

UNIT ONE

STATES AND PEOPLES OF THE SOUTHERN ETHIOPIA IN THE 19TH CENTURY

Introduction

This unit deals with the territory to south and southeast of Abay River which consisted of many states and peoples.

Among these, there were groups of states such as the Omotic states, the Oromo states, the Shewan kingdom, the Harar Emirate, the Sheikdoms of Asosa Benishangul and Komosha. Several other autonomous states and peoples were in different stages of socio-economic and political development. The political organization of some of these states was based on a monarchical system. Most of these states followed the power of the kings (rulers) by propagating the idea of divine kingships. The Muslim communities of the region also possessed well organized states known as Sheikdoms or Emirates. The political organization of the rest of the states of the south followed traditional political systems of different sorts.

In the 19th century the peoples and states of the Ethiopian region had maintained strong economic relationships with one another. This economic relationship was created by trade and trade routes which bound the region together as a single economic unit.

Objectives

After studying this unit students will be able to:

- * mention the various states and peoples found south and south east of Abay River;
- * point out the different autonomous states that existed in the Ethiopian region, until the end of 19th century or before the formation of modern Ethiopian empire;
- * explain the importance of long distance trade in the economy of the Ethiopian region; and
- * appreciate the importance of long distance trade in promoting interaction among different people of the Ethiopian region in various aspects of social life.

Terms to know

- Astessor
- Mikerecho
- Tate-kisho
- Mowa
- Minjo
- Tato

- Erasho (rasho)
- Mobilization
- Waso
- Incorporated
- Monarchy
- Watch tower
- Manjo
- Musk

1.1. The Omotic States

The peoples and the states which occupied the territory around the Omo river basin speak various languages collectively known by linguists as Omotic languages. The peoples and the states are also known by the genetic linguistic term of Omotic. So around thirty different languages are classified under the Omotic family. The most important languages under the Omotic language family are Kaffa, Walayita, Dawuro, Bench, Dorze Gamo, Gofa, Koyra, Yem, Sheka, and Maji.

The Kingdom of Kaffa

It is found south of the Gojeb river. The land is Kaffa and the people are called Kaffecho. The origins of the kingdom can be traced as far back as the fourteenth century. The names of two dynasties are very important in the history of the Kaffa Kingdom. These dynasties were Matto and Minjo. The Matto dynasty ruled Kaffa before 1390. The first king of the Minjo dynasty was Minjilo and after whom, the ruling dynasty came to be known as Minjo.

In the 19th century, particularly between 1821 and 1897, five prominent kings successively ruled Kaffa. They were:

Gahe Nhchochi (r.1821-1841), Kawe Erochi (r. 1841-1843), Kaji Sharochi (r.1843-1868), (Gali Sarochi r.1868- 1890 (Galito), Gaki Sharochi. (r 1890-1897).

During the reign of these kings, the kingdom developed its monarchical system and was extended to south, southwest northeast of Kaffa. The administration of the kingdom was divided into twelve and later into eighteen provinces. The Kaffa kings held a royal title called tato. The tato was assisted by a state councilors called Mikerecho. There were eight Mikerecho with one non- permanent member. The

land in the Kingdom was considered as the property of the king. Here the concept of the king and the state are overlapped. The kingdom of Kaffa was known to have an efficient system of frontier defense. All along the territory of Kaffa, watch towers were secretly erected at high points to watch and detect the approach of the enemy. The approach of the enemy was signaled by beating drums that imply call for mobilization. The drums from the border were beaten by assigned clans called the Manjo. The Manjo are known to have been outcaste clans in Kaffa.

The economy of Kaffa was based on agriculture. The peasants produced different kinds of crops. They also kept Civet cat to collect musk. The peasants paid taxes from their products including the collected musk. Taxes were collected by assigned collectors called Tate- kisho, meaning the hand of the king. Taxes were collected in kinds. The economy of Kaffa was also supplemented by trade. The most trade items of Kaffa were: coffee, ivory, musk, slave and gold. Long distance trade routes linked Bonga, the center of the kingdom with the center and the coast of Ethiopian region. Many merchants from different directions came to Kaffa market places in search of lucrative commodities, which are mentioned above. Kaffa is also known for its coffee production. Beads, salt bars and iron bars were used as medium of exchange. There also existed traditional iron industry.

