unsuccessful, but there is no doubt that the movement's campaign for electoral reform played an important role in the development of democracy in the UK.

Development of party System in England

1. Introduction:

The history of political parties in England in this paper mainly deals with the period of time after the Exclusion Bill Crisis (1678~1681) and before the start of World War I (1914). The existence of political parties has played a crucial role in shaping the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland today, from an absolute monarchy to a limited constitutional monarchy. The division of specific parties by which people can forward their various interests can be seen as another meaningful step towards government by the people. This term paper will focus on the forming processes of English political parties and how the parties changed over time in reaction to various events and policies. Rather than emphasizing the parties' influences on each environment, it is the purpose of his paper to follow the parties' progress.

II. Early Tory / Whig Parties (1678-1783)

II.1.The Formation of the Two Parties

After the English Civil War had established a protectorate in place of a monarchy under New Model Army leader Oliver Cromwell, a period known as the Restoration began. During this time King Charles II (the son of the previously executed Charles I) was restored to the throne but was under specific limits placed upon by parliament. The Bill of Rights was enacted in 1689, and certain privileges were protected from intrusion by any power including the monarchy. When the heir to the throne, James Duke of York was discovered to be a Catholic a rift among parliamentarians arose on the issue of support for the Catholic king. The people who wished to exclude James from the throne came to be known as Whigs, and the people who gave support were known as Tories, or the Tory party. Both names inherently have negative connotations: 'Whig' means a horse driver in Scottish Gaelic and 'Tory' means outlaw in the Irish Gaelic language. This schism during the Exclusion Bill Crisis served as the starting point of the formation of political parties in England. Although the bill was ultimately defeated in the House of Lords in 1681, the division of the two political tendencies remained. It should be noted, however, that real party distinctions did not clarify until a later time. The terms of 'Whig' and 'Tory' were used more as tendencies to support an opinion in policy: rigid blocks of political coordination were yet to be constructed.

The Tories came to represent and support the Anglican Church, the gentry, and the maintenance of a relatively strong monarchy. On the other hand, the Whigs supported non-Anglicans (notably Presbyterians), wealthy middle class people, and later industrial, mercantile interests. People following the tendencies of Whigs were also generally supportive of the supremacy in parliament's power to govern, while the authority of the monarchy was to be largely decreased. Although the main issue regarding the Exclusion Bill Crisis was the religious affiliation of James II, it is possible that the Whigs desired a

notable decrease in the monarchy's authority by discontinuing the hereditary custom of passing the throne. The Tories wished the opposite of the Whigs' plans.

During the Glorious Revolution (1688-89) the two Whig and Tory parties cooperated in discontinuing the Stuart dynasty and seating William III of Orange on the throne of England, Scotland, and Ireland. It was during this period that the two parties, although their differences were ameliorated to an extent, moved forward another step in fomenting their respective party identities. The idea of a limited constitutional monarchy was generally accepted by people of both parties, in contrast to the absolutism of a king held by divine right. 'Toryism' became identified with Anglicanism and the regional squires, while 'Whiggism' came to represent the wealthy middle class and aristocracy. Until around 1714, political power was contested by both Whigs and Tories, when monarchs favoured one political tendency over another such as the case of Queen Anne's initial preference to the Tory party. A group of Whigs known as the Junto Whigs increasingly dominated politics until Queen Anne dismissed the Whig Ministry and replaced them with Toriesin 1710.

II.2 Dominance of 'Whig' tendencies in Politics (1714-1760)

The death of Queen Anne in 1714 led her successor, George I Duke of Hannover to the throne. George the first was a nominee by the Whig members of parliament, and this substantially increased the influence of the Whig party. In 1715 and 1745, Jacobite uprisings with the motive of restoring the Stuart dynasty by the son of James II (Bonnie Prince Charlie, also known as the Young Pretender) gave reason for the Whig party to discredit the majority of the Tories as traitors, although only a few had initially taken part in the uprising. The leader of the Tory Party, Henry St. John, first Count of Bolingbroke fled England for France, further threatening the maintenance of the party. The loosely coalesced Whigs, unchallenged, became the dominant force of government for the next several decades while the Tories practically lost their ground to function as a cohesive political force. Individual Tories during this time, however, continued to serve in the House of Commons. The 'Whigs' in control during this period were generally aristocratic groups and their connections, who preferred to name themselves as Whigs. Tories were generally country gentlemen, following the party's background.

