

**SELECTED PROBLEMS OF
MEDIEVAL AND MODERN
WORLD HISTORY
(HIS2C04)**



STUDY MATERIAL

**II SEMESTER
CORE COURSE**

**MA HISTORY
(2019 ADMISSION ONWARDS)**

UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT
SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION
CALICUT UNIVERSITY- P.O, MALAPPURAM- 673635, KERALA.

190508

UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT

SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

STUDY MATERIAL

SECOND SEMESTER

MA HISTORY (2019 ADMISSION)

CORE COURSE :

**HIS2C04 : SELECTED PROBLEMS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN
WORLD HISTORY**

PREPARED BY:

*SRI.SARAVANAN. R,
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR IN HISTORY,
PG AND RESEARCH DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY,
P S M O COLLEGE, TIRURANGADI, MALAPPURAM.*

SCRUTINIZED BY:

*SRI. MAJEED.P.
GUEST LECTURER,
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY,
P S M O COLLEGE, THIRURANGADI, MALAPPURAM*

HIS 2C04

SELECTED PROBLEMS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN WORLD HISTORY

Module I

Medieval Societies

Feudal Society in Europe- Economy- Religion and Culture- Christianity- Islam

1. Feudal Society in Europe

1.1. Feudalism

The word '**Feudalism**' derives from the medieval Latin terms *feudalis*, meaning fee, and *feodum*, meaning fief. The idea of feudalism is enormously contested among historians and theorists of all stripes. The system of governing and landholding, called feudalism, had emerged in Europe. Feudalism was a political system in which nobles were granted the use of land that legally belonged to the king. In return, the nobles agreed to give their loyalty and military services to the king. It was the medieval model of government predating the birth of the modern nation-state. The feudal system first appears in definite form in the Frankish lands in the 9th and 10th centuries.

Feudalism was the system in European medieval societies whereby a social hierarchy was established based on local administrative control and the distribution of land into units (**fiefs**). A landowner (**lord**) gave a fief, along with a promise of military and legal protection, in return for a payment of some kind from the person who received it (**vassal**). Such payment came in the form of feudal service which could mean military service or the regular payment of produce or money. Both lord and vassal were freemen and the term feudalism is not generally applied to the relationship between the unfree peasantry (**serfs or villeins**) and the person of higher social rank on whose land they laboured.

Feudalism spread from France to Spain, Italy, and later Germany and Eastern Europe. In England the Frankish form was imposed by William I. It was extended eastward into Slavic lands to the marches (frontier provinces), which were continually battered by new invasions, and it was adopted partially in Scandinavian countries. The important features of feudalism were similar throughout, but there existed definite national differences. Feudalism continued in all parts of Europe until the end of the 14th century

1.2. Feudal Society

The feudal system was based on rights and obligations. In exchange for military protection and other services, a lord, or landowner, granted land called a fief. The person receiving a fief was called a vassal. Feudalism depended on the control of land. The structure of feudal society was much like a pyramid. At the peak reigned the king. Next came the most powerful vassals—wealthy landowners such as nobles and bishops. Serving beneath these vassals were knights. Knights were mounted horsemen who pledged to defend their lords' lands in exchange for fiefs. At the base of the pyramid were landless peasants who toiled in the fields. In the feudal system, status determined a person's prestige and power. Medieval writers classified people into three groups: those who fought (nobles and knights), those who prayed (men and women of the Church), and those who worked (the peasants). Social class was usually inherited.

At the bottom of the social system were peasants. Lords rented some of their land to the peasants who worked for them. In Europe in the Middle Ages, the vast majority of people were peasants. Most peasants were serfs. Serfs were people who could not lawfully leave the place where they were born. Though bound to the land, serfs were not slaves. Their lords could not sell or buy them. But what their labor produced belonged to the lord. Under this system, people were bound to one another by promises of loyalty. In theory, all the land in the kingdom belonged to the monarch. A great deal of land was also owned by the Church. During the middle ages, people were born into a social class for life. They had the same social position, and often the same job, as their parents.

Feudal classes

1.3. Monarchs

At the very top of feudal society were the monarchs, or kings and queens. Most medieval monarchs believed in the divine right of kings, the idea that God had given them the right to rule. In reality, the power of monarchs varied greatly. Some had to work hard to maintain control of their kingdoms. They had to rely on their vassals, especially nobles, to provide enough knights and soldiers. In England, monarchs became quite strong during the Middle Ages. Since the Roman period, a number of groups from the continent, including Vikings, had invaded and settled England. By the mid-11th century, it was ruled by a Germanic tribe called the Saxons. The king at that time was descended from both Saxon and Norman. William, the

powerful Duke of Normandy (France), believed he had the right to the English throne. However, the English crowned his cousin, Harold. In 1066, William and his army invaded England. His triumph earned him the nickname **“William the Conqueror.”**

1.4. Lords

Like monarchs, lords and ladies were members of the nobility, the highest-ranking class in medieval society. Most of them lived on manors. Some lords had one manor (tract of agricultural land), while others had several. Those who had more than one manor usually lived in one for a few months and then traveled with their families to another. Manor Houses and Castles Many of the people on a manor lived with the lord’s family in the manor house. Manor houses were surrounded by gardens and outbuildings, such as kitchens and stables. They were protected by high walls. The manor house was the center of the community. Kings and queens, high-ranking nobles, and wealthy lords lived in castles. Castles were built for many purposes. A castle’s main function was to serve as a home. Castles were also one of the most important forms of military technology.

1.5. Knights

A knight is a person granted an honorary title of knighthood by a head of the state or representative for service to the monarch especially in a military capacity. In medieval times, a knight was a man of noble birth, who served his king or lord in war. Knights were usually vassals of more powerful lords. Knights lived by a strong code of behavior called chivalry. Knights were expected to be loyal to the Church and to their lord, to be just and fair, and to protect the helpless. They performed acts of gallantry, or respect paid to women. Jousts and tournaments were a major part of a knight’s life. In a joust, two armed knights on horseback galloped at each other with their lances extended. The idea was to unseat the opponent from his horse. Jousts were held as sporting events, for exercise, or as serious battles between rival knights. A tournament involved a team of knights in one-on-one battle.

1.6. Peasants

They were not part of the feudal relationship of vassal and lord, but they supported the entire feudal structure by working the land. Their labor freed lords and knights to spend their time preparing for war or fighting. During medieval times, peasants were legally classified as

free or unfree. These categories had to do with the amount of service owed to the lord. Free peasants rented land to farm and owed only their rent to the lord. Unfree peasants, or serfs, farmed the lord's fields and could not leave the lord's manor. In return for their labor, they received their own small plot of land to farm. The daily life of peasants revolved around work. Most peasants raised crops and tended livestock (farm animals). every manor also had carpenters, shoemakers, smiths and other skilled workers. Peasant women worked in the fields when they were needed. They also cared for their children, their homes, and livestock.

1.7. Decline of Feudalism

The feudal system was essentially based on the relationship of reciprocal aid between lord and vassal but as that system became more complex over time, so this relationship weakened. Lords came to own multiple estates and vassals could be tenants of various parcels of land so that loyalties became confused and even conflicting with people choosing to honour the relationship that suited their own needs best. Another blow to the system came from sudden population declines caused by wars and plagues. By the 13th century CE, the increase in commerce and the greater use of coinage changed the way the feudal system worked. Money allowed lords to pay their sovereign instead of performing military service; the monarch's use of mercenaries then meant military service, and thus the barons themselves became less important to the defence of the realm.

Conversely, a monarch could now distribute money instead of land in his system of rewards. A rich merchant class developed with no ties of loyalty to anyone except their sovereign, their suppliers and their customers. Even serfs could sometimes buy their freedom and escape the circumstances into which they were born. All of these factors conspired to weaken the feudal system based on land ownership and service even if feudalism would continue beyond the medieval period in some forms and in some places. The rise of powerful monarchs in France, Spain, and England broke down the local organization. Another disruptive force was the increase of communication, which broke down the isolated manor, assisted the rise of towns, and facilitated the emergence of the burgess class. This process was greatly accelerated in the 14th cent. and did much to destroy the feudal classifications of society. The system broke down gradually. It was not completely destroyed in France until the French Revolution (1789), and it persisted in Germany until 1848 and in Russia until 1917. Many relics of feudalism still persist, and its influence remains on the institutions of Western Europe.

1.8. Debates

The scholars attach different meanings to it. Some scholars termed the feudalism or lord-vassal personal relationship as the core of medieval mode of production. According to Karl Marx, human history passed through five successive formations/modes: **primitive**(primitive Communism), **slavery**, in which land belonged to rich and labour was extracted from slaves, **feudalism** which land belonged to feudal lords and labour was done by the serfs, **capitalism** in which bourgeoisie controlled the industries and labour was provided by the proletariat, and **Socialism/Communism** where means and forces of production would be controlled commonly by the working class. However, others recognized it as a fief and the seigniorial-manorial system, whereas many others explained it in terms of a method of the government, which devolved powers and authority to the landed aristocracy under what Perry Anderson designates as “**scalar sovereignty**” or “**parcelized sovereignty.**”

Such a debate resurfaced with the emergence of the French Annals School of Thought during the 19th-20th century though Montesquieu had made its beginning long back in his classical work *The Spirit of Laws*. In their “stage theory” of the 20th century, the European radicals, Frederic Engels and Karl Marx, widened the scope of the debate while declaring feudalism as an important rather a basic stage for socialism. To Rushton Coulbourn, feudalism was “a method of government not an economic and social order/system, though it obviously modifies and is modified by the social and economic environment”. To Perry Anderson, it sounded a “specific organization in which large land ownership (of the feudal lords) with small peasant(who worked on it) extracted the surplus from the immediate producer by customary forms of extra-economic coercion—labour services, deliveries in kind, or rents in cash and where commodity exchange and labour mobility was correspondingly restricted.”

Indian scholars and scientists like Nurul Hasan, R. S. Sharma, Irfan Habib, Harbans Mukhia, D. D. Kosambi, etc. also engaged in the above debate. According to Nurul Hasan, feudalism was primarily “agrarian economy where the surplus is expropriated by a „fairly closed“ ruling class through both non-economic coercion and the role played by it in agriculture as well as the subsidiary handicrafts production.” Harbans Mukhia sees it as “a specific form of socio-economic organization of production in which the producer was neither an independent economic being nor was he completely separated from the means of production, and so was made economically dependent on the sale of his labour to lord to

supplement their income for sustenance.” Irfan Habib recognized fief and serfdom as very important to feudalism. Similarly, according to R. S. Sharma and B. N. S. Yadava, control over the peasant’s process of production by the landlords (serfdom) and decline of trade and urbanization were the core features of Indian feudalism.

2. Economy

The ninth century also saw Europe disrupted by the raids of the Vikings in the north, the Muslims in the south and the Hungarians in the east. The empire of Charlemagne was broken up in the bitter civil wars that erupted between his successors. The most important was the rise in agricultural productivity. Major innovations such as the heavy plough, the horse-collar and the three-field rotation system, combined with the widespread availability of land relative to the population, generated a high and rising level of output that sustained a substantial rise in population from the ninth to the 11th century.

2.1. Trade

The great Roman roads deteriorated over time, making overland transport difficult and expensive. Towns shrank, and came to serve a more local area than in Roman times. Traders and craftsmen mainly serviced the needs of the local rural populations. Trade in luxury goods between different parts of Europe never completely disappeared, and coinage survived the fall of the empire, though was much rarer than before. Most long-distance trade goods from within and beyond Europe, such as amber, high quality ceramics, textiles, wines, furs, honey, walrus ivory, spices, gold, slaves and elephant ivory, was carried in the small sailing ships of the day. Trade by sea was much cheaper than by land. The coasts and rivers of Europe were the main thoroughfares of the time, and the North Sea, and even more, the Mediterranean Sea, were the main thoroughfares for international commerce.

In towns, people with the same occupation formed groups called guilds. Many guilds were formed by trades people, such as goldsmiths, bakers, weavers, and dyers. Guilds made rules that controlled the quantity and quality of production. The guilds watched out for their members and worked to make sure everyone found employment. The formation of the guilds was one of the many unique aspects of life in Medieval Europe. The growth of trade led to the rise of banking. At first, banking was in the hands of Jewish moneylenders, who were able to use their links with Jewish communities throughout Europe and the Middle East to handle the

money needed for international trade. In the 13th century indigenous Italian banking houses grew up, with agencies as far afield as London and Paris. The financial centre of London became known as **Lombard Street** (Lombardy is another name for north Italy).

Regional specialization led to a growth of internal trade, especially through the systems of fairs, such as the famous ones of Champagne. Monasteries also made important economic contributions through the organization of their own productive activities and the movement of pilgrims. Cathedrals and castle building stimulated the construction industry. From 11th century, more stable conditions began to prevail in western Europe. Population began to increase, the volume of trade expanded, and towns in many parts of Europe multiplied in number and grew in size.

2.2. Market Economy

The expansion of trade drew more and more rural communities into the market economy, and links between countryside and towns grew stronger. Manors lost a large measure of their self-sufficiency as they participated more in the money economy. These developments stimulated the expansion of towns, of merchant communities, and of coinage. The **Black Death**, after great initial disruption, accelerated the spread of the markets in the longer term by creating a shortage of labour and thus boosting the purchasing power of both urban and rural workers. All over western Europe merchants became increasingly wealthy, and politically more powerful. Meanwhile the countryside languished, in levels of population if not in prosperity. In those areas where the influence of large towns and their trade was strongest, in southern England, Flanders and northern Italy and serfdom began to die out.

2.3. Agriculture

Agriculture in the Middle Ages describes the farming practices, crops, technology, and agricultural society and economy of Europe from the fall of the Western Roman Empire in 476 to approximately 1500. The open-field system was the prevalent agricultural system in much of Europe during the Middle Ages. Two patterns of cultivation were typical of the open-field system. In the first, the arable land was divided into two fields. One half was cultivated and the other one was left fallow every year. Crops were rotated between the two fields every year, with the fallow field being allowed to recover its fertility and used for livestock grazing when not dedicated to crops. A three-field pattern was typical of the later Middle Ages in northern

Europe with its wetter climate. One field was planted in fall, one field was planted in spring, and the third field was left fallow.

2.4. Manorial System

During the Middle Ages, the manor system was the basic economic arrangement. In Europe, land not belonging to the ruler or the Church was mostly divided into manor lands. Each manor was owned by a noble or knight who might have been given it by his lord as a fief. Manor lands were made up of the demesne (the lord's land) and the land serfs farmed to meet their own needs. The main part of a noble's land was called a manor. The center of a manor was the house where the lord and his family lived. Often the manor house was a fortified building or castle. Surrounding the manor house was the lord's estate. Much of the estate consisted of farmland.

Serfs were said to be **“bound to the soil.”** This meant that they were considered part of the property. They remained on the land if a new lord acquired it. Feudalism and manor life had a powerful effect on the medieval European economy. Peasants rarely traveled more than 25 miles from their own manor. By standing in the center of a plowed field, they could see their entire world at a glance. A manor usually covered only a few square miles of land. The manor was largely a self-sufficient community. The serfs and peasants raised or produced nearly everything that they and their lord needed for daily life— crops, milk and cheese, fuel, cloth, leather goods, and lumber. The only outside purchases were salt, iron, and a few unusual objects such as millstones. These were huge stones used to grind flour. Crops grown on the manor usually included grains, such as wheat, rye, barley, and oats, and vegetables, such as peas, beans, onions, and beets.