Following the expansion of Menilik, Kaffa was finally incorporated into the Ethiopian Empire in 1897.

The kingdom of Yem

Another Omotic state was the kingdom of Yem. The Yem people occupied the western bank of Gibe river. Yem existed as political entity since the fourteenth century. In the nineteenth century the kingdom of Yem was ruled by a dynasty called the Mowa. The kings of Yem adopted a title called ano. The kings were both religious and political heads of their

people. The administration of the kingdom was hierarchically organized. The king was at the top of the social pyramid, and he was the most powerful figure in the kingdom. Below him, there was a council of officials known as astesor.

The astesor was chaired by an official who had the title called waso. The kingdom of Yem was divided into provinces and subprovinces. These provinces and subprovinces were ruled by officials known as erasho(rasho)and gena respectively. The economy of the kingdom was based on agriculture. The peasants paid tributes directly to the king. Trade and handicrafts such as weaving and iron work, were

auxiliary economic activities for the people of Yem. This kingdom was finally conquered by the force of Menelik in 1894.

The Kingdom of Walayita

The other prominent state in southwestern Ethiopia was the kingdom of Walayita. This kingdom had a strong connection with the medieval state of Damot. The founder of this kingdom was Motalami. Motalami founded a dynasty called Walayita Malla. Walayita Malla was established around the beginning of fourteenth century. In the fifteen century the Walayita Malla dynasty was ousted from power and replaced by a rival dynasty called “Tigre”. The Tigre dynasty ruled Walayita until the end of nineteenth century. While this dynasty was in power, Walayita expanded its territory towards the south and west. The kings of Walayita used the royal title called Kawo. The “goqa” were the privileged warrior class of Walayita kingdom. The economy of Walayita was based on Agriculture. All land in the kingdom was the property of a king. The king had also absolute power over the life and property of his people. These warrior classes resided around the court of the Walayita kings. The last king to rule independent Walayita was Kawo Tona. Walayita was finally conquered by Menilik II in 1894 after a stiff resistance.

The Kingdom of Sheka

This kingdom was found to the east of Baro and west of Gojeb Rivers or to the west of Kaffa kingdom. Sheka had two ruling dynasties before the end of the nineteenth century. These ruling dynasties were Batto and Bushasho. Much is not known about the Batto dynasty. The first Sheka Bushasho king migrated from neighbouring Anfillo to Sheka at the end of sixteen century. The Bushasho dynasty of Sheka ruled from the end of 16th to the 19th centuries. Christianity is believed to have been introduced to Sheka in the late sixteenth century. For the brief period in the seventeenth century, Sheka was conquered by the Mecha Oromo Tribe. But it regained its independence at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The kings of Sheka like Kaffa used the royal title “tato”. The kingdom of Sheka had a close economic, political and historical relationship with Enarya, Kaffa and Anfillo.

Traditions of Sheka kingdom recognized the names of five kings of the nineteenth century. These were:

Bedi Nechochi (r.1800-1805), Tachi Nechechi (r.1805-1810), Gali Goechi (r.1820-1850), Deji Goechi (r.1850-1887), Techie Goechi (r.1887-1898)

Besides the above states, there were also other Omotic states. Among these the most important were the kingdoms of Dawuro, Konta, Gamo and Gofa.

1.2. The Oromo Monarchies

Terms to Know

- Autonomy
- Monarchy
- Emirate
- Sheikdoms
- Gada system
- Pastoral life

What was the major political transformation the Oromo of the Gibe valley had undergone in the 19th century?

Another group of states emerged in the south-western Ethiopia in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries belonged to the Oromo people. At the beginning of nineteenth century, monarchical states emerged in Oromo settled areas of Gibe Valley. At the time of the Oromo population movement and expansion, the Gibe basin was occupied by the various clans of the Macha Oromo. At the time of their expansion and the Mecha Oromo mainly led pastoral life and they were governed by the gada system.

By about 1800, however, the Oromo of the Gibe Valley had undergone a profound political transformation. The traditional gada system was transformed into monarchical system of government.

Many factors accounted for this transformation. Firstly, the Oromo of this region had come into contact with Omotic states which had a long tradition of monarchical government. Secondly, the expansion of Oromo into wide area affected the system which worked very well in small groups. Thirdly, the long distance trade and the spread of Islam seem to have undermined the power of the gada government. Finally, frequent wars gave rise to powerful individuals such as the Abba dulas who became influential. On the whole, the combination of the above factors were responsible for the decline of the gada system and the rise of monarchical government.