As time progressed, the definite borders of 'Whig' and 'Tory' lost more of their ground as politicians faced no clear distinction by the use of such terms. By the time of King George III, a definitive 'Whig' party did not exist: groups of aristocratic people connected with each other were the major forces in parliament. Many groups in power claimed the status of Whigs, sometimes claiming lineage from the traditional wealthy Whig families. For example, the Rockingham Whigs under the leadership of intellectuals such as Edmund Burke called themselves 'Old Whigs', following the tradition of the old families such as the Pelhams. The opposition was not deemed to be a Tory party, but was composed of Whigs who were Tory-leaning. Not until under the leadership of William Pitt the Younger would party distinctions be made clear and the term 'Tory' be made usable again.

III. Distinction of Party Alignments (1760 -1834)

William Pitt the younger became the youngest prime minister in British history in 1783. His leadership led to a forming of a clear party division of new Tories and Whigs. When the previous Whig party split into a conservative faction (which joined William Pitt's government) and an opposition rump party led by Charles James Fox, the division was further made clear. After the death of Pitt the term 'Tory' rose in popularity to previous names such as 'Pittites' while Fox's group kept the name of 'Whig'. The new Tories broadly supported the country gentry¡¯s interests with those of the merchant classes and official administering groups. On the other hand, the Whig party came to forward the interests of religious dissenters, industrialists and other groups which sought reforms.

A notable development in the political history of England during this time was the Parliamentary Reform Act of 1832 and the abolition of slavery, passed by the Whig administration under Lord Grey. Successful campaigns led by the Whig party allowed the general election which followed the Act to reduce the Tories to only 180 Members of Parliament (MPs).

IV. Beginning of Conservative & Liberal Parties

IV.1.The Conservative Party

The pre-existing Tory and Whig parties experienced a phase in the 19th century where the Whigs formed the Liberal Party, and the Tories newly grouped under the Conservative Party. During the period of Tory decline in Parliament the name 'Conservative' began to be used, as politician Robert Peel rallied together the opponents of further reform in the 1830s. By 1832 the term 'Conservative Party' had effectively replaced 'Tory' in common use by the press and politics. Peel issued the Tamworth Manifesto in 1834, which outlined the goals of the Conservatives. The Tamworth Manifesto can be seen as a crucial point for the grouping of the Tory party into the Conservative Party. Robert Peel was successfully elected Prime Minister in 1841 as the leader of the Conservatives.

However, Peel's decision in 1846 to repeal the protectionist Corn Laws provoked disagreement among many within the party, and a faction named the Peelites who did not favour repeal broke away to form a coalition with the Liberal Party, with William Gladstone as the Peelite leader. After the death of Peel in 1850, the Peelites and Conservatives had definitively separated. A majority of the Peelites defected to the Whigs and Radicals to form the Liberal Party in 1859, under the leadership of Lord Palmerstone. The modern Conservative Party regrouped after the division and slowly built up its strength under the leaders Benjamin Disraeli and Lord Stanley (Earl of Derby). The Conservative Party was able to win the majority in parliament in 1874, but it was not until the split of the Liberals over the Irish Home Rule Bill and the defection of the Liberal Unionists that the Conservatives were able to safely hold majorities.

The coalition of the Unionists and the Conservatives suffered political losses during the early twentieth century due to the unpopular Boer Wars led by Joseph Chamberlain, leader

of the Liberal Unionists, and new tariff reforms. However, the party made up for its previous losses during the elections of 1910.

IV.2.The Liberal Party

The term 'Liberal Party' had been used by Prime Minister John Russell early on, but the identity of the party started from a coalition of Whigs and Radicals promoting free trade and reform. The coalition drew along similar lines compared to the previous Whig party, favouring reform, personal liberty, and the reduction in the role of the monarchy and church. Although initially defeated by the Conservative Party, conservatives' breakup over the repealing of the Corn Laws allowed ministries led by Russell, Palmerstone and the Peelite Lord Aberdeen to hold office during the mid-1800s. When Prime Minister Palmerstone’s second government was established, the Liberal Party had been officially founded. The Liberal Party in the beginning had a large traditional Whig element within it: however, through the leadership of William Gladstone, politicians with old Whig aristocratic tendencies diminished.