Marx explained feudalism in terms of a specific form of production having two exploitative methods, economic and extra-economic. Under the one, the feudal lords approximated the whole lot of economic benefits accruing from serfs' hard labour on the demesne, and under the other, they extracted from them unpaid additional services, the forced labour, for constructing roads and castles, tending herds, and other unpaid domestic services. While Henry Pirenne meant by feudalism a closed estate economy, where production was largely for consumption, and where trade was practically absent. Immanuel Wallerstein understood it as a “redistributive world system based on the extraction of the surplus produce of the agricultural producers in the form of tribute to an imperial or state

bureaucracy at a given level.” Frank Perlin explained feudalism as a “system wherein surplus was generated through the non-economic forces, the political and military power, backed by juridical institutions representing the permanent institutionality of the forces of repression.”

3. Religion and Culture

Medieval religion had deep significance and central importance in the lives of most individuals and nations. There was hardly any concept of a secular nation where religion did not play any role in the affairs of the states. Most people in the Middle Ages lived their lives fully believing in the reality of a spiritual realm all around them and in heaven or hell when they died. In the Middle Ages, the Church provided for the religious aspects of people's lives – baptism of babies, marriages, confession, the last rites for the dying and burying the dead. Monasteries and nunneries looked after the old and sick, provided somewhere for travellers to stay, gave alms to the poor and sometimes looked after people's money for them. Monks could often read and write when many other people could not, so they copied books and documents and taught children.

Many people chose a career in the Church or in a monastery. In 1300 one in twenty towns people was a cleric. Many knights tried to earn forgiveness for their sins by going on a Crusade. went on a pilgrimage to try to reduce the time they thought they would spend in purgatory. A person who had been on pilgrimage would wear a badge to show which shrine he had visited. Each shrine would have a different symbol that could be understood even by people who couldn't read or write. The symbols were a small bottle of oil (St Thomas Becket at Canterbury), a shell (St James of Compostela in Spain), a palm leaf (Jerusalem) and a cross keys (Rome). Jewish people were often attacked and in 1290 were expelled from England. In monasteries, Monks and nuns took vows of poverty (no money), chastity (no sex) and obedience (obeying the Abbot or Abbess). There were many different orders of monks, eg Benedictines, known as 'black monks' and Cistercians, known as 'white monks', named after the colour of the habits they wore. Monks usually live in closed communities.

2.1. Medieval Art

Medievalism is a system of belief and practice inspired by the Middle Ages of Europe which have been expressed in areas such as architecture, literature, music, art, philosophy, scholarship, and various vehicles of popular culture. Medieval art can be broadly categorised

into the **Byzantine art** of the Eastern Roman Empire, and the **Gothic art** that emerged in Western Europe over the same period.

2.1.1. Byzantine Art

It was strongly influenced by its classical heritage, but distinguished itself by the development of a new, abstract, aesthetic, marked by anti-naturalism and a favour for symbolism. The subject matter of monumental Byzantine art was primarily religious and imperial: the two themes are often combined, as in the portraits of later Byzantine emperors that decorated the interior of the sixth-century church of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople. However, the Byzantines inherited the early Christian distrust of monumental sculpture in religious art, and produced only reliefs in sharp contrast to the medieval art of the West, where monumental sculpture revived from Carolinian art onwards.

2.1.2. Migration Period Art

It includes the art of the Germanic tribes on the continent, as well the start of the distinct Insular art or Hiberno-Saxon art of the Anglo-Saxon and Celtic fusion in the British Isles. It covers many different styles of art including the polychrome style and the Scythian and Germanic animal style. Migration Period art developed into various schools of Early Medieval art in Western Europe which are normally classified by region

2.1.3. Romanesque art and Gothic Art

This art dominated Western and Central Europe from approximately 1000 AD to the rise of the Renaissance style in the 15th century or later, depending on region. The Romanesque style was greatly influenced by Byzantine and Insular art. Religious art, such as church sculpture and decorated manuscripts, was particularly prominent. Art of the period was characterised by a very vigorous style in both sculpture and painting. Colours tended to be very striking and mostly primary. Figures often varied in size in relation to their importance, and landscape backgrounds were closer to abstract decorations than realism. Gothic art developed from Romanesque art in Northern France the 12th century AD, led by the concurrent development of Gothic architecture. It spread to all of Western Europe and Southern and Central Europe.

2.2. Medieval Architecture

2.2.1. Romanesque Architecture

It is an architectural style of medieval Europe characterized by semi-circular arches. There is no consensus for the beginning date of the Romanesque style, with proposals ranging from the 6th to the 11th century. In the 12th century it developed into the Gothic style, marked by pointed arches. It is known by its massive quality, thick walls, round arches, sturdy pillars, groin vaults, large towers and decorative arcading. Each building has clearly defined forms, frequently of very regular, symmetrical plan; the overall appearance is one of simplicity when compared with the Gothic buildings

2.2.2. Gothic Architecture

It evolved from Romanesque architecture and was succeeded by Renaissance architecture. Its characteristics include the pointed arch, the ribbed vault (which evolved from the joint vaulting of Romanesque architecture) and the flying buttress. Gothic architecture is most familiar as the architecture of many of the great cathedrals, abbeys and churches of Europe.

3. Christianity

Christianity is an Abrahamic monotheistic religion based on the life and teachings of Jesus of Nazareth. Its adherents, known as Christians, believe that Jesus is the Christ, whose coming as the Messiah was prophesied in the Hebrew Bible, called the Old Testament in Christianity, and chronicled in the New Testament. Medieval Christianity was indeed an organised religion. Christians of the first and second centuries worshipped in small pockets throughout the Middle and Near East, and their religious practices differed from town to town. Moreover, Christianity was often outlawed under Roman law; many believers were persecuted and executed for professing their faith. Christianity underwent unification in the fourth century under the reign of Emperor Theodosius and through the theology of Bishop Augustine of Hippo (b. 356-d. 430). Almost seventy years after Constantine legalized Christianity, Theodosius established the Christian faith as the official religion of the Roman Empire. From then on, Christianity spread rapidly. Some converted to Christianity to advance in Roman society or out of fear of Roman authorities, but many converted willingly. These conversions

catapulted Christianity forward as a leading religion of the Roman Empire, which then encompassed most of Europe and North Africa.

Shortly after, Augustine became bishop of Hippo in North Africa. An adult convert to Christianity, Augustine came to be one of the most influential theologians in the history of the Christian church. Augustine provided significant explorations of the Trinity and human sinfulness, as well as the relationship between church and state. Augustine's numerous writings greatly influenced Christian thought from the fifth century to the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century and beyond. In the year 1054 C.E., the disagreements culminated in the "Great Schism" that divided Christianity into two major strands, Western and Eastern. Eastern Christianity includes the Orthodox churches, while Western Christianity includes the Catholic and Protestant churches.

Western Christianity flourished during the High Middle Ages of eleventh- to thirteenth-century Europe. Christianity inspired exquisite art, music, and architecture. The leader of the Western Christian church, the pope, was a major figure in European politics. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, however, the papacy lost some of its moral authority due to widespread corruption in the church, and many Christians began to question the power of Rome.

3.1. Church system

Religious practice in medieval Europe (c. 476-1500 CE) was dominated and informed by the Catholic Church. The majority of the population was Christian, and "Christian" at this time meant "Catholic" as there was initially no other form of that religion. The rampant corruption of the medieval Church, however, gave rise to reformers such as John Wycliffe (l. 1330-1384 CE) and Jan Hus (l. c. 1369-1415 CE) and religious sects, condemned as heresies by the Church, such as the Bogomils and Cathars, among many others. Even so, the Church maintained its power and exercised enormous influence over people's daily lives from the king on his throne to the peasant in the field.

The institutional Church can be divided into two unequal parts: the larger of the two was the secular church, and the other was the regular church, so called because its members followed a monastic rule (*regula*, in Latin). The secular church, attended by the general population, was carved into regions governed by archbishops, and their territory was in turn divided into areas known as diocese, which were administered by bishops. The parish church was the basic unit of the Christian community, providing the sacraments required by the lay

community. For most medieval Christians, religious experience was focused on a parish church which they attended on religious festivals. Religious orders can be categorised as monastic orders, mendicant orders, and military orders.

3.2. Church Structure

By the time of the Middle Ages, the Church had an established hierarchy:

- Pope – the head of the Church
- Cardinals – advisors to the Pope; administrators of the Church
- Bishops/Archbishops – ecclesiastical superiors over a cathedral or region
- Priests – ecclesiastical authorities over a parish, village, or town church
- Monastic Orders – religious adherents in monasteries supervised

The lives of the people of the Middle Ages revolved around the Church. People, especially women, were known to attend church three to five times daily for prayer and at least once a week for services, confession, and acts of contrition for repentance. The Church paid no taxes and was supported by the people of a town or city. Citizens were responsible for supporting the parish priest and Church overall through a tithe of ten percent of their income. Tithes paid for baptism ceremonies, confirmations, and funerals as well as saint's day festivals and holy day festivals such as Easter celebrations. The teachings of the Church were a certainty to the people of the Middle Ages.

4. Islam

Islam is an Abrahamic monotheistic religion teaching that Muhammad is a messenger of God. The Islamic era began in 622. Muslim-majority and Muslim-ruled societies underwent massive transformations during the medieval period. They went from being united under centralized, Arab-dominated caliphates like the Umayyads and Abbasids to being ruled by smaller, decentralized regional powers. Many of these regional powers were non-Arab or had different religious traditions. As a result, Muslim societies featured very different kinds of social organization. Within each society, complex social relations governed the lives of residents. People's lives were defined by their religion, ethnicity, social class, gender, and legal status. Because so many factors were involved, it's difficult to generalize about life in the Muslim world during this time. From the 11th to the 16th centuries many thousands of Turks

and Mongols migrated across the vast plains of Central Asia into the Middle East. They also adopted Islam.

4.1. Medieval Islamic society

The 'Islamic world' was not a single state in the Middle Ages, but the different countries which formed it had many things in common: It was united – the Umma was the community of all Muslim believers and shared a commitment to Islam. Religion and government were much more closely connected in the Muslim states than in feudal Europe. The ulama, the experts in Sharia law, were important religious scholars who advised the caliph, the leader of the umma. Until the 9th century the caliph was the religious and political leader of all Muslims. Later on, military leaders, known as amirs or sultans, dominated the caliphs, but the caliphs kept their spiritual role.

Islam began in the Arabian peninsula, and the first Islamic empires had a distinctly Arab character. The Umayyad Caliphate in particular gave preference to Arabs and used Arabic as its administrative language. Non-Arab Muslims, called **mawali**, Arabic for clients, were accorded lower status and paid higher taxes, though they often played important clerical roles. This created a lot of resentment against the Umayyads among the caliphate's non-Arab subjects. Ultimately, non-Arab Muslims, namely Persians, were incorporated into the Abbasid state, where they exerted considerable cultural influence. The Arab dominance of the Rashidun and Umayyad courts waned in the Abbasid Caliphate, and as Abbasid power declined, Persian, Turkic, and Berber powers rose in its place.

During the late Abbasid and post-Abbasid period, there were ethnic divisions within the military. Enslaved Turkic soldiers, called **ghilman or mamluks**, comprised a professional military class that was separate from the civilian population. This division of the military contributed to the rising power of the Turkic Mamluk dynasty. The most successful non-Arab regime was that of the Mamluks in Egypt, but many other Islamic states were governed by non-Arabs.

Medieval Islamic society was more patriarchal than early Islamic societies. Some of that influence came from Sasanian and Byzantine culture, through their ruling-class customs and other religious ideas. As Muslim societies integrated ideas from conquered regions, the cultures of these regions affected the interpretation of Islamic scripture as it related to gender. Elite women were also often educated. While they did not participate in official Islamic legal

bodies, they had their own educational institutions where they studied and taught religion and other subjects to other women. There were also Sufi convents, where women were able to live and worship. One notable Sufi mystic was Rabia of Basra, who lived in the eighth century and was known for her extreme piety. In legal matters, women did not act as judges, and their testimonies were not as valuable as those of their male counterparts. Christians and Jews were often integrated into societies and played roles in administrative, cultural, and scientific institutions. Over time, non-Muslims developed relationships with the caliphate. They were able to negotiate favorable policies which ensured that they had freedom over their religious practice.

Non-Muslims did not always enjoy the same legal and social privileges as Muslims, though. Sometimes they had restrictions on their dress, public religious display, professions, and places of worship. They also paid higher taxes and tariffs. Additionally, non-Muslim men could not marry Muslim women. However, these restrictions were enforced inconsistently. Harassment and exploitation of non-Muslims was often heightened during times of political and economic turmoil. Generally, non-Muslims were able to practice their religions and exerted some degree of autonomy in governing their own internal affairs and commercial activity. As a protected class, called **dhimmi**, they were accorded these freedoms provided they paid a special tax called a **jizya** and accepted Muslim rule.

MODULE II

Transition from Medieval to Modern

Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism-Debate- Maurice Dobb, Paul M Sweezy, Polanyi, etc.
-Absolutism in Europe

1. Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism

Feudalism was the politico-economic system that emerged in Europe in the 5th and 6th centuries. It served the needs of the medieval European society for more than six centuries. A system that existed for such a long period must have been useful and effective in its purpose of maintaining order and fulfilling the socio-economic needs of the people. But basically feudalism created a static system, marked by stratification, localism and exclusiveness. New forces appeared in European society around 12th-13th centuries -the forces which provided dynamic and expanding could not get along with a static and exclusive system like feudalism.

These forces grew in strength with the passage of time and eventually demolished the structure of feudalism, which had been obstructing their growth. The Crusades, which had begun in the late 11th century, dealt the first blow to feudalism by unleashing some of these new forces. The beginning of trade and commerce on a European scale and the rise of the East-West trade dealt the severest blow to the feudal system. The rise of nation-states and mercantilism further weakened feudalism. The geographical discoveries proved disastrous to feudalism as they helped the expansion of trade and commerce on a global scale. The Renaissance and Reformation further promoted trade and commerce and best symbolised the transition from feudalism to capitalism.

1.1. Causes

Several factors were responsible for the transition from feudalism to capitalism. It must be noted that the transition was a slow process. It began around the late 11th century with the beginning of Crusades in 1092, which dealt the first serious blow to feudalism and primarily ended with the three crucial happenings of world history, namely, the Geographical Discoveries, the Renaissance and the Reformation all taking place during 15th-16th centuries. In other words, the transition process itself took nearly five centuries to reach a certain point where we can claim that the age of feudalism was over.

1.1.1 'Crusade'

The term 'Crusade' stands for the religious war fought between the Christian and the Muslim powers, led by the Seljuk Turks. There was a total of seven Crusades lasting for two centuries. The first one beginning in 1092 and the seventh one ending in 1291. Beginning with the sole objective of freeing the Holy Land, consisting of Jerusalem, Bethlehem and Nazareth, from the invading hordes of Seljuk Turks, the Crusades helped the unruly and disorganized bands of European mercenaries and civilians to make deep inroads into the Middle East and Asia Minor. The Turks were driven out of the Holy Land, but they were able to regain the same by 1280. In that sense the Crusades failed to achieve the desired objective. The real significance is that they forced the feudal Europe to shake off its stratification, localism and exclusiveness and to stand united against the Muslim forces. The Crusades achieved further political and economic gains by freeing both eastern and western parts of the Mediterranean Sea from the Muslim control and gradually turning them into a thriving trade zone. In short, they hit hard at medieval feudal docility and seclusion, marked the rise of towns, promoted trade and commerce based on the guild system and made way for the advent of capitalism.

1.1.2. Trading and Commercial Activities

The period covering 12th and 13th centuries witnessed rise of trading and commercial activities. The growth of trade and commerce on a European level as well as world level occurred on such a scale that money economy was slowly but steadily making its appearance replacing the old subsistence economy. Exchange of goods or barter system became outdated. Money, coins and bills of exchange came into use for smooth and efficient conduct of business. This marked the primary stage of capitalism. With the rise of commercial activities, busy and lucrative trade zones came into existence in the 12th and 13th centuries. These zones were the northern trade zone and the mediterranean trade zone.