The monarchical system of government first emerged around the beginning of nineteenth century. This historical development took place among the Oromo around the Gibe River and Wellega. Five states emerged around Gibe River which came to be known as the "Gibe monarchies". These were Gera, Goma, Guma, Jimma and Limu- Enarya. The earliest of these monarchical states was Limu-Enarya. This state was built on the ruins of the medieval kingdom of Enarya/ Hinnario. Enarya was defeated after long period of resistance by the Mecha Oromo.

Limu-Enarya became powerful because it controlled the long distance trade route of the region. Limu-Enarya reached the height of its power during the reign of Abba- Bagibo, or Ibsa (r.1825-1861). From the middle of nineteenth century on Limu-Enarya declined and gave way to its rival, Jimma Kaka. Jimma under its ruler, Abba Jifar became powerful and controlled trade and trade routes.

At about the same time, three Oromo kingdoms emerged to the west and southwest of Jimma. These were Gera Goma and Guma. All the Gibe states were located along the trade route which accounted for their rise and prosperity.

At about the middle of nineteenth century, two other Oromo states emerged in Wollega region. One of these states was Leqa Neqemt. This state was founded by a Bakare Godana. This state reached at the height of its power during the reigns of Moroda and his son Kumsa. Kumsa was later baptized taking the Christian name, Gebre Igzeber. When Menelik's territorial expansion was under way, Kumsa peacefully subdued and was able to maintain his local autonomy. Kumsa ruled Leqa Neqemt in the 2nd half of the nineteenth century.

The other Oromo state in Wollega region was Leqa Qellam. Leqa Qellam was founded by Tullu and became powerful during the reign of his son Jote Tullu. The main source of Leqa Quellam wealth and power was its cross-frontier gold trade and the trade with neighbouring Shiekdoms of Aqoldy and Bela Shangul.

1.3. The Harar Emirate

Terms to Know

- Currency
- Pastoralists
- Sedentary
- Shrines
- Hegemony

Explain why the Harari people build wall around the city of Harar.

The Harari people lived in the city of Harar. In the nineteenth century, they possessed a highly organized system of government. The political organization of Harari people was the result of political developments of the past centuries. The Sultanate of Adal was the most powerful state in the 15th and 16th centuries and much of the territory in the East had been under the hegemony of this sultanate. For most of this period, the sultanate ruled the region from its center in Harar.

In 1577 the pressure of the Oromo expansion forced the sultanate of Adal to shift its center from Harar to Aussa in the north east of the Awash valley. A little before this time, Harar city was also surrounded by a stone wall to resist the Oromo pressure. This wall was built by Emir Nur, the immediate successor of Ahmed Ibrahim Ibin El Ghazi, commonly known as Ahmed Gagn.

The shift of the Adalite political center had one important consequence. This was the emergence of the Harar Emirate. From 1577 to the middle of the seventeenth century on, the emirs of Harar paid annual tribute to the Imam of Aussa. The tributary relation came to an end with rise of Emir Ali Dawud. Ali Dawud (r. 1647-1662). He declared the independence of the Harar emirate. The Emir established a dynasty that was to rule Harar up to the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

For more than two centuries, Harar became the most important trade center in the East. The city was strategically situated between the trade routes of the northern Somali Coasts and the Interior of the Ethiopian region. Two routes from the northern Somali ports of Zeila and Berbera meet at Harar. These trade routes further proceeded to the interior of the Ethiopian region. These trade routes were controlled by the state of Harar, which made it very prosperous.

Fig.1.5. Harar town at the beginning of the 20th century

The commerce of Harar was an important economic asset to the surrounding Oromos and Somalis. During the first wave of the Oromo expansion, the city had secluded itself from the communities outside the city. As the initial waves of the Oromo expansion subsided, the seclusion gave way for the economic interaction between the Harari behind the wall and the Oromos and the Somalis outside the wall. When this process started, the contact between two groups was very limited. The gates of the wall were opened only for trading purposes. The merchants and local traders from outside the wall were forced to surrender their weapons at the city gates.

The security measures were gradually abandoned and free movement inside and outside the city started. In fact, common economic interests determined closer and peaceful interactions among the peoples. The Oromos around the city became good farmers. These farmers exchanged their agricultural products for items brought to the city by foreign merchants.