Prime Minister William Gladstone was able to become the first leader of the modern Liberal party, by Russell’s retirement in 1868 and Palmerstone’s death in 1865. The dominance of the aristocracy in the party had ceased after Gladstone's leadership, thus the word 'modern' may be applied. After the Second Reform Act was passed in 1867 by agreement between the two parties, Gladstone acquired a large victory at the 1868 election and formed the first Liberal government. In the 1890s the Liberal Party was in the opposition for a decade, and then was nearly split into two factions over the Boer Wars. The varying left-right tendencies of party members caused division within the Liberal Party. However, party leader Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman was able to lead the party to a win a large majority in parliament by following traditional Liberal policies of land reform and free trade. This period marked the height of the Liberal Party's power: the following crisis of the Unionists' Ulster Volunteers in conflict over Irish home rule and World War I signalled its decline.

V. Advent of Other Political Parties

V.1. Liberal Unionists

Liberal Unionists were those politicians who were originally part of the Liberal Party, but split from the main party. This was due to Prime Minister William Gladstone's support for the Home Rule Bill for Ireland in 1886. Because the members of parliament did not want a near independent state of Ireland to break away from the United Kingdom by granting home rule, they took on the name of Liberal Unionists. The party was composed of radical Unionists with Joseph Chamberlain as leader and the moderate/Whig Unionists who were lead by the Marquis of Hartington. The two groups each founded organizations: the Liberal Unionist Association, and the National Radical Union. However, in 1889 Chamberlain effectively merged the two organizations under the name of the National Liberal Union. In 1895 the Liberal Unionists took office during the Conservative Government, which eventually led to the formal union of the Conservative and Liberal Unionist parties in 1912.

V.2.The Labour Party

Towards the end of the 19th century there arose a number of political parties representing the working class. Previously, in the 1880s political representatives of the working class had run for parliament as Liberal-Labour candidates. The need for an independent political party for the working class resulted in the formation of The Independent Labour Party, which was lead by Keir Hardie. In 1898, the ILP joined with another Labour party, the Social Democratic Federation. This resulted in a Labour party majority in the region of West Ham, which convinced another left-wing group to join, the Fabian Society. In 1900, the leaders of all socialist groups in Britain joined to form the Labour Representation Committee (LRC).

In the following general elections, the Labour Representation Committee achieved gradual success. Although the Social Democratic Federation¡¯s disaffiliation from the party in 1901 the Labour Party won more seats in the 1906 general election than it did in the 1900 election. In 1906 The LRC officially changed its name to the Labour Party. In the years to come, the Labour Party would eventually grow to dominate the political landscape and replace the Liberal Party as the most powerful left party in Great Britain, contending with the Conservative Party.

V.3. Other Parties

Some parties lead a short existence in their formation and declined in influence throughout the 19th century. A group known as the Chartists began in 1838 and decreased in influence by the 1850s. Many other minor parties arose in the early twentieth century, such as the Socialist Labour Party and the Socialist Party of Great Britain, both of which broke away from the Social Democratic Federation. The division and fragmentation of politics into various parties remain a phenomenon to the present, while a few major parties dominate the majority of the parliament's composition and have wide appeal to the public.

VI. Conclusion

In a larger context, England's early steps toward a limited constitutional monarchy with rule by Parliament is meaningful in that they set precedents for a number of other nations to follow. The history of the political parties of England until the start of First World War can be largely summed up into three phases : First, the beginnings of party division into Whigs and Tories; second, the development of such groups into modern political parties; and third, the creation of smaller minority parties from pre-existing political parties. The traditions and tendencies of the parties have continued on in history leading up to the present, and political parties maintain important roles in Britain's government today.

The Co-operative movement

The co-operative movement was one of the first social movements of modern times, with roots at the beginning of the industrial revolution, and was an integral part of the early labour movement. The movement for worker cooperatives, workplace democracy, and social enterprises is resurgent around the world today. The cooperative movement of the

present and near future operates primarily in the spaces that the corporate system cannot and will not fill. Cooperatives can provide a dignified living for the many millions who would otherwise be unemployed or marginalized. Grassroots social movements have turned to cooperatives in response to the depredations of globalism and the worldwide deep recession, to improve people's living conditions and to empower them. Many of the new social enterprises are arising from spontaneous initiatives of grassroots groups, and many are being organized, coordinated, and backed by non-profit development organizations, governments, and communities. Cooperatives and social enterprises are the world's best hope of achieving peace, prosperity, and social equity in this new century, and it is there that the eyes of the world need to turn.