1.1.2.1. Northern trade zone: It covered a wide area that included the northern and western parts of Europe. It linked up the Baltic Sea region with the North Sea region with a thriving commercial relationship. The Baltic region contained Sweden, Denmark and the German towns of the Hanseatic League, while the North Sea region included England, France and the Flanders.

1.1.2.2. Mediterranean trade zone: The Mediterranean trade zone was much wider, with more trade routes and activities than the Northern trade zone. It was a trading zone through which European products went to the East and the eastern goods came to Europe.

1.2.1. Rise of Nation States

The period from 12th to 15th centuries witnessed the rise of nation states. meant that kings were becoming stronger at the cost of the feudal lords. The feudal estates were losing their identity as isolated and exclusive units and were coming more and more under the control of the monarchs. The rise of absolute national monarchies meant that the hitherto stratified, local and secluded feudal units were merging into the kingdom of the monarch. This was indeed a jolt to feudalism. The nation-state became a patron and promoter of commercial activities. And in encouraging trade and commerce the king not only thought of increasing state's revenue, but also his personal profit and gains. Thus, the nation-state became a factor for the rise of capitalism and its evolution very well symbolised the transition from feudalism to capitalism.

1.2.2. Mercantilism

This is the first stage of capitalism. It basically meant the state's control and monopoly of trade and commerce. The state formulated rules and regulations for guiding commercial activities. It also reflected the rise of towns during 11th 13th centuries and of 'town burghers', the community of merchants who accumulated a lot of wealth through commerce. In the rural areas also a capitalist class, the 'country knights' emerged, who made good fortune with agriculture. The kings, feudal lords and bandits all cast their greedy eyes on the wealth of this newly emerging capitalist class. The feudal elements particularly fleeced the merchant community through increasing taxes, tolls and even extortion.

1.2.3. Geographical Discoveries

This was motivated by the insecurity of the East-West trade route after the fall of Constantinople in 1453. The important discoveries of oceanic trade routes took place between 1488 and 1530. It effected unprecedented transformation in European society, economy and polity. The European commerce passed from the thalassic to oceanic stage, and from the regional to global stage. The discoveries symbolised a jolt to feudalism. The geographical discoveries actually symbolised the struggle of explorers, merchants and navigators against the feudal-dominated narrow medieval world. The discovery of the Indian and Atlantic Ocean routes and the finding and exploration of the New World all led to incredible expansion of commercial activities. It gave a great impetus to mercantile capitalism.

1.2.4. Commercial Revolution

It symbolised the zenith of mercantilism. It signified that trade and commerce not only expanded on an unprecedented scale, but their method, technique and management have also improved so much

during 16th to 18th centuries as to be called the Commercial Revolution. The Commercial Revolution very well illustrates the transition from feudalism to capitalism. The large business enterprises, the huge capital investment, the banking and Insurance systems and the technological innovations in sea-faring, all point to the fact that commercial activities had reached a sophisticated stage. Popularising the banking system was a great contribution of the Commercial Revolution. The banks immensely promoted trading activities. The early bankers were Italians hailing from Florence and Lombardy. marine insurance system helped in capital formation, while giving protection to ships on their long voyages. In addition to these, the scientific and technological developments in sea-faring further boosted commercial activities. Improvements were made in ship-building and in the making of compass, sextant and astrolabe. All these reflected the change from feudal economy to the fast expanding commercial capitalism.

1.2.5. Renaissance and Reformation

Both Renaissance and the Reformation stood for struggle against medieval systems. The Renaissance raised its voice against Scholasticism, and regarded the feudal system as docile and backward while the Reformation protested against the Pope-dominated church system. Moreover, the Renaissance glorified wealth in addition to wisdom. It very much promoted the cause of the 'nouveau riche' or the newly emerged rich merchant community. It endeavored endlessly to lead men from the narrow world of ignorance and superstition to the vast world of knowledge and wisdom. The Reformation, like its predecessor the Renaissance, gave the seal of approval to capitalism.

• Debate

Several historians and economist including Maurice Dobb, Paul M Sweezy, Polanyi, Rodney Hilton and Christopher Hill, joined the debate. In 1970, the work of Emmanuel Wallerstein, *THE ORIGINS OF MODERN WORLD SYSTEM*, Part 1 (1974) and Part II (1980), and Perry Anderson's two volumes - *PASSAGE FROM ANTIQUITY TO FEUDALISM* 1974, and *LINEGES OF THE ABSOLUTE STATE* 1974 and later Robert Brellner's three articles in the *PAST AND PRESENT*, 1976 and 1982 and the *NEW LEFT REVIEW*, 1977 renewed the debate. The debate was mainly about two points -whether the extension of external trade dissolved the feudal mode broke of production -"The exchange relations perspective; or whether the feudal mode down as a result of an inner contradiction In the feudal relations of production, i.e. the intensification of the extraction of the surplus by the nobility and its expenditure on unproductive activities such as war and luxury consumption -"property

relations" perspective. A new dimension related to the relevance of demography was raised, after the research between 1947 and 1954, and reformulations were made including the demographic determinism perspective; Perry Anderson's perspective is described as "**Marxist eclecticism**"

Brenner believed class struggle to be the cause rather than developments in the forces of production as being the determinants of various historical developments in the countries of the late medieval and early modern Europe. He concluded that a successful struggle by peasants to protect the integrity of the tenancy of their holdings led to a sort of historical regression, since small scale production by its very nature, is incapable of technological innovation and that it was proto-capitalist land owners and wall-to do yeomen who lay emphasis for a full-fledged capitalist agriculture. In medieval feudalism there was a long-term fall in the rate of feudal levy, beginning, according to Bois, during the expansion phase, when increasing numbers of peasant families were forced into sub-class of small holders without adequate substance. Takahashi argues that the belief that the emergence of money rent was somehow incompatible with the feudal economic relations is not borne out by evidence. He rejects Sweezy's thesis and suggests that the contradiction between feudalism and capitalism is not the contradiction between 'system of production for use' and 'system of production for market' but between feudal land and industrial capital.

2. Schools of thought

Three schools of thought regarding the rise of capitalism and decline of feudalism were based on the Market theory, the Marxists and the Demography.

2.1.1. Market theorists: The Market theorists were Henry Pirenne, Paul Sweezy and Immanuel Wallerstein. According to Pirenne, trade or "grand trade" which was different to the petty local trade, occupied the crucial position. He implied that feudalism, trade and urbanisation were alien to each other and visualised "grand trade" as external to feudalism.

2.1.2. Marxists: Perry Anderson, a Marxist, who stressed that changes in social relations must precede development of the productive forces. So far he was conforming the views of Dobb, Hilton and Brenner, but unlike them, he rejected the view that class struggle plays a decisive role in the germination as well as in the resolution of social crisis. Anderson stressed the importance of towns and international trade to the process of capitalist development. But these forces are seen to proceed from

an interaction between classical slave based and feudal social relations, rather than from some unspecified sphere external to the logic of feudalism.

2.1.3. Demographic: The Demographic Determinism Theory was supported by Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie of the Annales School, Malthusian model or Neo-Malthusian model, Michael Poston and Habakkuk of the Liberal School and Guy Bois, a Marxist. In 1950s, some new dimensions which had been neglected earlier by the Marxist historians, such as the relevance of demography, were added. Ladurie and Poston used the data from the church records to explain the long-term growth and the decline of the population in the middle ages and after. They have drawn attention to non human forces like climatic change, plague and pestilence, which along with social factors like the age of marriage, economic incentive to have large or small families, influence the demographic cycle.

3. Maurice Dobb

Maurice Herbert Dobb was a British economist at Cambridge University and a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. He is remembered as one of the pre-eminent Marxist economists of the 20th century. Maurice Dobb in his *STUDIES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM* in 1947, elaborated the Marxist debate over the western pattern of transition from feudalism to capitalism and this debate developed in the early 1950s round the journal "Science and society". His selected work are *Capitalist Enterprise and Social Progress*, *Political Economy and Capitalism: Some essays in economic tradition*, *Soviet Planning and Labour in Peace and War: Four Studies*, *On Economic Theory and Socialism*, *The Sraffa System and Critique of the Neoclassical Theory of Distribution etc.*

Dobb gives evidence of Eastern Europe where the very development of trade led to the reinforcement of feudal obligations between the 16th and 18th centuries, the period of "second serfdom" in Engel's phrase. Most historians believe as Witold Kula does, that every feudal enterprise, big or small, had both the "natural" and "monetary" sectors within it. A part of the estate produced for consumption and another for exchange.

This unending debate began with the publication of Maurice Dobb's stimulating work—"studies in the development of capitalism" (1946). It was vehemently challenged by Paul Sweezy, who also gained the support of Wallenstein. This debate expanded among wider range of historian who supported either Dobb or Sweezy. Dobb's views are strongly supported and elaborated by scholars such as Hilton, Porchnev, Hill, Takahashi, Anderson and many others.

His work challenged the 'Commercialisation Model'. In his work, he tried to highlight issues related to the factors responsible for the transition from feudal society to capitalist society. He provides the first major explanation for the decline of feudalism. Dobb asserts that the feudal economy can't simply be described as 'natural economy'. According to him, trade never disappeared from feudal society and in fact could be a significant part of the feudal society. Hence development of trade does it for the desolation of feudalism. According to Dobb and many other scholars like Hilton, Takahashi and Eric Hobsbawm, it is internal relationship of feudal mode of production that determines the system's disintegration. The absence of technology, low productivity, of the manorial economy, the attempts by lords to augment taxes, an increased need of revenue for wars, brigandage and crusades and the extravagances of the nobles, combined to act as a drain on feudal revenue and pushed feudalism towards crisis.

After the feudal crisis, feudal relations crumbled and the feudal mode of production reached an advanced stage of disintegration. But this didn't immediately lead to smooth capitalist relations. There was a period of transition, characterised by production that was neither feudal nor yet capitalist. Dobb argues that it were the internal factors within the feudal society he describes as 'dynamic mode of production' that led the transition towards capitalism. According to him, the wastage and inefficiency of the feudal mode of production brought about the crisis in the 14th century, with this the continuous wars and excessive exploitative nature of this system which caused a number of evidences of peasant protest accelerated the process towards transition. He also argued that this feudalism was a 2 stage process i.e. between 9th-17th century the society was feudal dominant and with the start of 18th century, the transition to capitalism took place.

According to Dobb, while defining feudalism Sweezy gives over emphasis on the nature of circulation and consumption to determine the nature of feudal mode of production, which was incorrect because in the Marxist mode of production, the nature of production determined the nature of consumption and not vice-versa. The factors pointed out as external according to Dobb, were actually internal processes. Dobb believes that trade and market were important for feudalism as any other market. He also points out that the merchant class was not extinct in feudal system, as they traded in luxurious objects and the trade that emerged during 14th-17th century was feudal trading class.

4. Paul Sweezy

He was a Marxist economist, political activist, publisher, and founding editor of the long-running magazine "Monthly Review". He is best remembered for his contributions to economic theory as one

of the leading Marxian economists of the second half of the 20th century. His most important work are *The Theory of Capitalist Development*, *The Present as History: Reviews on Capitalism and Socialism*, *The Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism*, *Post-Revolutionary Society: Essays*, *The Limits of Imperialism*, *Four lectures on Marxism and Modern Capitalism and Other Essays*.

Sweezy objects Dobb's identification of feudalism and his explanation for the transition, he is of the opinion that Dobb's theory has a number of problems associated with it. He is of the opinion that there was no major historical work to support Dobb's analysis and the major works that are present are against his theory. There are significant aspects in his analysis that no historical evidence supports and does not sustain his analysis (such as the 'stage of realisation'). He also critiques Dobb for projecting the internal factors responsible for the transition but he fails to explain the motor force resulting only in transition to capitalism. He also objects Dobb's identification of feudalism with 'serfdom' as interchangeable terms, and calls his definition inadequate. He also disagrees with Dobb's analysis that the transition process was a 2 stage process as for him it was a 3 stage process (i.e. 9th-14th century, feudalism was a dominant process; 14th-17th century was an interim phase which was distinct from both feudalism and capitalism in its economic, social and political characters, and the last was the 18th century which saw the rise of capitalism.

According to Paul Sweezy, the distinctive feature of feudalism was its objective of production (i.e. for self-consumption rather than for market). Hence, it is a mode of production that lacks trade and market. Sweezy along with the support from Wallenstein bring out the role of market and exchange economy in the decline of feudalism and rise of capitalism. Sweezy provides an alternative antithetical view. He adopts a market centric approach called "commercial model". According to him, the rise of exchange economy that led to monetization of relations between feudal lords and the peasants mass somehow signalled the dissolution of feudalism. He believes that the external factor was the prime mover, as he identifies primarily the expansion of trade.

He explains that the revival of long distance trade in the 14th century played an important role in the transformation. Also the emergence of urban centres acted as magnets to the over-exploited peasants and led to mass migration resulting in the dissolution of feudal ties and relations. These new centres emerged politically outside the feudalism and belonged to the new class of merchants, the urban centre economy was no longer a self-production unit. He believed that it was the emergence of urban centres that led to the decline of feudalism as without it, the emergence of long distance trade could not bring the change and the new social class of merchants that emerged in these centres provided leadership to the process of transition.

One of the liveliest academic debates in relate to the question of what led to the decline of feudalism and the rise of capitalism. It is commonly identified as the ‘transition debate’. The Dobb-Sweezy transition debate began between the Marxists and later amongst shifted to the Marxist and non-Marxist scholars too. The main controversy began on the issues such as the causes that led to the transition, whether these were internal or external; the principal social class responsible for this transition and the class that dominated the society during this change; whether it was market or the class struggle that delivered the output of this transition and the second issue was the stages in the transition [whether it was a result of two stages (Dobb) or three stages (Sweezy)]. Dobb calls long distance trade as a subordinate cause which Sweezy has pointed as the principle cause. Dobb also believes that class equilibrium that Sweezy believes, can never exist and was his piece of imagination as it was thearistocrat class that was dominant and the subsequent works prove it. The debate between Dobb and Sweezy was on every aspect of this transition. For Dobb, the definition of feudalism has 2 key aspects (force of labour, form of exploitation) whereas for Sweezy it was the objective of production that was of importance. Dobb called feudalism as a dynamic mode of production to which Sweezy disagreed and instead called it a static mode of production.

5. Karl Polanyi

Karl Polanyi, a 20th century’s anthropologist and economic historian, criticized economics based on liberalism and utilitarianism, because he saw human groups as asocial band rather than the sum of individuals. Within the context of the social sciences, Karl Polanyi is usually viewed as the “father” of the concept of embeddedness. His selected work are *The Great Transformation*, *Universal Capitalism or Regional Planning?*, *Trade and Markets in the Early Empires*, *For a New West: Essays etc.*

For Polanyi, Embeddedness means that the economy is immersed in social relations, i.e., it cannot be a separate, autonomous sphere vis-a-vis society as a whole. The formalist approach is based on an ontological scarcity of the means for providing to human needs, and takes as its object of analysis the discrete (“rational”) individual who seeks to maximize his gains, i.e., it stays within the predicates of *homo economicus*. According to Polanyi, the formalist schema – based on the neoclassical model of economic theory – can only be applied to the study of modern capitalist economies, where price-making markets play a crucial role. The substantivist approach, on the other hand, in its effort to study the role of the economy within society, deals with the institutional forms taken by the process of satisfaction of human needs in different societies, both past and present, its main concern being sufficiency rather than efficiency.