The fertile territories around Harar produced grain, varieties of fruits and vegetables, coffee and chat. Above all, the last two items, coffee and chat, together with dyes and ostrich feathers, formed the major export of Harar. These items were supplied by the communities around the city of Harar. Therefore, economic interdependence created the ground for more and broader interaction among the peoples of the region.

The growth of the trade of the region made Harar wealthy and prosperous. The city developed its own currency as early as the 17th century. The wealth made the emirate very powerful and it gradually extended its hegemony over the surrounding Oromos and the Somalis. The extension of hegemonic power was facilitated by economic links and marriage relations. Above all, the spread of Islam among the Oromos and the Somalis was important in promoting the power of the Harar Emirate.

Harar is one of the earliest centers of Islam in Ethiopian region. The city of Harar continued to serve as the center of Islamic religious study and training. In this way, the Emirate became a center of the

Islamic culture. A number of mosques were built in the city. The Grand Mosque and the palace of Emir were the most important edifices of the city. There were also several religious shrines in the city. The Harari possessed well developed handicrafts.

The emirate had maintained close economic and political ties with Yemen and the Arabian Peninsula through Zeilla and Berbera ports. Many foreigners lived in the city of Harar. Among these, the most important were the Arabs, Persians, Turks, Armenians and the Greeks. But the

emirate had no direct relations with Europeans. The emirs were suspicious of Europeans whom they did not allow to enter into their territory. Europeans who tried to enter Harar were often imprisoned or killed. But in 1855, the British traveler Sir Richard Burton was able to stay in the city for ten days. Burton's visit had strong impact on the emirates future. This traveler disclosed the wealth of the city as well as the strategic importance of the emirate to the outside world. In the consequence the first threat came from the Egyptians. In 1875 the ruler of Egypt, Khedive Ishmael (r.1863-1879) sent a military expedition led by Mohammed Rauf Pasha and occupied Harar.

After ten years of occupation. The Egyptian army withdrew in 1885. Soon after the withdrawal of the Egyptian troops Menelik of Shawa,

defeated the force of the last Emir of Harar, Emir Abdullahi at the battle of Chalenqo, on January 6, 1887 and conquered Harar. With that the independent existence of Harar came to an end. The Emirate as well as the surrounding Oromos and Somalis were incorporated into the Ethiopian Empire.

1.4. The Sheikdoms Asosa, Benishangul and Komosha

During the nineteenth century, there existed Muslim states or Sheikdoms situated along the Ethio-Sudan border. These were Asosa, or Aqoldi, Beni Shangul and Khoosha. The main factor for the rise of these Muslim States was the influence of Islam and the border trade. This region was very rich in gold.

This and other natural resources of these states attracted the Sudanese (the Mahdists) and the Egyptians to develop a special interest in the region. However, their attempt to control the region failed as the result of the incorporation of the whole region in to Menelik's Empire in 1880s and in 1890s.

1.5. The Shawan Kingdom

Terms to Know

Domain

Negus

Effective administrative

Successors

Envoy

Aristocrat

Fire armed

How do you account to the growth of Shawan autonomy?

Shawa was founded in 1695 by the local aristocrat called Negasi Kirstos. The core area of the Shawa state was a locality called Menz. After Negasi Kirstos, Shawa was ruled by his successors; Sibste (r.1703-1745), Amha Yesus(r.1745-1775), Asfa Wossen(r.1775-1808), and Wosen Seged (r.1808-1813). These successors of Negasi expanded the frontiers of Shawa into the territories of the neighbouring Oromo and Gurage lands.

The distance Shawa had from the center of Christian kingdom (Gondar) allowed the Shawan rulers to exercise full authority in their kingdom. From about the middle of eighteenth century, Shawa ceased to pay tribute to Gondar and became virtually independent from Gonderian rule.

Shawa reached the height of its power during the reign of Shale Selassie(r.1813-1847). He was the first Shawan ruler to adopt the title Negus for himself. The former rulers of Shawa were simply contained with the titles like Meridazmach and Abeto. Shale Selassie was able to organize an effective administrative system for his kingdom. The administration of Shawa was sub-divided in to nine provinces, namely, Minjar; Bulga, Yafat, Gidim, Tegulet, Menze, Gishe, Moret and Shawa-Meda. These were administered by their respective governors who were appointed by the king and answerable to him.