Cooperative movement, series of organized activities that began in the 19th century in Great Britain and later spread to most countries of the world, whereby people organize themselves around a common goal, usually economic. The term usually refers more specifically to the formation of non-profit economic enterprises for the benefit of those using their services.

Types of Cooperatives

An old and widespread form is the consumers' cooperative, in which people organize for wholesale or retail distribution, usually of agricultural or other staple products. Traditionally, membership is open, and anyone may buy stock. Goods are sold to the public as well as to members, usually at prevailing market prices, and any surplus above expenses is turned back to the members. Money is saved through direct channelling of goods from producer to consumer. Producers' cooperatives are manufacturing and distributive organizations commonly owned and managed by the workers. Another development in such cooperatives has been the acquisition of failing manufacturing plants by labour unions, who run them on a cooperative basis. Agricultural cooperatives usually involve cooperation in the processing and marketing of produce and in the purchase of equipment and supplies. Actual ownership of land is usually not affected, and in this way the agricultural cooperative differs from the collective farm. Agricultural cooperatives are often linked with cooperative banks and credit unions, which constitute another important type of cooperative. There is also cooperative activity in insurance, medical services, housing, and other fields.

Origin and Growth

The origin of cooperative philosophy is found in the writings and activities of Robert Owen, Louis Blanc, Charles Fourier, and others. Its early character was revolutionary, but under the impact of such movements as Christian Socialism this aspect diminished. After some early 19th-century experiments, consumers' cooperation took permanent form with the establishment (1844) of the Rochdale Society of Equitable Pioneers in England.

The cooperative movement has since had considerable growth throughout Great Britain and the Commonwealth, where local cooperatives have been federated into national wholesale and retail distributive enterprises and where a large proportion of the population has membership. Various examples of cooperative organization are also found in the Scandinavian countries, Israel, the People's Republic of China, Russia, and France. In the United States the cooperative movement began in the 19th century, first among workers and then among farmers. The National Grange, a farmers' cooperative, was founded in 1867 and later exercised considerable political influence. An international alliance for the dissemination of cooperative information was founded in 1895.Today the major types of cooperatives include those of farmers, wholesalers, and consumers, as well as insurance, banking and credit, and rural electrification cooperatives (the growth of the latter two facilitated by loans from the federal government). There has been increasing international collaboration among the various kinds of cooperatives and a growing trend toward the establishment of international cooperative distribution.

Laissez-faire

Laissez-faire**,** (French: “allow to do”), policy of minimum governmental interference in the economic affairs of individuals and society. The origin of the term is uncertain, but folklore suggests that it is derived from the answer Jean-Baptiste Colbert, controller general of finance under King Louis XIV of France, received when he asked industrialists what the government could do to help business: “Leave us alone.” The doctrine of laissez-faire is usually associated with the economists known as Physiocrats, who flourished in France from about 1756 to 1778. The policy of laissez-faire received strong support in classical economics as it developed in Great Britain under the influence of economist and philosopher Adam Smith.

Belief in laissez-faire was a popular view during the 19th century; its proponents cited the assumption in classical economics of a natural economic order as support for their faith in unregulated individual activity. The British economist John Stuart Mill was responsible for bringing this philosophy into popular economic usage in his Principles of Political Economy (1848), in which he set forth the arguments for and against government activity in economic affairs.

Laissez-faire was a political as well as an economic doctrine. The pervading theory of the 19th century was that the individual, pursuing his own desired ends, would thereby achieve the best results for the society of which he was a part. The function of the state was to maintain order and security and to avoid interference with the initiative of the individual in pursuit of his own desired goals. But laissez-faire advocates nonetheless argued that government had an essential role in enforcing contracts as well as ensuring civil order.

The philosophy's popularity reached its peak around 1870. In the late 19th century the acute changes caused by industrial growth and the adoption of mass-production techniques proved the laissez-faire doctrine insufficient as a guiding philosophy. Although the original concept yielded to new theories that attracted wider support, the general philosophy still has its advocates.