Polanyi argued that the development of the modern state went hand in hand with the development of modern market economies and that these two changes were inextricably linked in history. Essential to the change from a premodern economy to a market economy was the altering of human economic mentalities away from their grounding in local social relationships and institutions, and into transactions idealized as "rational" and set apart from their previous social context. Prior to the great transformation, markets had a very limited role in society and were confined almost entirely to long distance trade. The great transformation was begun by the powerful modern state, which was needed to push changes in social structure, and in what aspects of human nature were amplified and encouraged, which allowed for a competitive capitalist economy to emerge. For Polanyi, these changes implied the destruction of the basic social order that had reigned throughout pre-modern history.

Polanyi argues that once the free market attempts to separate itself from the fabric of society, social protectionism is society's natural response, which he calls the "double movement". Polanyi did not see economics as a subject closed off from other fields of enquiry, indeed he saw economic and social problems as inherently linked. He ended his work with a prediction of a socialist society, noting, "after a century of blind 'improvement', man is restoring his 'habitation.'"

6. Absolutism in Europe

Age of Absolutism

Absolutism is a term used by historians to describe a form of monarchical power that is unlimited by any other institution, such as the church, parliament, or social elites. The absolute monarch exercises ultimate authority over the state and his subjects, as both head of state and head of government. In an absolute monarchy there is no constitution or legal restriction on the monarch's power. Absolute monarchy is normally hereditary or passed on through marriage. The term Absolutism is typically used in combination with some European monarchs during the transition from Feudalism to early Capitalism, and monarchs described as absolute can especially be found in the 17th century through the 18th century. The Age of Absolutism is usually thought to begin with the reign of Louis XIV (1643–1715) and ends with the French Revolution (1789).

6.1. Features of Absolute Rule

Absolutists made sure that the key elements of national government would be solely placed into the hands of the monarch: the armed forces, tax collection, and the judicial system. These were powers normally enjoyed by the local nobility in their territories; the national administration of these functions, however, required the formation of a nationwide bureaucracy whose officials were answerable to the

king alone. Consequently, this new type of bureaucracy had to make a stand against the most powerful institutional forces opposed to the king: the nobility, the church, legislative bodies (parliaments), and regions which had been autonomous until then. Apart from the rise of professional bureaucracies, absolute states featured a national legislation, a national jurisdiction, a large, standing military under the direct control of the king, and a national tax collection mechanism in which taxes went straight to the national government (i. e. the king's treasury) rather than passing through the hands of the local nobility. Absolute monarchs spent exorbitant sums on warfare and extravagant buildings, such as the Palace of Versailles, for themselves and the nobility. They often required the nobles to live at court for some time, while state officials ruled their lands in their absence. Behind this was the idea to reduce the effective power of the nobility by making them become reliant upon the munificence of the monarch.

6.2. Foundations of Royal Absolutism

Absolute monarchies often gave birth to ideologies that eloquently justified the power exercised by the absolutist monarch. Political and religious doctrines of royal absolutism were either based on the Divine Right of Kings or a variation of the Social Contract Theory.

6.3.1. Divine Right of Kings

The Divine Right of Kings states that a monarch is subject to no earthly authority since he derives the right to rule directly from God. As a consequence, he is not subject to the will of his people, the clergy or the nobility. The Divine Right of Kings implies that whoever might attempt to remove the king from his office or restrict his powers runs contrary to the will of God and thus commits heresy. In England the same theory surfaced under the reign of King James I of England (1603–25). In the book "The True Law of Free Monarchies" (1598), James categorically proclaimed his own ideas of kingship, explaining that for biblical reasons kings are higher beings than other men: "Kings are called gods because they sit upon God His throne in earth". During the reign of King Louis XIV of France, the theory of divine right was strongly promoted by the French bishop and theologian Jacques Benigne Bossuet (1627–1704). Court preacher to Louis XIV, Bossuet was a strong advocate of political absolutism. The theory of divine right disappeared in England after the Glorious Revolution of 1688. The American(1776) and French (1789) Revolutions further weakened its appeal, and by the early twentieth century, it was given up completely.

6.3.2. Social Contract Theory

The first modern philosopher to articulate this kind of theory was Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679). In his book *Leviathan* (1651), Hobbes argues for a social contract and rule by an absolute monarch. According to Hobbes, life without a strong central government would lead to chaos and civil war since, in this “state of nature”, each person has the natural right to everything. Thus people’s lives would be “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short”. To escape from the state of nature, people agree on a social contract and thus establish a society. All individuals in that society transfer their natural rights to the monarch for the sake of protection. But peace comes at a stiff price: any abuse of power by bad rulers has to be accepted. There is no right to resist and the process of transferring one’s rights to the king is irreversible.

6.3.3. Enlightened Absolutism

Enlightened absolutism is a form of absolute monarchy in which rulers were influenced by the Age of Enlightenment. Enlightened monarchs tended to allow religious toleration, freedom of speech and the press, and the right to hold private property. Most of them patronized the arts, sciences, and education. Their ideas about royal power were often similar to those of absolute monarchs, in as much as they believed that they were entitled to govern by right of birth and generally refused to grant constitutions. In particular, the Holy Roman Emperor, Joseph II (1765–1790), can be said to have fully embraced the ideas of Enlightenment. In the true spirit of the movement, he stressed his ambitions to improve the lives of his subjects when he said: “Everything for the people, nothing by the people.” He quickly proceeded to realize his ideal of enlightened absolutism. Among his reforms were the emancipation of the peasantry, the spread of education, the freedom of worship and the compulsory use of the German language (replacing Latin or local languages). He also abolished the death penalty. However, many of his reforms did not last and were taken back by his successors.

6.3.4. Absolutism In England

6.3.4.1. English Civil Wars (1642–46)

The English Civil Wars are traditionally considered to have begun in England in August 1642, when Charles I raised an army against the wishes of Parliament, ostensibly to deal with a rebellion in Ireland. Throughout the 1640s, war between king and Parliament ravaged England, but it also struck all of the kingdoms held by the house of Stuart and, in addition to war between the various British and

Irish dominions, there was civil war within each of the Stuart states. For this reason the English Civil Wars might more properly be called the British Civil Wars the Wars of the Three Kingdoms. The wars finally ended in 1651 with the flight of Charles II to France and, with him, the hopes of the British monarchy.

6.3.4.2. Oliver Cromwell

Cromwell was elected as a Member of Parliament for Huntingdon in 1628. The First English Civil War began in August 1642, and Oliver Cromwell joined the war effort of the parliamentary army, leading an early military engagement in the conflict. In 1644 he became a Lieutenant General in the Eastern Association Cavalry, and was instrumental in a Parliament victory at Marston Moor, where his actions earned him the nickname “Ironsides”. In 1648, the second English Civil War commenced, and Cromwell returned to the battlefield. He began a campaign by ending an uprising of Royalists in South Wales, and then annihilated the Scottish Army at the battle of Preston. After the King’s execution, a Council of State was instituted in place of a monarchy. This council ordered Cromwell to take Ireland in 1649, followed by Scotland in 1650. Cromwell led his armies into battle at Worcester, in September of 1651, and the resulting victory united England, Scotland, and Ireland, into the Commonwealth. December of 1653 saw Cromwell appointed Lord Protector, the administrator of government and chief magistrate of the Commonwealth. He was offered the crown at one point by parliament, but declined the offer. A constitution decreed that if he wished to call or dissolve a parliament, he must receive a majority vote from the Council of State. This check on power led to the ruling that a monarch of England, without parliament’s approval, cannot govern.

6.3.4.3. Whig and Tory

The Whigs were a political faction and then a political party in the parliaments of England, Scotland, Great Britain, Ireland and the United Kingdom. The Whigs played a central role in the Glorious Revolution of 1688 and were the standing enemies of the Stuart kings and pretenders, who were Roman Catholic. Tory is the Conservative Party, officially the Conservative and Unionist Party, and also known colloquially as the Tories or simply the Conservatives, is a political party in the United Kingdom. Ideologically, the Conservatives sit on the centre-right of the British political spectrum. The Whig Party was one of the main political parties active between the late 17th and mid-19th centuries in England. Because of its social and religious tolerance, it is considered antithetical to the Tory Party. The formal name of the Whig Party was originally the ‘Country Party’. In general, the Whigs supported great aristocratic families and the non-Anglicans (dissenters like the Presbyterians), whereas the Tories

gave their support to the Anglican Church and to the small nobility. Later, the Whigs met the interests of the emerging industrial class and wealthier merchants. The Tories, on the other hand, gathered the support of landowners and members of the British Crown.

6.3.4.4. Glorious Revolution of 1688

Glorious Revolution, also called Revolution of 1688 or Bloodless Revolution, in English history, the events of 1688–89 that resulted in the deposition of James II and the accession of his daughter Mary II and her husband, William III, prince of Orange and stadholder of the United Provinces of the Netherlands. James II of England (VII of Scotland) was the second surviving son of Charles I; he ascended the throne upon the death of his brother, Charles II, in 1685. During his short reign, James became directly involved in the political battles between Catholicism and Protestantism and between the Divine Right of Kings and the political rights of the Parliament of England. James's greatest political problem was his Catholicism, which left him alienated from both parties in England. However, the facts that he had no son and his daughters were Protestants were a "saving grace." James's attempt to relax the Penal Laws alienated Tories, his natural supporters, because they viewed this as tantamount to disestablishment of the Church of England. Abandoning the Tories, James looked to form a "King's party" as a counterweight to the Anglican Tories, so in 1687 he supported the policy of religious toleration and issued the Declaration of Indulgence. By allying himself with the Catholics, Dissenters, and Nonconformists, James hoped to build a coalition that would advance Catholic emancipation. Matters came to a head in June 1688, when the king had a son, James. Until then, the throne would have passed to his daughter Mary, a Protestant.

6.3.4.5. Conspiracy:

Mary and her husband, her cousin William Henry of Orange, were both Protestants and grandchildren of Charles I of England. William was also stadtholder of the main provinces of the Dutch Republic. He had already acquired the reputation of being the main champion of the Protestant cause against Catholicism and French absolutism. In the developing English crisis, he saw an opportunity to prevent an Anglo-French alliance and bring England to the anti-French side by carrying out a military intervention directed against James. This suited the desires of several English politicians who intended to depose James. It is still a matter of controversy whether the initiative for the conspiracy was taken by the English or by the stadtholder and his wife.

On June 30, 1688, a group of seven Protestant nobles invited the Prince of Orange to come to England with an army. By September, it became clear that William would invade England. William arrived on November 5. James refused a French offer to send an expeditionary force, fearing that it would cost him domestic support. He tried to bring the Tories to his side by making concessions, but failed because he still refused to endorse the Test Act. His forward forces had gathered at Salisbury, and James went to join them on November 19 with his main force, having a total strength of about 19,000. Amid anti-Catholic rioting in London, it rapidly became apparent that the troops were not eager to fight, and the loyalty of many of James's commanders was doubtful. Meanwhile, on November 18, Plymouth had surrendered to William, and on November 21, William began to advance. In December, William's forces met with the king's commissioners to negotiate. James offered free elections and a general amnesty for the rebels. In reality, by that point he was simply playing for time, having already decided to flee the country. James was received in France by his cousin and ally, Louis XIV, who offered him a palace and a pension.

6.3.4.6. Bill of Rights

The status of William and Mary in England was unclear while James, though now in France, still had many supporters in the country. In order to avoid James's return to the throne, and facing opposition in Parliament, William let it be known that he was happy for Mary to be queen in name and for preference in the succession given to Princess Anne's (Mary's sister) children over any of William's. Anne declared that she would temporarily waive her right to the crown should Mary die before William, and Mary refused to be made queen without William as king. The Lords accepted the words "abdication" and "vacancy" and Lord Winchester's motion to appoint William and Mary monarchs. The decision was made in light of a great fear that the situation might deteriorate into a civil war. Although their succession to the English throne was relatively peaceful, much blood would be shed before William's authority was accepted in Ireland and Scotland.

The proposal to draw up a statement of rights and liberties and James's invasion of them was first made in January in the Commons, but what would become the Bill of Rights did not pass until December 1689. The Bill was a restatement in statutory form of The Declaration of Rights presented by the Convention Parliament to William and Mary in February 1689, inviting them to become joint sovereigns of England. The Bill of Rights lay down limits on the powers of the monarch and set out the rights of Parliament, including the requirement for regular parliaments, free elections, and freedom of speech in Parliament. It set out certain rights of individuals, including the prohibition of cruel and

unusual punishment, and reestablished the liberty of Protestants to have arms for their defense within the rule of law. Furthermore, the Bill of Rights described and condemned several misdeeds of James II of England. These ideas reflected those of the political thinker John Locke, and they quickly became popular in England.

The Glorious Revolution of 1688 is considered by some as one of the most important events in the long evolution of the respective powers of Parliament and the Crown in England. The passage of the Bill of Rights stamped out once and for all any possibility of a Catholic monarchy and ended moves towards absolute monarchy in the British kingdoms by circumscribing the monarch's powers. These powers were greatly restricted. He or she could no longer suspend laws, levy taxes, make royal appointments, or maintain a standing army during peacetime without Parliament's permission. Since 1689, government under a system of constitutional monarchy in England, and later the United Kingdom, has been uninterrupted. Also since then, Parliament's power has steadily increased while the Crown's has steadily declined.

MODULE III

Emergence of Modern World

Intellectual Trends- Renaissance- Enlightenment- Idea of Progress, Humanism, Secularism and Rationalism- French revolution- Background and Impact.

1. Intellectual Trends

People tend to think of intellectual trends as primarily based on reason and logic. Reason is the capacity of consciously making sense of things, applying logic, and adapting or justifying practices, institution, and beliefs based on new or existing information. Aristotle drew a distinction between logical discursive reasoning (reason proper), and intuitive reasoning, in which the reasoning process through intuition—however valid—may tend toward the personal and the subjectively opaque. But intellectual trends and systems of thought are subject to social mood just like other social trends. Great thinkers are affected by emotions like everyone else, and their ideas must find a welcoming environment in order to take hold and be generally accepted or influential. Some ideas have taken centuries to gain a foothold. For example, heliocentrism, the concept that Earth revolves around the sun, was proposed as early as the third century BC but was not widely accepted for many centuries. In the 17th century, Galileo's championing of heliocentrism caused him to be tried by the Roman Inquisition. He was found guilty of heresy, forced to recant, and spent the rest of his life under house arrest. Bob Prechter has written about how various historical eras and their thinking were propelled by social mood: the negative social mood of the Dark Ages with its superstitious beliefs and anti-intellectual environment; the positive mood of the Age of Reason and the Enlightenment with the emergence of an emphasis on rationality and science. And within various disciplines, social mood influences artistic, literary, and sociopolitical thought and trends.

1.1. Intellectual History

It is the study of the history of human thought and of intellectuals, people who conceptualize, discuss, write about, and concern themselves with ideas. The investigative premise of intellectual history is that ideas do not develop in isolation from the thinkers who conceptualize and apply those ideas; thus the historian of intellect studies ideas in two contexts: **(i)** as abstract propositions for critical application; and **(ii)** in concrete terms of culture, life, and history. As a field of intellectual enquiry, the history of ideas emerged from the European disciplines of Cultural History and Intellectual History

from which historians might develop a global intellectual history that shows the parallels and the interrelations in the history of critical thinking in every society.

The concerns of intellectual history are the intelligentsia and the critical study of the ideas expressed in the texts produced by intellectuals; therein the difference between intellectual history from other forms of Cultural History that study visual and non-verbal forms of evidence. Intellectual history can frequently involve a close reconstruction of philosophical arguments as they have been recorded in formal philosophical texts. In this respect intellectual history may bear a noteworthy resemblance to philosophy, and most especially, the history of philosophy. But intellectual history remains importantly distinct from philosophy for a number of reasons. Most importantly, philosophy tends to disregard differences of history or cultural context so as to concentrate almost exclusively upon the internal coherence of philosophical arguments in themselves. Intellectual historians want chiefly to “understand”—rather than, say, to “defend” or “refute”—a given intellectual problem or perspective, and they therefore tend to be skeptics about the philosophers’ belief in decontextualized evaluation.