The economy of Shawa was based on agriculture. Trade also contributed a great deal to the wealth and consolidation of the kingdom. The territorial expansions of king Shale Selassie enabled the kingdom to have access to a supply of ivory, coffee, Gold, civet cat and slaves. These trade items were very

important to get fire arms. King Shale Selassie, like other rulers and chief of his time, was interested in firearms and military technology as this would enable him to silence his rivals.

The economic prosperity and political stability of the Kingdom attracted a considerable European interest in Shawa. During the reign of king Shale Selassie, many Europeans who visited Shewa tried to influence their governments to establish relations with the Shawan rulers. The first Europeans to approach the Shawan king were the missionaries Isenberg and Krapf, who arrived at the court of Shale Selassie in 1837. In 1839 another European, the French chemist Rochet d'Hericourt, came to Shewa. He tried to influence the French government to establish relations with the kingdom.

However, the British government took the lead in establishing relation with the kingdom. On the basis of Krapf's recommendation, Britain sent an envoy to Shawa in 1841. This envoy was led by W.C.Harris who succeeded in securing a formal treaty between the British and Shawa. Later in 1843 the French envoy Rochet d' Hericourt, on the behalf of his Government signed a treaty of commerce and friendship with Sahle Selassie. These foreign contacts helped king Sahle Selassie to get firearms with which he was able to expand his kingdom.

King Sahle Selassie died in 1847 and was succeeded by his son Haile Melekot. The reign of Haile Melekot (r1847-1856), marked the end of the autonomous existence of Shawa. This was because Emperor Tewodros II (r.1855-1868) campaigned to Shawa in 1856 and made it one of his provinces. King Haile Melekot died a little before Tewodros defeated the Shawan force at the Battle of Bereket, in November 1855. At the end of his Shawan campaign Tewodros captured Menilik, the son of Haile Melekot and brought him to his court where he stayed for the coming ten years. In 1865, Menilik escaped from Meqdella royal prison and established his power in Shawa. His first capital was at Ankober and with the expansion of his domain; he shifted his center to Entoto until the founding of Addis Ababa.

Questions

1. When did Shawa reach the height of its power?
2. Who was responsible for the founding of the kingdom of Shawa in 1695?
3. What were the traditional titles of the Shawan rulers?
4. What are the events that marked the end of the Shawan autonomous existence?

Fig 1.7 Menelik king of Shawa and later Emperor of Ethiopia

1.6. Trade and Trade Routes

Terms to Know

- Amole
- Barter (bartering)
- Caravan
- Entities
- Institution
- Medium of exchange
- Nagadras
- Robbers

The Ethiopian region in the 19th century was divided into several political entities. However, the people and the states of the region had close economic ties with one another. In the nineteenth century different states and peoples of the Ethiopian region were interconnected by chains of trade routes. Which connected the trade of the Ethiopian region with the Red Sea commerce.

The trade routes, which linked various territories of the Ethiopian region, consisted of two main lines. The starting point for both lines was the south western part of the Ethiopian region. One of the lines begins from Bonga, the capital of the Kingdom of Kaffa, and connected the peoples and states of the southern region with the northern part of the region. Starting from Bonga, this trade route ran northwards through important trade centers such as, Jiren (in Jimma), Seka (in Limu Enarya), Asendabo (in Horro gudru), Basso (in Gojjam), and Darita (in Begemider). From Darita the routes enter Gondar, the important trading center in the northern region. At Gondar the trade routes branched into two. One branch of the trade route proceeded westward to the Sudan through Metemma (Galabat). The other branch ran northward through Adwa and entered Massawa on the Red Sea coast. In the first decades of the nineteenth century, these trade routes were crucial significant for commercial activities of the Ethiopian region.

The second major line of trade route connected the Ethiopian region with Zeila and Berbera, the most important commercial centers of the northern Somali coast. This route was very important, particularly during the reign of Negus Sahale Selassie. This line also served the Shewan kingdom when it was detached from Gonderian rule during the "Era of Princes" ("Zemene Mesafint").

The second major trade route started from Jiren, Jimma and moved to Seka. From Seka it changed its course towards the south east and continued to Sodoo and Rogge near Mount Yerer. This trade route continued and passed through the town of Aliyu Amba, the most important trade center in the kingdom of Shawa. Then it ran eastward to Harar, where it branched into two and proceeded to Zeila and Berbera.