English Economists

During the 18th and 19th centuries, several major writers began commenting on the economy. These individuals attempted to uncover theories which could be applied to markets in order to promote a better society. Among the most influential theorists of the time were **Adam Smith**, **David Ricardo**, and **Thomas Malthus**.

Adam Smith:

Adam Smith is known as the father of modern economics. Born in Scotland in 1723, he embarked on an academic career at the age of 15. Educated primarily in European literature, he was awarded a position as chair of logic in 1751 and then chair of moral philosophy the following year at Glasgow University.

In 1764, Smith became the tutor of the young Duke of Buccleuch. This career change had lasting effects on Smith's philosophy. While he travelled with the Duke, he visited places like Switzerland and France and became aware of the ideas of thinkers such as **Voltaire**, **Rousseau**, **Quesnay**, and **Turgot**.

Importantly, his employment with the Duke gave him a life-long pension. This granted him the freedom to retire and write his work ***Theory of Moral Sentiments***, which was published in 1759. He continued to write afterwards and produced '**An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the *Wealth of Nations*** in 1776. The philosophy he advocated in these works continues to influence economic thought today.

According to Smith, people have a capacity for reasonable judgment that is often underestimated and should not allow politicians or philosophers to impose unreasonable government regulations on them. He was an advocate of **laissez-faire** thinking, which was a policy of minimal government intervention in the economy. According to Smith, free markets allowed the natural laws of supply and demand to function properly. Smith remained a life-long bachelor and died in Scotland in 1790.

David Ricardo:

Another influential economist was David Ricardo. Born in London on April 18, 1772, he was the third of 17 children. At the age of 14, he began working with his father, who was a successful stock broker. Ricardo worked with his father until 1793. During that year, Ricardo married Priscilla Anne Wilkinson, a Quaker. Later, he converted from Judaism to

Christianity, a move that greatly angered his parents. This forced Ricardo to leave his father's business and start his own.

As a broker, he was able to save money to retire at the age of 42. With his first career over, he looked to politics for his next challenge. Ricardo read Adam Smith's book *Wealth of Nations* in 1799. He was so intrigued by the concepts in Smith's work that he began studying economics himself. In 1810, he produced his first publication, ***The High Price of Bullion, a Proof of the Depreciation of Bank Note***, which argued for the use of metallic currency.

His methods of analyzing market forces by using deduction and mathematics still influence economics today. He also believed, like Smith, that economies functioned best when they were left alone by governments. Ricardo was an early advocate of free trade.

One of his most influential theories was comparative advantage, which was the idea that nations should focus on industries where they could easily compete in the market and only trade with other countries to gain products not available nationally. By this theory, each nation could profit from specializing in certain industries. Ricardo died in 1823 at the age of 51.

Thomas Malthus:

The Rev. Thomas Robert Malthus (13 February 1766 – 29 December 1834 was an English cleric and scholar, influential in the fields of political economy and demography. Malthus himself used only his middle name Robert.

His An Essay on the Principle of Population observed that sooner or later population will be checked by famine and disease, leading to what is known as a Malthusian catastrophe. He wrote in opposition to the popular view in 18th-century Europe that saw society as improving and in principle as perfectible. He thought that the dangers of population growth precluded progress towards a utopian society: "The power of population is indefinitely greater than the power in the earth to produce subsistence for man". As an Anglican cleric, Malthus saw this situation as divinely imposed to teach virtuous behaviour.

Malthus placed the longer-term stability of the economy above short-term expediency. He criticized the Poor Laws, and (alone among important contemporary economists) supported the Corn Laws, which introduced a system of taxes on British imports of wheat. His views became influential, and controversial, across economic, political, social and scientific thought. Pioneers of evolutionary read him, notably Charles Darwin and Alfred Russell Wallace. He remains a much-debated writer.

Methodism

Methodism was an 18th-century movement founded by John Wesley that sought to reform the Church of England from within. The movement, however, became separate

from its parent body and developed into an autonomous church. There were roughly 15 million Methodists worldwide at the turn of the 21st century.