● Renaissance

The Renaissance is one of the most interesting and disputed periods of European history. Many scholars see it as a unique time with characteristics all its own. A second group views the Renaissance as the first two to three centuries of a larger era in European history usually called early modern Europe, which began in the late fifteenth century and ended on the eve of the French Revolution (1789) or with the close of the Napoleonic era (1815). Renaissance began in Italy about 1350 and in the rest of Europe after 1450 and that it lasted until about 1620. It was a historical era with distinctive themes in learning, politics, literature, art, religion, social life, and music. Renaissance developments influenced subsequent centuries, but not so much that the Renaissance as a whole can be called "modern."

The word “Renaissance,” whose literal translation from French into English is “Rebirth,” appears in English writing from the 1830s. The word occurs in Jules Michelet’s 1855 work, *Histoire de France*. The word “Renaissance” has also been extended to other historical and cultural movements, such as the Carolingian Renaissance and the Renaissance of the 12th century. The term "Renaissance" comes from the Renaissance. Several Italian intellectuals of the late fourteenth and the early fifteenth centuries used the term *rinascità* ('rebirth or "Renaissance") to describe their own age as one in which learning, literature, and the arts were reborn after a long, dark Middle Age. Italian humanists invented the concept of the "Middle Ages" to describe the years between about 400 and 1400. Northern Europeans

accepted the historical periodization of ancient, medieval, and Renaissance and added a religious dimension.

2.1. Italian Renaissance

The Italian Renaissance began in Tuscany, centered in the cities of Florence and Siena. It later had a significant impact in Venice, where the remains of ancient Greek culture provided humanist scholars with new texts. The Italian Renaissance peaked in the late-fifteenth century as foreign invasions plunged the region into turmoil. The Italian Renaissance is best known for its cultural achievements. They include works of literature by such figures as Petrarch, Castiglione, and Machiaveli; works of art by artists such as Michelangelo and Leonardo da Vinci; and great works of architecture, such as The Duomo in Florence and St. Peter's Basilica in Rome.

2.2. Cultural, Political, and Intellectual Influences

As a cultural movement, the Renaissance encompassed the innovative flowering of Latin and vernacular literatures, beginning with the 14th-century resurgence of learning based on classical sources, which contemporaries credited to Petrarch; the development of linear perspective and other techniques of rendering a more natural reality in painting; and gradual but widespread educational reform. In politics, the Renaissance contributed the development of the conventions of diplomacy, and in science an increased reliance on observation. Although the Renaissance saw revolutions in many intellectual pursuits, as well as social and political upheaval, it is perhaps best known for its artistic developments and the contributions of such polymaths as Leonardo da Vinci and Michelangelo, who inspired the term "Renaissance man."

Renaissance states had three basic forms of government: princedoms, monarchies, and oligarchies, which the Renaissance called republics.

2.2.1. Princedoms

A prince was an individual, whether called duke, count, marquis, or just signore (lord), who ruled a state, usually with the support of his family. The term "prince" meant the authority to make decisions concerning all inhabitants without check by representative body, constitution, or court. He often had displaced another ruler or city council by force, war, assassination, bribery, diplomacy, purchase, marriage, or occasionally because the city invited him in to quell factionalism. Princely power was seldom absolute. Most princes depended on some accommodation with powerful forces within the state, typically the nobility or the merchant community.

2.2.2. Monarchie

Monarchies typically were larger than princedoms and ruled subjects speaking multiple languages and dialects. Monarchies usually had developed laws and rules that determined the succession in advance. Monarchies grew in power and size in the Renaissance

2.2.3 Republics

The smallest and most unusual political unit was the city-state consisting of a major town or city and its surrounding territory of farms and villages. Oligarchies, usually drawn from the merchant elite of the town, ruled republics. Borrowing terminology and legal principles from ancient Roman law and local tradition, the men who formed oligarchies called their governments “republican” and their states “republics.” They believed that their rule was based on the consent of the people who mattered.

2.3. Historical Perspectives

The Renaissance has a long and complex historiography, and in line with general skepticism of discrete periodizations there has been much debate among historians reacting to the 19th-century glorification of the Renaissance and individual culture heroes as “Renaissance men,” questioning the usefulness of “Renaissance” as a term and as a historical delineation. Some observers have called into question whether the Renaissance was a cultural advance from the Middle Ages, seeing it instead as a period of pessimism and nostalgia for classical antiquity, while social and economic historians, especially of the *longue durée* (long-term) have focused on the continuity between the two eras, which are linked, as Panofsky observed, “by a thousand ties.”

- **Renaissance in Art**

Art and Architecture is undoubtedly the best-loved and -known part of the Renaissance. The Renaissance produced an extraordinary amount of art, and the role of the artist differed from that in the Middle Ages. The Renaissance had a passion for art. Commissions came from kings, popes, princes, nobles, and lowborn mercenary captains. Leaders commissioned portraits of themselves, of scenes of their accomplishments, such as successful battles, and of illustrious ancestors. A remarkable feature of Renaissance art was the heightened interaction between patron and artist. The new styles came from Italy, and Italy produced more art than any other part of Europe. Art objects of every sort were among

the luxury goods that Italy produced and exported. It also exported artists, such as Leonardo da Vinci. Artists and humanists studied the surviving buildings and monuments, read ancient treatises available for the first time, and imbibed the humanist emphasis on man and his actions and perceptions, plus the habit of sharp criticism of medieval styles.

Stimulated by the ancients, Renaissance artists were the first in European history to write extensively about art and themselves. Leon Battista Alberti (1404–1472) wrote treatises on painting (1435) and on architecture (1452); Raphael wrote a letter to Pope Leo X (c. 1519) concerning art. Giorgio Vasari's (1511–1574) *Lives of the Artists* (first edition 1550, revised edition 1568) was a series of biographies of Renaissance artists accompanied by his many comments about artistic styles. It was the first history of art. The silversmith Benvenuto Cellini (1500–1571) wrote about artistic practices and much more about himself, much of it probably fictitious, in his *Autobiography*, written between 1558 and 1566.

Leonardo da Vinci is admired as a scientist, an academic, and an inventor, he is most famous for his achievements as the painter of several Renaissance masterpieces. da Vinci's work unique are the innovative techniques that he used in laying on the paint, his detailed knowledge of anatomy, his use of the human form in figurative composition, and his use of sfumato. All of these qualities are present in his most celebrated works, the *Mona Lisa*, *The Last Supper*, and the *Virgin of the Rocks*. Michelangelo was a 16th century Florentine artist renowned for his masterpieces in sculpture, painting, and architectural design. Michelangelo was a 16th century Florentine artist renowned for his masterpieces in sculpture, painting, and architectural design. His most well known works are the *David*, the *Last Judgment*, and the *Basilica of Saint Peter's* in the Vatican.

2.4.1. Florentine School

It is a major Italian school of art that flourished between the 13th and 16th centuries, extending from the Early Renaissance to the crisis of Renaissance culture. The founder of the Florentine school was Giotto, whose work placed Florence in the foreground of pre-Renaissance art. The work of his successors, who included Taddeo Gaddi and Maso di Banco, developed along the lines he had originated. A leading role in the development of Early Renaissance art in Italy was played by the architect Filippo Brunelleschi, the sculptor Donatello, and the painter Masaccio. The *quattrocento* art of the Florentine school was marked by a consistent interest in realism and by a passionate concern for the theory and practice of perspective and other problems concerning the relationship between art and the empirical sciences

2.4.2. Venetian School

Venetian School School of Italian painting that flourished in the 15th, 16th, and 18th centuries. The Venetian School refers to the distinctive art that developed in Renaissance Venice beginning in the late 1400's, and which, led by the brothers Giovanni and Gentile Bellini, lasted until 1580. It's also called the Venetian Renaissance, and its style shared the Humanist values, the use of linear perspective, and naturalistic figurative treatments of Renaissance art in Florence and Rome.

2.5. Renaissance in Architecture

The Renaissance refers to the era in Europe from the 14th to the 16th century in which a new style in painting, sculpture and architecture developed after the Gothic. There was a revival of ancient Roman forms, including the column and round arch, the tunnel vault, and the dome. The basic design element was the order. Michelangelo is given credit for designing St. Peter's Basilica. Michelangelo's chief contribution was the use of a symmetrical plan of a Greek Cross form and an external masonry of massive proportions, with every corner filled in by a stairwell or small vestry. The effect is of a continuous wall surface that is folded or fractured at different angles, lacking the right angles that usually define change of direction at the corners of a building. This exterior is surrounded by a giant order of Corinthian pilasters all set at slightly different angles to each other, in keeping with the ever-changing angles of the wall's surface. Above them the huge cornice ripples in a continuous band, giving the appearance of keeping the whole building in a state of compression.

Renaissance architects found a harmony between human proportions and buildings. Filippo Brunelleschi is considered the first Renaissance architect. Some historians consider the start of the Renaissance to be 1419, when he won the commission to build the dome above the cathedral of Florence. This dome was an ambitious undertaking as it was to be the largest dome built since the Pantheon in Ancient Rome, which had been built 1500 years earlier. Leon Battista Alberti's *Ten Books on Architecture*, inspired by Vitruvius, became a bible of Renaissance architecture. The Sistine Chapel is a chapel that is part of the official residence of the Pope in Vatican City, this building is most noted for its ceilings painted by Michelangelo. Palazzo Pitti, Originally built in 1458 for Florence banker Luca Pitti, this palace later became part of the Medici family empire. El Escorial is the majestic building was built in the late 1500s as the palace of the King of Spain. It is laid out in orderly symmetric squares as shown in the picture below. Some believe that the floor plan was to mimic Solomon's Temple. Pazzi Chapel, this chapel is said to be a masterpiece of the simple form of the architecture of the time. It is thought that the original design was by Filippo Brunelleschi even though the building wasn't finished until nearly 20 years after his death

2.6. Renaissance in literature

With the advent of the printing press in 1440, the development of vernacular languages, and the weakening influence of the Catholic Church on daily life, among other historic events, Renaissance writers and scholars had new avenues for expressing their views. Early writers such as Desiderius Erasmus and Thomas More staged direct attacks on the Church and society with works such as Erasmus's *The Praise of Folly* and More's *Utopia*. Elizabeth Carey wrote *The Tragedy of Mariam* in 1609. Miguel de Cervantes wrote his masterpiece *The History of that Ingenious Gentleman*. Desiderius Erasmus's satire *The Praise of Folly* had the greatest influence on later humanist writers, who mimicked Erasmus's style in their own satirical works. Most famous work of Niccolò Machiavelli is *The Prince*. Montaigne wrote his major work, *The Essays*, in his native French. William Shakespeare wrote more than thirty plays, including *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, and *Julius Caesar*.

2.7. Renaissance in science

Near the end of the Renaissance, the scientific revolution began. This was a time of great strides in science and mathematics. Scientists like Francis Bacon, Galileo, Rene Descartes, and Isaac Newton made discoveries that would change the world. Nicolaus Copernicus was a Renaissance-era

mathematician, astronomer, and Catholic clergyman who formulated a model of the universe that placed the Sun rather than Earth at the center of the universe. Johannes Kepler was a German astronomer, mathematician, and astrologer. He is a key figure in the 17th-century scientific revolution, best known for his laws of planetary motion, and his books *Astronomia nova*, *Harmonices Mundi*, and *Epitome Astronomiae Copernicanae*. Francis Bacon, also known as Lord Verulam, was an English philosopher and statesman who served as Attorney General and as Lord Chancellor of England. His works are credited with developing the scientific method and remained influential through the scientific revolution.

3. Enlightenment

It is a European intellectual movement of the 17th and 18th centuries in which ideas concerning God, reason, nature, and humanity were synthesized into a worldview that gained wide assent in the West and that instigated revolutionary developments in art, philosophy and politics. Central to Enlightenment thought were the use and celebration of reason, the power by which humans understand the universe and improve their own condition. The goals of rational humanity were considered to be knowledge, freedom, and happiness. The Enlightenment produced the first modern secularized theories of psychology and ethics. Enlightenment was marked by an emphasis on the scientific method and reductionism, along with increased questioning of religious orthodoxy. It advocated such ideals as liberty, progress, tolerance, fraternity, constitutional government, and separation of church and state. The ideas of the Enlightenment played a major role in inspiring the French Revolution, which began in 1789 and emphasized the rights of the common men, as opposed to the exclusive rights of the elites.

3.1. Philosophes

The philosophes were the intellectuals of the 18th-century Enlightenment. Few were primarily philosophers; rather, philosophes were public intellectuals who applied reason to the study of many areas of learning, including philosophy, history, science, politics, economics, and social issues.

Thomas Hobbes(1588-1679): He is A mathematician, Hobbes' political theory was an effort to make politics into an exact science like geometry. He wrote the *Leviathan* in 1651. *Leviathan* attempted to turn politics into a science, arguing that men could be predicted with mathematical accuracy, and thus regulated. According to the writing of Hobbes, men were motivated primarily by the desire for power and by fear of other men, and thus needed an all powerful sovereign to rule over them.

René Descartes (1596-1650): He is often credited with being the “Father of Modern Philosophy.” Descartes attempted to address the former issue via his method of doubt. His basic strategy was to consider false any belief that falls prey to even the slightest doubt. This “hyperbolic doubt” then serves to clear the way for what Descartes considers to be an unprejudiced search for the truth. His celebrated work is *Discourse on the Method and Principles of Philosophy*.

John Locke (1632-1704): Locke, who witnessed the almost bloodless, “Glorious Revolution” in England became convinced that people could live amicably together, after discovering God’s law through the application of reason. In Locke’s *Two Treatises of Government* (1690), he outlined a theory of politics based on people’s natural rights: life, liberty, and the ownership of property. To Locke, the task of the state was to protect these rights: Government was a contract between ruler and subjects; rulers were granted power in order to assure their subjects welfare.

Montesquieu (1689-1755): Montesquieu came to respect the British political system of limited constitutional monarchy after a stay in England from 1729-1731. In his masterwork *The Spirit of the Laws*, published in 1748, he developed the notion that human, natural and divine laws guide all things, including forms of government, and can best be discovered by empirical investigation. He also was influenced by Locke’s *Two Treatises of Civil Government* (1690), in which Locke articulated his support for the government which was created by the revolution.

Voltaire (1694-1778): England became for him a model of religious and philosophical freedom, and greatly affected the course of his work, culminating with the publication of his *Philosophical Letters Concerning the English Nation* in 1733, in which he praised the customs and institutions of English life. His most famous works included the fictitious *Lettres philosophiques* (1734) and the satirical novel *Candide* (1759).

Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778): He was an outspoken critic of the French social and political order. In his landmark work, *The Social Contract*, written in 1762, Rousseau rejected existing forms of government in favor of a community based on the choice of all its citizens, and their democratic participation in every major decision. These ideas were to be of central importance after the outbreak of the French Revolution.