A great variety of items were exchanged in the trade between the Ethiopian region and the Red Sea coast. In Ethiopia, the main source of trade items was the southwestern part of the region where coffee, ivory, gold, animal skin, rhinoceros's horn, musk and slave were plentiful. Some of these items were consumed by the local markets. Coffee, for instance, was not exported in large quantity until the beginning of 20th century. On the other hand, slavery was widespread institution throughout the Ethiopian region. Slaves caught in different part of the region were sold on local market places like Abdul Rasul, near Aliyu Amba, Gindeberet in the north western Shawa and Yejube in Gojjam. Some of the slaves were used to domestic purposes and the rest were sold to North West Africa and to the Arab countries.

The imported trade items include: mirror, cowries shells, cotton cloth, glass and iron wares. Part of cowries shells was used as ornaments, while the rest served as medium of exchange. Before the nineteenth century, in many part of the Ethiopian region, trade was mostly conducted through bartering. Bartering was a system in which people exchange what they have with what they don't. In the nineteenth century, however, different items were used as a medium of exchange. Among such items,

the most important was salt in the form of bars (salt bars), commonly known as “amole”. Amole was the chief medium of exchange in the trade of the Ethiopian region. The salt was obtained from deposits in the northern Danakil desert and was transported by camel to Tigray from where it was carried to various parts of Ethiopian region. The value of amole constantly increased as they were carried further distance from their origin. In addition to the amole, other items or materials such as iron bars, beads and pieces of cotton cloth (Abujadid) were also used as medium of exchange. Apart from these traditional currencies, Maria Theresa dollar (thaler) served as medium of exchange in the nineteenth century. Maria Theresa coins were introduced into Ethiopian region at the end of eighteenth century.

The long distance trade between the coast and the interior was conducted by Muslim merchants, most of whom were foreigners. But some Ethiopian Muslim merchants also had participated in this long distance trade. Among such merchants, were the Oromo Muslim merchants of the southwestern region. These Muslim Oromo merchants were known as “afkala”. The active muslim merchants in the northern were also called Jabarti. The Argobba merchants from Shawa, were active in the trade between Harar and the northern Somali coast.

Participating in the long distance trade caused several hazards. It was very risky to cross some rivers, gorges, mountains and deserts. In addition to these natural barriers, robbers (shiftas) and brigandes as well as deisposed local rulers created much difficulty for merchants. In order to challenge such problems, merchants organized them selves into a caravan .These organized merchants choose one merchant as a leader of the caravan traders. The leader of the caravan traders was known as “nagadras” or chief of traders.

Besides long distance trade, local trade and trade in the border areas were also important throughout the Ethiopian region. Through these economic relationships, political divisions in the Ethiopian region were bridged or connected and many states and peoples interacted in different aspects of social life.

Summary

Before the end of the nineteen century there were several states and peoples who maintained an autonomous political and social life. This political division did not hinder (obstacle) interaction among the peoples and states in the Ethiopian region. The interaction of the peoples and states maintained or created strong economic relationship through trade. Besides getting satisfaction in economic needs, trade also promoted exchange of new ideas and cultural elements among different peoples. The above conditions created the ground for later political unity during the last quarter of the nineteen century.

Review Questions

Part I. Say "True" if the statement is correct "False" if the statement is incorrect

1. There were two different states and peoples before the last quarter of the 19th century in the Ethiopian region
2. The different people who lived around the Omo river basin were referred as the Omotic people.

3. The ruling family of Yem was called Mowa.
4. The political organization of the Oromo people was called Gada System

Part II. Match the items in column A with those in B

"A"	"B"
1. The last king of Kaffa	A. Nur
2. Council of Yem officials	B. kawo
3. The famous ruler of Jimma	C. Gaki Sharochi
4. Built the wall of Harar	D. Abba Jiffar
5. The famous ruler of Limu, Enarya	E. Abba Bagibo

Part III. Choose the best possible answer from the alternatives given for each question