John Wesley was born in 1703, educated in London and Oxford, and ordained a deacon in the Church of England in 1725. In 1726 he was elected a fellow of Lincoln College at Oxford, and in the following year he left Oxford temporarily to act as curate to his father, the rector of Epworth. Wesley was ordained a priest in the Church of England in 1728 and returned to Oxford in 1729. Back in Oxford, he joined his brother Charles and a group of earnest students who were dedicated to frequent attendance at Holy Communion, serious study of the Bible, and regular visitations to the filthy Oxford prisons. The members of this group, which Wesley came to lead, were known as Methodists because of their “methodical” devotion and study.

Corn Laws

The Corn Laws were measures in force in the United Kingdom between 1815 and 1846, which imposed restrictions and tariffs on imported grain. They were designed to keep grain prices high to favour domestic producers. The laws did indeed raise food prices and became the focus of opposition from urban groups who had far less political power than rural Britain. The Corn Laws imposed steep import duties, making it too expensive to import grain from abroad, even when food supplies were short. The laws were supported by Conservative landowners and opposed by Whig industrialists and workers. The Anti-Corn Law League was responsible for turning public and elite opinion against the laws. It was a large, nationwide middle-class moral crusade with a Utopian vision, according to historian Asa Briggs; its leading advocate Richard Cobden promised that repeal would settle four great problems simultaneously:

‘First, it would guarantee the prosperity of the manufacturer by affording him outlets for his products. Second, it would relieve the Condition of England question by cheapening the price of food and ensuring more regular employment. Third, it would make English agriculture more efficient by stimulating demand for its products in urban and industrial areas. Fourth, it would introduce through mutually advantageous international trade a new era of international fellowship and peace. The only barrier to these four beneficent solutions was the ignorant self-interest of the landlords, the 'bread-taxing oligarchy, unprincipled, unfeeling, rapacious and plundering’.

The first two years of the Irish famine of 1845–1852 forced a resolution because of the urgent need for new food supplies. Prime Minister Sir Robert Peel, a Conservative, achieved repeal with the support of the Whigs in Parliament, overcoming the opposition of most of his own party.

"Corn" included any grain that requires grinding, especially wheat. The laws were introduced by the Importation Act 1815 and repealed by the Importation Act 1846. The laws are often considered examples of British mercantilism.

The economic issue was food prices. The price of grain was central to the price of the most important staple food, bread, and the working man spent much of his wages on bread.

The political issue was a dispute between landowners (a long-established class, who were heavily over-represented in Parliament) and the new class of manufacturers and industrial workers (who were under-represented). The former desired to maximise their profits from agriculture by keeping the price at which they could sell their grain high. The latter wished to maximise their profits from manufacture by reducing the wages they paid to their factory workers—the difficulty being that men could not work in the factories if a factory wage was not enough to feed them and their families; hence, in practice, high grain prices kept factory wages high also.

The Corn Laws enhanced the profits and political power associated with land ownership. Their abolition saw a significant increase of free trade.

Repeal of the Corn Act, 1846

The Corn Laws were part of Britain's colonial mercantile economic system. Grain from the colonies entered Britain tax free or with only a low tariff, but grain from any other country had a substantial tax added to its price.

In the 1840s a new movement called the Anti-Corn Law League began to campaign against these protective tariffs. They were in favour of free trade and laissez-faire economics. Get the government's nose out of the economy, they demanded, and let the market set its own prices. These people were part of a rising industrialist class who wanted to be able to buy raw materials from the cheapest source and sell their finished products for the best price they could get. They didn't want to be restricted to dealing only with the colonies. If there were no tax on grain imports, these factory owners felt, then food would be cheaper and they could pay their workers less money.

In 1846 the free traders won out and the Corn Laws were done away with. At first this had a devastating effect on British North America which had always enjoyed a protected, guaranteed market for its wheat. There was also a world depression at the time which didn't help matters. But things began to pick up in the 1850s and the North American colonies turned to the United States as a trading partner. North-south railway lines began to replace east-west canal systems as the favoured lines of trade.