4. Idea of Progress

The writings on progress of the 18th century drew inspiration from the intellectual achievements of the 16th and 17th centuries. During this time, Europe witnessed an explosion of scientific and mathematical activity. In the natural sciences, the main fields of investigation were physics and

astronomy. Major figures included Copernicus (1473–1543), Galileo (1564–1642), Kepler (1571–1630), and Newton (1642–1727). Newton synthesized the work of the previous thinkers to bring the behavior of bodies on earth and bodies in space under a single scientific law, the law of universal gravitation. The discoveries of these scientists had broad implications. Two thinkers of the French Enlightenment, Anne-Robert-Jacques Turgot, Baron de Laune (1727-81), and Marie Jean Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet (1743-1794), integrated reflection on scientific discoveries into their writings on progress. Turgot, a minister to Louis XVI, produced two influential works, *A Philosophical Review of the Successive Advances of the Human Mind* and *On Universal History*. Condorcet was inspired by Turgot to write *Outlines of an historical view of the Progress of the human mind*, a piece that echoes many of Turgot's convictions. Both authors suggest that philosophical progress is the deepest condition of scientific progress. Influenced by British empiricism, Turgot and Condorcet assert that all human knowledge is grounded in experience. Turgot and Condorcet agree that scientific progress is dependent on mathematical and technological progress, and vice versa.

Adam Smith first work, *The Theory of the Moral Sentiments*, addressed the philosophy of moral judgment and action. Smith's central observation is that, in economic life, it often happens that individuals in pursuit of their self-interest nevertheless contribute to the common good. Smith contends, that the poorest members of European countries are richer than the richest members of societies in other parts of the world. Immanuel Kant writings on progress consist of a series of short pieces from the 1780s and 90s, including “Ideas toward a Universal History with Cosmopolitan Intent,” and “Perpetual Peace.” In addition to its reliance on *a priori* reasoning, Kant's work is noteworthy for its emphasis on world peace and its detailed description of the domestic and international institutions needed for peaceful conditions. Hegel thinks that war is more than an engine of progress. Hegel argues that, without war, individuals in liberal societies become self-absorbed and weak, unwilling to work for the common good. Like Hegel, Marx asserts that conflict drives historical development. But in Marx's account, conflict occurs when the productive forces outgrow the relations of production. A different class of society represents each side of the conflict. The class that benefits from the outmoded relations of production seeks to maintain them, while the losing class seeks to destroy them and replace them. Auguste Comte holds that the driving force of human progress is intellectual development, he asserts that progress itself consists in moral improvement.

5. Humanism

Humanism was the major intellectual movement of the Renaissance. In the opinion of the majority of scholars, it began in late-14th-century Italy, came to maturity in the 15th century, and spread to the rest of Europe after the middle of that century. Humanism then became the dominant intellectual movement in Europe in the 16th century. Proponents of humanism believed that a body of learning, humanistic studies consisting of the study and imitation of the classical culture of ancient Rome and Greece, would produce a cultural rebirth after what they saw as the decadent and “barbarous” learning of the Middle Ages. Under the influence and inspiration of the classics, humanists developed a new rhetoric and new learning. Some scholars also argue that humanism articulated new moral and civic perspectives and values offering guidance in life. Humanism transcended the differences between the Protestant and Catholic Reformations, as leaders of both religious movements studied and used the ancient Latin and Greek classics.

Renaissance Humanism is the spirit of learning that developed at the end of the middle ages with the revival of classical letters and a renewed confidence in the ability of human beings to determine for themselves truth and falsehood.

Western Cultural Humanism is a good name for the rational and empirical tradition that originated largely in ancient Greece and Rome, evolved throughout European history, and now constitutes a basic part of the Western approach to science, political theory, ethics, and law.

Philosophical Humanism is any outlook or way of life centered on human need and interest. Sub-categories of this type include Christian Humanism and Modern Humanism.

Christian Humanism is “a philosophy advocating the self-fulfillment of man within the framework of Christian principles.” This more human-oriented faith is largely a product of the Renaissance and is a part of what made up Renaissance humanism.

Modern Humanism, also called Naturalistic Humanism, Scientific Humanism, Ethical Humanism, and Democratic Humanism, is defined by one of its leading proponents, Corliss Lamont, as “a naturalistic philosophy that rejects all supernaturalism and relies primarily upon reason and science, democracy and human compassion.” Modern Humanism has a dual origin, both secular and religious, and these constitute its sub-categories.

Secular Humanism is an outgrowth of eighteenth century enlightenment rationalism and nineteenth century freethought. Many secular groups, such as the Council for Secular Humanism and the American Rationalist Federation, and many otherwise unaffiliated academic philosophers and scientists, advocate this philosophy.

Religious Humanism largely emerged out of Ethical Culture, Unitarianism, and Universalism. Today, many Unitarian Universalist congregations and all Ethical Culture societies describe themselves as humanist in the modern sense.

6. Secularism

The term “Secular” means being "separate" from religion, or having no religious basis. A secular person is one who does not owe his moral values to any religion. His values are the product of his rational and scientific thinking. Secularism means separation of religion from political, economic, social and cultural aspects of life, religion being treated as a purely personal matter. It is a political philosophy that addresses the relationship between religion and the state. It advocates the separation of religion from the state. One of the strongest selling points of secularism is that, by separating religion from the state, it protects every person’s freedom to choose what to believe or what not believe, within the law. This protects religious people from other religious people, as well as from people whose beliefs are not religious. And vice-versa. Secularism advocates that the state should not be involved in matters of religion and religion should not be involved in matters of the state. It emphasized dissociation of the state from religion and full freedom to all religions and tolerance of all religions. It also stands for equal opportunities for followers of all religions, and no discrimination and partiality on grounds of religion.

Secularism and secularisation: There is a difference between secularism and secularisation, as in “the secularisation of society”. Confusing these two terms may be one reason why some people conflate atheism with secularism. Whereas “secularism” can be summarised as a political philosophy advocating the separation of religion and state, “secularisation” is, in a sense, a turning away of society generally from organised religion. More precisely it has been taken to mean “the process whereby religious thinking, practice and institutions lose their social significance”.

7. Rationalism

The term "rationalism" (from Latin ratio, "reason") has been used to refer to several different outlooks and movements of ideas. In philosophy, rationalism is the epistemological view that "regards reason as the chief source and test of knowledge" or "any view appealing to reason as a source of knowledge or justification". The rationalism movement started in the 17th century with Descartes and was continued by Cartesian thinkers. The rationalists’ confidence in reason and proof tends, therefore, to detract from their respect for other ways of knowing. Rationalism has long been the rival of empiricism, the doctrine that all knowledge comes from, and must be tested by, sense experience. As

against this doctrine, rationalism holds reason to be a faculty that can lay hold of truths beyond the reach of sense perception, both in certainty and generality. In religion, rationalism commonly means that all human knowledge comes through the use of natural faculties, without the aid of supernatural revelation.

8. French Revolution

The French Revolution was a period of radical social and political disorder in France and Europe. French society underwent massive changes as feudal, aristocratic, and religious privileges ceased to exist. The monarchy was abolished, and old ideas about hierarchy and tradition gave in to new Enlightenment principles of citizenship and inalienable rights. The French Revolution changed the world and even today the French people celebrate the Storming of the Bastille on July 14th 1789 as their national holiday. The revolutionary principles of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity generated a new political force, namely, dynamic nationalism, which first swept France and was responsible for the overthrow of absolute monarchy and the privileges of the feudal lords. In its wake it brought new ideas and conceptions which made drastic changes in realm of politics, law and government. The revolution shook France between 1787 and 1799 and reached its first climax there in 1789. During this period, French citizens razed and redesigned their country's political landscape, uprooting centuries old institutions such as absolute monarchy and feudal system. The disruption was caused by widespread discontent with the French monarchy and the poor economic policies of Louis XVI, who met his death by guillotine as did his wife Marie Antoinette.

8.1. Background

French Revolution are two sides of the same coin; one side were the long-ranging problems, such as the condition of French society. Since the Middle Ages the French population had been divided into three orders or estates which enjoyed different rights. The First Estate was the clergy whose members did not have to pay France's main tax, the *taille*, and who owned about ten per cent of the land. However, the clergy was not a homogenous group: the higher clergy were often the younger sons of the most important noble families, and the lower clergy were often poor parish priests who were overworked and whose interests lay with the common people. The Second Estate of the Ancien Régime was the nobility. Just as the First Estate, its members possessed several privileges and were exempt from taxes, especially the *taille*. The nobles held the best jobs in the army and the government. Nevertheless, some of the nobles had debts because of their expensive lifestyle. Therefore, they tried to raise the dues paid by the peasants. Although the nobles enjoyed their economic advantages, they tried

to expand their power at the expense of the monarchy while keeping their central positions in the military, the church, courts, and administration.

The overwhelming majority of the French belonged to the Third Estate, or the commoners of society. These commoners were divided by major differences in occupation, education, and wealth. The peasants constituted the largest segment of this order (about 80 per cent of the total population), owning about 40 per cent of the land. They had to give dues to their local landlords as well as the tithe* to the clergy. They also had to work for the lord, especially at harvest time. The peasants' crops were often ruined when the nobles went hunting which was one of the nobles' privileges. The majority of the people lived in the country, the people in the towns and cities, especially in Paris, played a crucial role in the French Revolution. Among them were workers whose living conditions were very harsh. They often had insecure jobs in workshops or factories or worked at home. In times of economic trouble, they were often hungry and desperately poor as prices rose faster than wages. The streets they lived in were dirty and unhealthy. Other commoners in the cities were better off. Some members of the Third Estate became rich as bankers, manufacturers, or merchants. Others went to university and became lawyers or university teachers, often criticizing absolutism and the privileges of the First and Second Estate.

8.2 Causes of French Revolution

8.2.1. Social Causes

The first two classes were called the “privileged” classes and the third was the under-privileged class. The privileges of the clergy dated back to medieval times when the Church was supposed to be the guardian of the “souls” of the people and looked after their education and tended the weak and invalid. In the lieu of spiritual service the clergymen were granted large estates and the Church owned a good deal of landed property. In the 16th 17th 18th centuries the name of the Church had suffered much on account of the corruption and vices of the clergymen and the consequent Reformation movement, yet the clergymen in the 18th century still enjoyed their old privileges and influence. The nobles in France formed a hereditary caste and unlike England, the sons of French nobles kept themselves aloof from the commoners and were jealous of their rights. They enjoyed a number of privileges which dated back to the heydays of feudalism and though Richelieu and Mazarin had deprived them much of their political power, their privileges were still intact. The nobles often monopolized trade and were extremely rich and lived in a grand style. They did not pay any direct taxes and were exempted from a number of indirect ones.

The peasants were subjected to “triple taxation” they paid taxes to the king, to the nobles and to clergy. The king claimed both direct and indirect taxes. The direct taxes comprised the “taille” or the land tax, a poll tax per head and income tax which amounted to one-twentieth of the peasant’s income. The indirect taxes comprised salt tax, customs and excise duties and forced labor on the roads. A new middle class had steadily emerged through the last two or three centuries. It consisted of the bourgeoisie or towns- people who controlled commerce and industries and worked for a living in some profession or the other. They mostly controlled all industry through guilds. They had become fairly rich on account of overseas trade in tobacco, wine, spices, tea, coffee and cotton with the colonies and quite a few of them could compete very favorably in wealth with the nobles. But they belonged to the underprivileged class and were subjected to taxation. They were inspired by the French philosophers and the successful revolt of the American colonies against Great Britain and by their “Declaration of Independence”. They attacked the privileges of nobles and were in sympathy with the peasants.

8.2.2. Economic Causes

There had been considerable economic and agricultural development in the 17th century under Richelieu and Colbert, agriculture was still backward and quite often they were famines and food riots. King Louis XVI had just spent millions of francs helping the American colonies fight against the England. Because of this and others debts, just the interest payments on loans took up over half of the France’s economy. Then in 1788 France was hit by a terrible drought that nearly destroyed the entire year’s harvest and the jobless, starving people began to riot. Louis XVI was in dire financial straits because of France’s involvement in the American War of Independence (the French supported the Americans against England) and due to other wars that had been fought less successfully, increasing the national debt.

The royal court was costly, civil servants had to be paid, the military needed financial support – all factors leading to the king’s bankruptcy. The poorly run tax system did not help to ease the situation, as many taxes were collected by private companies and did not reach the king. Consequently, he wanted to get more money, but to achieve this, he needed to call an assembly of the three estates, the Estates-General, which had not met since 1614. In August 1788, Louis XVI called the Estates-General for the next year. The hopes of what this assembly should accomplish were high: The king hoped to raise new taxes which even the Second Estate should pay, the nobles hoped to limit the powers of the king, and

the people hoped that it would solve all their current problems, shown in the lists of grievances and hopes for the future.

8.2.3. Political Causes

Louis XVI was weak-willed through religious, pious, kind and moral. He lacked all those qualities of leadership and kingship which were required at this crucial time in history of France, when the king was faced with a grave financial and political crisis. He was too much under the influence of his young and beautiful queen, the Austrian princess, Marie Antoinette, who was intensely hated by the French people because she was foreigner. She had no love for the French people and was extravagant and unsympathetic. While France was passing through a serious financial crisis and was faced with the problem of food, she was lavishly spending money on her pleasures and was absolutely unconcerned about the miseries of people.

The monarchy was, in short, incompetent and utterly unable to solve the question of the nobles' privileges and the problem of food and thus allowed the condition to drift and deteriorate. The administration had been highly centralized in the 17th century and continued to be so in the 18th. Everything in the state was decided by the council at Versailles which hardly any time to devote to the affairs of the state. Too much centralization had deprived local officials of all initiative and unnecessary delay was caused by references to the central government even over trivial matters.

8.2.4. Impact

The French Revolution had serious consequences throughout Europe. News of events initially caused much interest and prompted radicals to demand political reforms. For others, however, the French Revolution represented a serious political danger. It was the cause of much anxiety in the absolute governments and illustrated the potentially serious consequences of social unrest and the ideas of the Enlightenment. : The Republic of Mainz was a product of the French Revolution: it lasted from March to July 1793. After the ruler of Mainz had fled in October 1792, citizens of Mainz founded a Jacobin club; they promoted the Enlightenment and the French revolutionary ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity, aiming for a German republic to be established following the French model. A democratically elected parliament met in March 1793, declaring the represented territory (which extended to Bingen in the west and to Landau in the south) to be free and democratic, denying any ties to the Holy Roman Empire, and joining France. The same day, Mainz was besieged by Prussian and Austrian troops, and, in July, the democratic experiment ended with the fall of the city. This outlines the

development of the early 19th century, when more and more countries found themselves caught between revolution and restoration

8.2.5. Girondists and Jacobins

There were two prominent parties in the Legislative Assembly in 1791 i.e. the Girondists and the Jacobins. The Girondists had the majority and the Jacobins were in a minority. The Girondists were so-called from the district of Gironde from which many of their leaders came. National Convention opened, a republic was proclaimed in France and a struggle for supremacy between the Girondists and Jacobins started. To begin with, the Girondists were stronger and they seemed to be determined to use their power to suppress and punish the leaders of the Paris Commune. They succeeded in dissolving the Commune. However, in other respects the Girondists were not successful. Their monopoly of power was threatened by the Jacobins. In October 1792, Pache, the Minister of War, left the Girondists and joined the ranks of the Jacobins. The War Office became the meeting place of the Jacobins and Pache also put his wealth and influence at the disposal of the Jacobins.

The Girondists were also weakened by the trial and execution of the king in January 1793. While the Jacobins had demanded the execution of the king, the Girondists were prepared to compromise with him if only he was prepared to give up the exercise of his discretionary power and act as a constitutional head. From the beginning of 1793, the Girondists began to lose ground. Roland, who was a very active member of the Girondists party, resigned his office in January 1793. Garat was put in charge of the Ministry of the Interior. When Pache joined the Jacobin party, he was removed from the War Office but he was elected the Mayor of Paris and thus the Jacobins secured control over the Commune of Paris. At that time, the Girondists' proposals for a new constitution were published. Those proposals were unpractical in their nature and pleased none.

The Jacobins got an opportunity to attack the Girondists on the ground that the latter wanted to give more powers to the provinces and thereby weaken the influence of Paris and break the unity of the republic. The Girondists declared a kind of war on the Paris Commune. They condemned the disorders which had been created by the mobs of Paris. In April 1793, the Girondists attacked Marat who was responsible for the September massacres of 1792. However, he was acquitted by the Revolutionary Tribunal. The Girondists condemned the plots in the various parts of Paris, but in spite of their condemnation, those plots continued. Instead of compromising, they decided to appeal to the country against Paris. They proposed to shift the National Convention from Paris to Versailles. The Jacobins and the Paris Commune decided to take action against the Girondists. On 31 May, 1793, the

Commission was cancelled, but on 2 June, 1793, the National Convention was immediated to order the arrest of 22 leaders of the Girondist party.

Module IV

Rise and growth of Colonialism and Nationalism

Colonization of Asia and Africa (China, West Asia and Algeria)- Different tactics of National Movement- Nationalism in Europe.

1. Colonization of Asia and Africa

Colonization refers to large-scale population movements where the migrants maintain strong links with their or their ancestors' former country, gaining significant privileges over other inhabitants of the territory by such links. It is the action or process of settling among and establishing control over the indigenous people of an area. Colonization or the “colonial complex” is: (1) colonization begins with a forced, involuntary entry; (2) the colonizing power alters basically or destroys the indigenous culture; (3) members of the colonized group tends to be governed by representatives of the dominant group; and (4) the system of dominant-subordinate relationship is buttressed by a racist ideology. This process has created the identities of both the colonized and the colonizer with pathological effects. It has destroyed both the lives and the cultures of the colonized and implanted a culture of destruction upon all inhabitants, both the colonized and the colonizer. There are two reasons for exploring the pathology of colonization.

1.1. Ideology of Colonization

Colonization is based on the doctrine of cultural hierarchy and supremacy. The theory of colonialism is the domination by a metropolitan center, which rules a distant territory through the implanting of settlements. It is the establishment and control of a territory, for an extended period of time, by a sovereign power over a subordinate and “other” people which are segregated and separated from the ruling power. Features of the colonial situation include political and legal domination over the “other” society, relations of economic and political dependence, and institutionalized racial and cultural inequalities. The colonialists see their culture as a superior culture; usually tied to either Cultural Evolutionary or Social Darwinist theories. In an attempt to control, reap economic benefits, and “civilize” the indigenous peoples the colonialist dismantle the native cultures by imposing their own. There is a destruction of the cultural values and ways of life. Languages, dress, techniques are defined and constructed through the ideology and values of the colonialist.

1.2. Colony and Colonial Identity

The way a person sees the world, both geographically and culturally, is dictated by their abstract understanding of the world. Although culture does exist as a tangible entity, it is the abstract ideologies of comparison between cultures that create cultural identities situated in social, economic, and political hierarchies. It is in this abstract world of ideas that the colonizer, by creating the “other” which was to be colonized, created his own identity in opposition to that of the colonized.

Essentially, a colony is a collectivity of people. Colonies established by few or some migrants tend to be peripheries of strong political centres (‘empires’). Almost invariably, they are imperial colonies politically depending on the motherland (British India, Africa; in principle, provinces of the Persian, Roman, Ottoman, etc. empires). Colonies with substantial immigrant populations are sometimes imperial (British and French North America, parts of Spanish South America, Australia) sometimes non-imperial (Greek and Phoenician colonies in the Iron Age). The stronger the immigrant population of the colony (New England, the Thirteen Colonies in North America), the stronger is usually its strife for political independence from the motherland.

1.3. Type of Colonies

Pure imperial colonies (‘provinces’): It established through conquest for the purpose of tributary exploitation; low influx of colonial immigrants (specialised administrative personnel only): British India, French Indochina, British Egypt, African colonies, provinces of (Assyrian, Persian, Roman, Ottoman, etc.) empires. Special cases are the Hellenistic empires, the Seleucid one in the first place, where military conquest was flanked by colonial settlement of Greeks and Macedonians.

Imperial settlement colonies: established through massive settlement colonisation flanked by military power with the purpose of exploiting local labour and/or exporting excess population. Colonisation may involve extinction or marginalisation (New England, Canada, Australia) or disenfranchisement (Southern Rhodesia, South and South West Africa, French Algeria) or importation of labour-force deported from third countries (Caribbean). Colonies are dependent on imperial centres (‘motherland’), but ties tend to be looser than in the case of pure imperial colonies (often resulting in independence).

Pure settlement colonies: established through massive settlement colonisation, often flanked by violence, with the purpose of land seizure. This type of colonisation tends to result in local populations being marginalised (the Russian East, the American West, Greek Sicily, Magna Graecia, partly Phoenician colonies in North Africa, Sardinia and Spain).

Outpost colonies: established through conquest or peaceful agreement, with a moderate influx of (usually specialised) colonial immigrants, for the purpose of gaining (strategic or commercial) access to a hinterland: Hong Kong, Batavia, Malacca, Singapore, Aden, Shanghai, Pithekoussai, Phoenician trading posts in Spain, Sicily and North Africa.

1.4. Colonizer and Colonized

The colonist who was either born in the colony or traveled there to better himself economically and embraces the colonial structure in which he was, in his eyes, entitled to was obviously the majority of the colonists. By accepting the role of the colonizer, he accepted the responsibility and identity of both himself and the colonized. Although the colonized are an interracial and necessary economic part of the colony, the colonizer must disown the colonized and defend his identity both intellectually and physically. He must accept the violence and poverty he sees daily; it is his job to rationalize the actions of himself and fellow colonialists because he needs to absolve himself of the atrocities committed in the name of economic and cultural superiority.

To justify the colonization of a people, images need to be created so that the subjugation makes sense. These images become the identity of the colonized. There are many images used, but one universal image that has been put on native people is laziness. This image is a good example of how the colonizer justifies his actions. This image becomes the excuse for the colonial situation because without such images the actions of the colonialist would appear shocking. The image of the lazy native is a useful myth on many levels; it raises the colonizer and humbles the colonized. It becomes a beautiful justification for the colonizer's privilege. There is a psychological distinction between image of the settler and native village.

1.5. Decolonization

Most decolonization theory is solely focused on the decolonization of the colonized. There is a necessary reason for this. The issue of colonization and the atrocities committed by the colonists towards the colonized is no less than cultural and physical genocide. Frantz Fanon discusses in *The Wretched of the Earth*, there is no way to return to a pristine/pre-colonial time, so the only way to change the stratification of the post colonial world is through decolonization. But this decolonization cannot just be of the colonized, this process must be also of the colonizer. White people need to deconstruct their culture and ideologies because the stratification is founded and maintained in our hegemony in regards of this culture of colonization. The key to decolonization is a conscious act of

cultural revitalization. There needs to be a rebirth of cultures dismantled during colonialism. The cultures of colonized and traditional people need to teach this culture lessons of the past.

1.6. Asia and Africa

The first phase of European colonization of Asia and Africa took place throughout the 16th and 17th centuries after the arrival of Dutch, Portuguese, Spanish, and later French and British marine spice traders. Fiercely competitive, the Europeans soon sought to eliminate each other by forcibly taking control of the production centers, trade hubs and vital strategic locations, beginning with the Portuguese acquisition of Malacca in 1511. Throughout the 17th and 18th centuries conquests focused on ports along the maritime routes, that provided a secure passage of maritime trade. It also allowed foreign rulers to levy taxes and control prices of the highly desired Southeast Asian commodities. By the 19th century, virtually all Southeast Asian lands had been forced into the various spheres of influence of European global players. The second phase of Asia is related to the Industrial Revolution and the rise of powerful nation states in Europe. As the primary motivation for the first phase was the mere accumulation of wealth, the reasons for and degree of European interference during the second phase are dictated by geo-strategic rivalries, the need to defend and grow spheres of interest, competition for commercial outlets, long term control of resources and the Southeast Asian economies becoming more closely tied to European industrial and financial affairs by the late 19th century.

The role of the Europeans changed, however, in the industrialised phase as their control expanded beyond their trading posts. As the trading posts grew due to an increase in the volume of trade, demand for food supplies and timber (to build and repair ships) also increased. To ensure a reliable supply of food and timber, the Europeans were forced to deal with the local communities nearby. These marked the beginnings of territorial control. A good example is the case of Batavia. There, the Dutch extended control over parts of western Java and later to central Java and the east where rice was grown and timber found. To ensure that trade flourish, the Europeans had to maintain political stability. Sometimes, they interfered with the internal affairs of the natives to maintain peace. The Europeans also tried to impose their culture on their colonies. European interference has effected Southeast Asians on all major existential issues. Exploited by the colonial economic system, robbed of the vast regional resources and subjected to racial and ethnic discrimination on the one hand, yet witnessing the rapid transformation towards modernity, scientific and technical progress, the import of secular political and education systems and humane ideas, that contradicted the current colonial reality on the other. Perception of the political reality differed widely among the Southeast Asian regions and the early 20th

century popular, communist movement leaders of Vietnam were notably optimistic and “predicted a blessed future in which automobiles and trains would no longer be uniquely Western”, while Dutch author J.H. Boeke observed, that “societies like Indonesia were incurably dual”

European exploration of Africa begins with the Age of Discovery in the 15th century, pioneered by the kingdom of Portugal under Henry the navigator. The Cape of Good Hope was first reached by Bartolomeu Dias on 12 March 1488, opening the important sea route to India and the Far East, but European exploration of Africa itself remained very limited during the 16th and 17th centuries. The European powers were content to establish trading posts along the coast while they were actively exploring and colonizing the New World. Exploration of the interior of Africa was thus mostly left to the Arab slave traders. Prince Henry, known as *the Navigator*, was the first European to methodically explore Africa and the oceanic route to the Indies. From his residence in the Algarve region of southern Portugal, he directed successive expeditions to circumnavigate Africa and reach India. By 1583, the Portuguese established themselves in Zanzibar and on the Swahili coast. The Kingdom of Congo was converted to Christianity in 1495; its king taking the name of Joao I. The Portuguese also established their trade interests in the kingdom of Mutapa in the 16th century, and in 1629 placed a puppet ruler on the throne. Beginning in the 17th century, the Netherlands began exploring and colonizing Africa. While the Dutch were waging a long war of independence against Spain, Portugal had temporarily united with Spain, starting in 1580 and ending in 1640. As a result, the growing colonial ambitions of the Netherlands were mostly directed against Portugal.

In Dutch Mauritius the colonization started in 1638 and ended in 1710, with a brief interruption between 1658 and 1666. Numerous governors were appointed, but continuous hardships such as cyclones, droughts, pest infestations, lack of food, and illnesses finally took their toll, and the island was definitively abandoned in 1710. The Dutch left a lasting impact in South Africa, a region ignored by Portugal that the Dutch eventually decided to use as a station in their route to East Asia. Jan van Riebeeck founded Cape Town in 1652, starting the European exploration and colonization of South Africa. Almost at the same time as the Dutch, a few other European powers attempted to create their own outposts for the African slave trade. As early as 1530, English merchant adventurers started trading in West Africa, coming into conflict with Portuguese troops. In 1581, Francis Drake reached the Cape of Good Hope. In 1663, the English built Fort James in Gambia. One year later, another English colonial expedition attempted to settle southern Madagascar, resulting in the death of most of the colonists. The English forts on the West African coast were eventually taken by the Dutch. The British expressed their interest by the formation in 1788 of The Association for Promoting the Discovery of the

Interior Parts of Africa. The individuals who formed this club were inspired in part by the Scotsman James Bruce, who had ventured to Ethiopia in 1769 and reached the source of the Blue Nile. Overall, the European exploration of Africa in the 17th and 18th centuries was very limited. Instead, they were focused on the slave trade, which only required coastal bases and items to trade. The real exploration of the African interior would start well into the 19th century.

China

Colonialism first stepped into China after the victory of the British Navy in the first opium war (1839-42). This war is marked in history as the first in which steam-driven ships were used as the main force. By the end of the second opium war (1856-60), colonialism further strengthened its foothold within Chinese territories. The Qing dynasty had to accept a series of humiliating treaties committing to pay an unusually high amount of compensation over the years, and grant sovereign control over the major ports of China in the coastal region. Colonialism in China, which initially started in only a few treaty port areas during the 1840s, gradually expanded over time and continued for more than a century, finally to end in 1945 after Japan was defeated in World War II. The most devastating impact colonialism had on 19th and early 20th century China was on the Qing state. During the colonial era, the Qing state became politically, administratively and financially too weak to function as an effective government to lead the country towards a positive direction. The military and administrative power of the state was shattered due to successive wars against imperialist powers and a series of domestic rebellions. The desperation of the Qing government to collect additional revenue to meet the enhanced requirement of indemnity payment caused widespread dissatisfaction among their subjects, especially among the peasants. As a result, various rebellions sparked in different parts of China during the early years of the colonial era.

It is evident that colonialism impacted 19th and early 20th century China both directly and indirectly, with mixed results in different sectors. The Chinese state was heavily affected by the forceful imperialist invasion that dealt a major blow to its overall capacity to perform its due role in leading China as a united nation towards prosperity. Historical evidence does not support the argument that colonialism had any kind of direct negative impact on the Chinese economy. Colonialism also brought in many positive influences on the Chinese society through the introduction of a modern education system, modern technology and know-how and so forth. But these positive influences were also limited to a few treaty port cities and the adjacent areas to a number of missionary stations.

1.7. West Asia

"Western Asia" was in use as a geographical term in the early 19th century, even before "Near East" became current as a geopolitical concept. In the context of the history of classical antiquity, "Western Asia" could mean the part of Asia known in classical antiquity, as opposed to the reaches of "interior Asia", i.e. Scythia, and "Eastern Asia" the easternmost reaches of geographical knowledge in classical authors, i.e. Transoxania and India. The West Asian region was often referred as the holy land for three major religions Islam, Christianity and Judaism. The main colonial conquerors in the region were primarily the English and French, and not all English and French possessions in the region were treated with same status of 'colonies'. It varied according to the occupier's history with the possession, strategic importance of it, and how well they contribute to the plans of colonial powers. West Asia was crucial to British Empire, as it provided access to its much larger and productive colony, India; especially after the construction of Suez Canal. French control over the region was limited compared to the British, but their nature of engagement with the region was similar to that of the British. Arab revolt against the Ottoman Turks was a direct result of certain colonial assurances given to the Arab population.

After the fall of Ottoman Empire, the West Asian region falls primarily under the control of the British Mandate, which was eager to secure its position at the centre of the world. British interests in West Asia, was to secure their access to Indian Ocean through which a large chunk of their trade was going through, and the ease of access to their biggest colony, India. Thus colonialism, in the twentieth century, had a great influence in the political stability, economic development of the West Asian region. Oil was a great concern for them, as the unchecked supply of oil was needed to support the intended economic growth which the colonial powers were trying to achieve. Ambitions of the Colonial powers influenced the West Asian region, and the transformed West Asia from a transit point between continents or a barren battleground to an important geo strategic location also happened place in the twentieth century.

1.8. Algeria

The manner in which French rule was established in Algeria during the years 1830–47 laid the groundwork for a pattern of rule that French Algeria would maintain until independence. During the late 1800s through the late 1900s, France was one of the great European imperialist powers. The colony was a site of mass trade and valuable in its natural resources and market opportunities. Algeria also became a perfect site for French tourism, with the appeal of "exotic" African adventures and the

mystique of the Muslim Kasbah. But rather than admitting to the real motivation behind the colonization and occupation of North Africa. The conquest of Algeria was initiated in the last days of the Bourbon Restoration by Charles X, as an attempt to increase his popularity amongst the French people, particularly in Paris, where many veterans of the Napoleonic Wars lived. On 1 December 1830, King Louis Philippe named the Duc de Rovigo as head of military staff in Algeria. De Rovigo took control of Bone and initiated colonisation of the land. He was recalled in 1833 due to the overtly violent nature of the repression.