Gladstone (1809-1898) and the Liberal Policy

William Ewart Gladstone was the great Liberal prime minister of Britain's golden age of parliamentary government. Along with his equally great Conservative rival Benjamin Disraeli he dominated British politics for the second half of the 19th century. Gladstone served as Liberal prime minister four times (1868–74, 1880–85, 1886, and 1892–94). His

financial policies, based on the notion of balanced budgets, low taxes and laissez-faire, were suited to a developing capitalist society but could not respond effectively as economic and social conditions changed. Called the "Grand Old Man" later in life, he was always a dynamic popular orator who appealed strongly to British workers and lower middle class. The deeply religious Gladstone brought a new moral tone to politics with his evangelical sensibility and opposition to aristocracy. His moralism often angered his upper-class opponents (including Queen Victoria), and his heavy-handed control split the Liberal party. His foreign policy goal was to create a European order based on cooperation rather than conflict and mutual trust instead of rivalry and suspicion; the rule of law was to supplant the reign of force and self-interest. This Gladstonian concept of a harmonious Concert of Europe was opposed to and ultimately defeated by a Bismarckian system of manipulated alliances and antagonisms.

Benjamin Disraeli and Conservatism

Benjamin Disraeli (21 December 1804 – 19 April 1881) was a British Conservative politician and writer, who twice served as Minister. He played a central role in the creation of the modern Conservative Party, defining its policies and its broad outreach. Disraeli is remembered for his influential voice in world affairs, his political battles with the Liberal leader William Ewart Gladstone, and his one-nation conservatism or "Tory democracy". He made the Conservatives the party most identified with the glory and power of the British Empire. He is, at 2015, the only British Prime Minister of Jewish birth.

Disraeli was born in London. His father left Judaism after a dispute at his synagogue; young Benjamin became an Anglican at the age of 12. After several unsuccessful attempts, Disraeli entered the House of Commons in 1837. When the Conservatives gained power in 1841, Disraeli was given no office by the Prime Minister, Sir Robert Peel. In 1846, Peel split the party over his proposal to repeal the Corn Laws, which imposed a tariff on imported grain. Disraeli clashed with Peel in the Commons. The Conservatives who split from Peel had few who were adept in Parliament, and Disraeli became a major figure in the party, though many in it did not favour him. When Lord Derby, the party leader, thrice formed governments in the 1850s and 1860s, Disraeli served as Chancellor of the Exchequer and Leader of the House of Commons. He also forged a bitter rivalry with the Liberal Party's William Ewart Gladstone.

Upon Derby's retirement due to ill health in 1868, Disraeli became Prime Minister briefly before losing that year's election. He returned to opposition, before leading the party to a majority in the 1874 election. He maintained a close friendship with Queen Victoria, who in 1876 created him Earl of Beaconsfield. Disraeli's second term was dominated by

the Eastern Question—the slow decay of the Ottoman Empire and the desire of other countries, such as Russia, to gain at its expense. Disraeli arranged for the British to purchase a major interest in the Suez Canal Company (in Ottoman-controlled Egypt). In 1878, faced with Russian victories against the Ottomans, he worked at the Congress of Berlin to maintain peace in the Balkans and made terms favourable to Britain which weakened Russia, its longstanding enemy. This diplomatic victory over Russia established Disraeli as one of Europe's leading statesmen.

World events thereafter moved against the Conservatives. Controversial wars in Afghanistan and South Africa undermined his public support. He angered British farmers by refusing to reinstitute the Corn Laws in response to poor harvests and cheap American grain. With Gladstone conducting a massive speaking campaign, his Liberals bested Disraeli's Conservatives in the 1880 election. In his final months, Disraeli led the Conservatives in opposition. He had throughout his career written novels, beginning in 1826, and he published his last completed novel, Endymion, shortly before he died at the age of 76.

Books for Reading

Module I

1. G. M. Travelyan, A Social History of England, Vol. I

2. G. M. Travelyan, Illustrated English Social History

3. Carter and Mears, A History of England

4. H. A. L. Fischer, History of Europe

Module II

1. G. M. Travelyan, A Social History of England, Vol. I

2. G. M. Travelyan, Illustrated English Social History

3. Carter and Mears, A History of England

4. H. A. L. Fischer, History of Europe

5. E J Hobsbaum, Age of Capital

6. E J Hobsbaum, Age of Empire

Module III

1. G. M. Travelyan, A Social History of England, Vol. I

2. G. M. Travelyan, Illustrated English Social History

3. E J Hobsbaum, Age of Capital

4. H. A. L. Fischer, History of Europe

5. G. B. Adams, Constitutional History of England

6. E J Hobsbaum, Age of Empire