In 1834, France annexed as a colony the occupied areas of Algeria, which had an estimated Muslim population of about two million. Colonial administration in the occupied areas — the so-called government of the sword — was placed under a governor general, a high-ranking army officer invested with civil and military jurisdiction, who was responsible to the minister of war. Marshal Bugeaud, who became the first governor-general, headed the conquest. Soon after the conquest of Algiers, the soldier-politician Bertrand Clauzel and others formed a company to acquire agricultural land and, despite official discouragement, to subsidize its settlement by European farmers, triggering a land rush. A commission of inquiry established by the French Senate in 1892 and headed by former Premier Jules Ferry, an advocate of colonial expansion, recommended that the government abandon a policy that assumed French law, without major modifications, could fit the needs of an area inhabited by close to two million Europeans and four million Muslims. Muslims had no representation in the French National Assembly before 1945 and were grossly under-represented on local councils.

2. Different tactics of National Movement

Nationalism can be seen as a complex relationship and, like most such relationships, people have to work hard to balance the tension between *self* and *others*. While many nations have succeeded in using nationalism to develop, this same nationalism has also generated forms of exclusivism and competition that make it hard to resolve shared global problems. Economic development is an important—but not the only—goal that nations must pursue. Typologies of nationalism abound: ethnic versus civic, revolutionary versus counterrevolutionary, official versus protonational. None are exhaustive, but all provide useful clues about the ontology of nationalisms, their agents, and their consequences.

2.1. Traditional Nationalism

Political science literature on nationalism focuses on the political strategy that emerged in Europe to create and reproduce congruence between the political and cultural boundaries of the nation – in other words, to form a territorially sovereign, culturally homogeneous nation-state. Nation-state approach is traditional, because it was the dominant mechanism of state development in Europe and many other parts of the world throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. One of the most frequently drawn distinctions is that between so-called political and cultural – or, in the framework of democratization, civic and ethnic – definitions of nation. According to this dichotomy, some nations are defined on the basis of political community (citizenship) and others on the basis of common ethnicity. Historically, aggressive cultural policies that defined nation on the basis of ethnicity accompanied traditional nation-state development. Most Western European states – including France and Germany, founding members of the European community – continue to uphold the ‘national’ principle and maintain institutions that perpetuate the nation on a desired territory. At the same time, since Germany’s reunification, establishing or consolidating nation-states through the traditional nationalist strategies described above has not been a primary concern for any of the current EU member states.

States in which traditional nationalism remains a dominant political strategy include the newly independent states of Croatia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Serbia, and Slovakia. Older states that continue to practice nation-state policies are Bulgaria and Romania. In all of these cases, political elites have seen significant challenges to their completion of a traditional nation-state project stemming from the existence of strong minorities whose kin constitute the majority in a neighboring state. In each, majority political elites have based their nation building strategies primarily on cultural definitions of nation and continue to pursue policies of cultural assimilation.

2.2. Substate Nationalism

Substate nationalism pertains to groups that view themselves as rightful owners of a homeland but that have no state to call their own. Within the European Union, communities that can claim historical connections to the land (in some instances, even past statehood) are considered ‘historical national minorities’ and are differentiated from relatively recent migrant or im-migrant groups. ‘Homeland community’ is a useful concept for understanding such communities in Europe. These communities consider the place where they have a lengthy history to be their homeland. Substate nationalists do not seek independent statehood and thereby differ from secessionist movements that fall in the traditional nationalist category. Instead, they aspire to maintain political representation and institutions that

guarantee the continued reproduction of the community. Substate nationalist actors hope that the European Union will weaken the authority of the central state government and allow the regions greater pursuit of their nationalist agendas. Not all regions will necessarily remain content with this approach, however, so substate nationalism could turn into a traditional secessionist project.

2.3. Transsovereign Nationalism

Transsovereign nationalism applies to nations that reach beyond current state boundaries but forgo the idea of border changes, primarily because it is too costly to pursue border changes in contemporary Europe. After World War II, stability in Europe was of paramount importance; therefore, the international system delegitimized the creation of new nation-states on the continent and instead encouraged national homogenization policies within already existing state boundaries. European state boundaries were then codified by the Helsinki Final Act of 1975, which legitimated only peaceful border changes. Examples of transsovereign nationalism include Austrian policies toward the German-speaking community in the Italian province of South Tirol after World War II, Russian policies toward ethnic Russians living in former Soviet republics like Latvia and Ukraine, and Romanian policies toward ethnic Romanians in Moldova.

The weakness of transsovereign national mobilization in Moldova is owing primarily to past failures of the Romanian center to foster a sense of common Romanian nationhood in this territory. When the modern Romanian state was first created at the end of the nineteenth century, it included part of the contemporary Moldova. Although political elites in the center began building a Romanian nation, according to Cristina Petrescu the Romanian-speaking people in this territory were not interested in Romanian nationhood, because they were very poor and overwhelmingly illiterate. The Hungarian transsovereign national strategy has three main interlocking components: (1) a network of institutions that link Hungarians beyond the borders to those in Hungary and strengthen the political and socio-economic status of Hungarians in their communities outside Hungary; (2) support for Hungarian minority demands for various forms of local and regional institutional autonomy; (3) the pursuit of EU membership for Hungary as well as its neighbors.

2.4. Protectionist Nationalism

A protectionist nationalism is primarily driven by fear of unpredictability in societies experiencing rapid demographic, racial, and cultural change. This kind of nationalism is characteristic of majority nationals in states that have for a significant time enjoyed effective sovereignty over their territory and

have been successfully reproducing a national culture that is widely shared by their population. Protectionist nationalists are typically in Western European states such as Austria, Belgium, France, and Germany – and thus already live in EU member states. Westerners pursuing protectionist nationalism believe that the costs of including poor Eastern cousins are too high; Easterners pursuing traditional nationalist projects resent what they view as the imperialism of the West.

- **Nationalism in Europe**

National awakening also grew out of an intellectual reaction to the Enlightenment that emphasized national identity and developed a romantic view of cultural self-expression through nationhood. The key exponent of the modern idea of the nation-state was the German G. W. Friedrich Hegel. The French Revolution, although primarily a republican revolution, initiated a movement toward the modern nation states and also played a key role in the birth of nationalism across Europe where radical intellectuals were influenced by Napoleon and Napoleonic Code, an instrument for the political transformation of Europe. "Its twin ideological goals, nationalism and democracy, were given substance and form during the tumultuous events beginning at the end of the eighteenth century." Revolutionary armies carried the slogan of "liberty, equality and brotherhood" and ideas of liberalism and national self-determinism. He argued that a sense of nationality was the cement that held modern societies together in the age when dynastic and religious allegiance was in decline. In 1815, at the end of the Napoleonic wars, the major powers of Europe met at the Congress of Vienna and tried to restore the old dynastic system as far as possible, ignoring the principle of nationality in favour of legitimacy, the assertion of traditional claims to royal authority. With most of Europe's peoples still loyal to their local province or city, nationalism was confined to small groups of intellectuals and political radicals. Furthermore, political repression, symbolized by the Carlsbad Decrees published in Austria in 1819, pushed nationalist agitation underground.

The invention of a symbolic national identity became the concern of racial, ethnic or linguistic groups throughout Europe as they struggled to come to terms with the rise of mass politics, the decline of the traditional social elites, popular discrimination and xenophobia. Within the Habsburg empire the different peoples developed a more mass-based, violent and exclusive form of nationalism. This developed even among the Germans and Magyars, who actually benefited from the power-structure of the empire. On the European periphery, especially in Ireland and Norway, campaigns for national independence became more strident. In 1905, Norway won independence from Sweden, but attempts to grant Ireland the kind of autonomy enjoyed by Hungary foundered on the national divisions on the

island between the Catholic and Protestant populations. The Polish attempts to win independence from Russia had previously proved to be unsuccessful, with Poland being the only country in Europe whose autonomy was gradually limited rather than expanded throughout the 19th century, as a punishment for the failed uprisings; in 1831 Poland lost its status as a formally independent state and was merged into Russia as a real union country and in 1867 she became nothing more than just another Russian province. Faced with internal and external resistance to assimilation, as well as increased xenophobic anti-semitism, radical demands began to develop among the stateless Jewish population of eastern and central Europe for their own national home and refuge. In 1897, inspired by the Hungarian-born Jewish nationalist Theodor Herzl, the first Zionist Congress, was held in Basle, and declared their national 'home' should be in Palestine. By the end of the period, the ideals of European nationalism had been exported worldwide and were now beginning to develop, and both compete and threaten the empires ruled by colonial European nation-states.

3.1 Serbian Revolution

It refers to the national and social revolution of the Serbian between 1804 and 1817, during which Serbia managed to emancipate from the Ottoman Empire and exist as a sovereign European nation state. The revolution was inspired by the developing concept of the nation state itself stimulated by the French Revolution. Serbs were encouraged by Russia to re-assert their national and ethnic identity and found inspiration too in memories of their brief imperial past. The revolutionary leaders stressed the Christian, as opposed to muslim identity of their national heritage. The term "Serbian revolution" was invented by a famous German historian Leopold von Ranke in his book *Die Serbische Revolution*, published in 1829. By 1817, Serbia was constituted as a Principality under the rule of Miloš Obrenović. It was not until 1878, though, that the Ottomans officially recognized Serbia's independence. In 1882, the Principality became a kingdom and in 1918, united with Croatia, Slovenia, and Bosnia to form what later became Yugoslavia

Serb leaders from both sides of the Danube began to conspire against the dahias (Janisarry leaders). When they found out, they rounded up and murdered tens of Serbian noblemen on the main square of Valjevo in an event known as "Massacre of Serbian knights" on February 4, 1804. Serbs gathered to proclaim the uprising, electing Karađorđe Petrović as the leader. The Proclamation called for unity of the Serbian nation, emphasizing the importance of freedom of religion, Serbian history, and rule of law—all of which the Ottoman Empire could not or had denied to provide, being a non-secular Muslim state. It also called on Serbs to stop paying taxes to the Ottoman Sultan because they were

based on religious affiliation. That afternoon, a Turkish inn (caravanserai) in Orašac was burned and its residents fled or were killed, followed by similar actions country-wide. Soon, the cities Valjevo and Požarevac were liberated, and the siege of Belgrade was launched. *uring almost 10 years of the First Serbian Uprising (1804-1813), Serbia perceived itself as an independent state for the first time after 300 years of Ottoman and short-lasting Austrian occupations.*

3.2. Greek War of Independence

Central impetus for the formation of the nationalist movement came from diaspora communities in cities such as Paris, Vienna and Odessa. It is not surprising that the War of Independence itself began not in the central territories of the later Greek state, but in a region which was never considered part of the Greek national territory, either then or now. On 22 February 1821, Alexandros Ypsilantis (1792–1828)– an officer of Greek descent serving in the Russian army and one of the few Phanariotes who had joined the *Philiki Etaireia* but who had then immediately become their leader – crossed the River Prut from Bessarabia into the principality of Moldavia with a legion of volunteers numbering about five hundred men, the so-called "Holy Company". Iași, the capital city of Moldavia, surrendered to him without any resistance two days later. From there, he moved southward in the direction of Bucharest, which he reached on 17 March, but which he could not hold for long. He was forced to retreat in the face of superior Ottoman forces. With this campaign, Ypsilantis had hoped to provide the impetus for a general rebellion against Ottoman rule. By this time, a general insurrection was underway there, with its centre in the Peloponnese. March 25, 1821 is officially identified as the start of this rebellion – though the rebellion actually began some days before this – and this date is now celebrated both as the Feast of the Annunciation of the Virgin Mary and as Greek Independence Day.

After the rebels had gathered at various points in the Peloponnese and central Greece at an agreed time, they succeeded relatively quickly in bringing a large part of this region under their control by forcing the local Ottoman forces to retreat into a small number of fortresses. Only Tripoli in Arcadia, the civil and military centre of Ottoman rule, managed to resist for a longer period and was only captured at the end of September 1821 after a battle. After the Peloponnese and central Greece, the insurrection spread in the spring of 1821 to the Aegean islands, particularly Hydra, Spetses and Psara, which played a decisive role in the maritime war in the subsequent years. The rebellion also flared up in other regions, such as in Thessaly, Epirus, southwest Macedonia, on the Chalkidiki Peninsula and in Thrace, though these were too weak and isolated and were quickly suppressed.

• **Belgian War of Independence**

Battles were fought almost every day to repel the Belgian troops. And, the Dutch army was successful in this. During the Battle of Boutersem, the Dutch also managed to defeat a part of the Belgian forces. During this violent encounter the horse of the commander-in-chief, the prince of Orange, was hit by a cannonball. The prince himself was unharmed. In the painting we see a wounded officer offering the prince another horse. The prince's own mount (at the left) was later put out of its misery. The next day, 12 August 1831, a battle was fought with another part of the Belgian army near Louvain. The Belgians were on the verge of losing this encounter as well. It was then that the 70,000 men strong French army came to the rescue of the Belgian troops. The prince of Orange ordered a retreat and signed a ceasefire that very same day.

The far-reaching meddling of the Protestant William I irritated various groups in the South, including the Catholics, the French speakers, and the Liberals. However, imminent revolt was still out of the question. This changed after the July Revolution in France of 1830, which saw the overthrow of the French king. Soon thereafter, incidents also broke out in the Southern Netherlands, beginning in Brussels. The king sent both his sons to Brussels, but to little avail. A truce was ultimately negotiated, after which a long period of political bickering ensued. William I refused to meet the demands of the Belgians, making secession inevitable. In a final attempt to have his way, he deployed the army one more time, part of which was already stationed in Rijen in the province of Noord-Brabant. It crossed into Belgium, at Poppel, on 2 August 1831.

The Belgian War of Independence also provided the Netherlands with a hero in the person of Jan van Speijk. He was in command of a Dutch gunboat that patrolled the Schelde River in Belgium. On 5 February 1831 a gale blew the vessel into the quay at the port of Antwerp, and it was stormed by a group of Belgians. Van Speijk knew what he had to do. Together with his commanders, he had sworn to never let his vessel fall into enemy hands. Shortly before Van Speijk had stated that he would rather blow up the boat along with himself than surrender. He put his words into action. Practically everyone on board, including himself and several unknown Belgians, died in the explosion.

● **Revolutions of 1848**

The European Revolutions of 1848, known in some countries as the Spring of Nations, Springtime of the Peoples or the Year of Revolution, were a series of political upheavals throughout Europe in

1848. It was the only Europe-wide collapse of traditional authority to date, but within a year, reactionary forces had won out, and the revolutions collapsed. This revolutionary wave began in France in february and immediately spread to most of Europe and parts of Latin America. Over 50 countries were affected, but there was no coordination or cooperation among the revolutionaries in different countries. Five factors were involved: the widespread dissatisfaction with the political leadership; the demand for more participation and democracy; the demands of the working classes; the upsurge of nationalism; and finally, the regrouping of the reactionary forces based in the royalty, the aristocracy, the army, and the peasants. The uprisings were led by shaky ad-hoc coalitions of reformers, the middle classes and workers, but it could not hold together for long. Tens of thousands of people were killed, and many more forced into exile. The only significant lasting reforms were the abolition of serfdom in Austria and Hungary, the end of absolute monarchy in Denmark, as well as the definitive end of the Capetain monarchy in France. The revolutions were most important in France, Germany, Poland, Italy, and the Austrian Empire, and did not reach Russia, Great Britain, Spain, Sweden, Portugal, or the Ottoman Empire.