1. Why do we say long distance trade is full of hazards?
 - a. crossing natural barrier was risky
 - b. problem of robbers
 - c. a and b
 - d. No answer
2. Maria Theresa coin in the Ethiopian region was introduced in _____ century
 - a. beginning of 19th century
 - b. end of 18th century
 - c. first decade of 20th century
 - d. no answer
3. The leader of a caravan traders was called
 - a. azmach
 - b. rasho
 - c. Negaderas
 - d. Emir
4. The trade route line which connected the peoples of the southwest with the north begins in
 - a. Bonga
 - b. Harar
 - c. Aliyu Amba
 - d. Seka
5. The last emir of Harar was
 - a. Abba megal
 - b. Abdullahi
 - c. Kumsa
 - d. Tona
6. Which one of the following does not belong to the group?
 - a. Lega Qellem
 - d. Guma

- b. Gera e. Limu Enarya
- c. Goma
7. Who was the founder of the walayita kingdom?
- a. Motolami c. Gaki -Sherochi
- b. Tona d. Gahe- nechochi
8. Tax collectors of the kingdom of Kaffa were
- a. ano b. tate kisho c. astesor d. waso
9. The kingdom which lie west of Gojeb and east of Baroo rivers (west of Kaffa) was
- a. Dawuro b. Bench Maji c. Sheka d. Yem
10. One of the Shiekdoms which existed along the Sudanese border was
- a. Asosa b. Adal c. Somali d. Aliyu Amba

Part IV. Fill in the blank with correct responses

B. Exchange of goods for goods was

D. The most important commercial centers and ports of the northern Somali coast were _____ and _____.

Part V. Give short answers

2. ano

4. trade routs

6. Gibe Oromo states

8. sedentary agricultural life

9. Ahmed Ibin Ibrahim al Ghazi

10. Bonga

UNIT TWO

DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM, NATIONALISM AND COLONIALISM

Introduction

This unit focuses on the advance of capitalism in Europe and America. It also deals with the social economic and political change of the life of the peoples in different countries of Europe and North America. As the result of the industrial Revolution the above countries were transformed from rural and agricultural to a predominantly urban and industrial society. The development of capitalism in turn brought about tremendous changes in various aspect of social life.

In some countries, the development of capitalism had specific social and political consequences. One of the main factors for the unification of Germany and Italy was the development of capitalism in the respective countries. The American civil war had its origin in the development of capitalism. It had also paved ways for the formation and rise of national states as well as the growth of nationalism in central Europe and in the Balkans.

The expansion of capitalism gave rise to an enormous demands for raw material, cheap labour, new markets and sphere of capital investment. These demands led the European industrialized countries to posses over sea territories. There fore, the industrialized nations of Europe embarked on empire building which finally led them to scramble for (partition of) Africa beginning from 1880's.

Objectives

After studying this unit, you will be able to:

- * point out the main economic, political and social consequences of the Industrial revolution;
- * analyze the causes, course and consequences of the civil war in the U.S.A;
- * explain the main factors that contributed to the German and Italian unification;
- * analyze the development of capitalism in Europe, and how it paved the way for colonial rivalries, clashes and scramble for Africa;
- * explain the nature of African resistance to the imposition of European colonial rule in Africa.

2.1. Unification of Italy

Terms to Know

- Annex
- Emancipation
- Papacy
- Appeasement
- Intervention
- Popular revolution
- Betrayal
- Nationalist
- Red-shirts
- Bloody victories
- Offensive war
- Republican

Unification of Italy

During the first half of nineteenth century Italy was a disunited nation. Rome was under the control of the French troops since 1848. Lombardy and Venetia were under Austria domination. The duchies of Parma, Modena, Tuscany and the kingdom of the Two Sicilies to which Naples was a part were under local rulers dominated by Austria. The Papal states were under the control of the Catholic Church.

Since the 1840s Italian nationalists followed different approaches in order to unify their country. One of these ideas was propagated by Giuseppe Mazzini and his organization, "Young Italy". Mazzini wanted to create a united and a free Italian republic through a popular revolution. The second approach came from

the north Italian state of Piedmont. This group wanted to unify Italy under the

leadership of Piedmont's monarchy. The third approach called for the unification of Italy under the Pope of the Roman Catholic Church. This group wanted the federation of all Italian States under the papacy.

In 1848 an uprising took place in the Italian peninsula. The uprising started in Sicily, in the south. It was a republican revolution which was led by Italian nationalists inspired by Mazzini.

The uprising soon spread to Venetia and Lombardy. When the war broke out between the Italians and Austrians, king Charles Albert of Piedmont declared war on Austria. Popular pressure also forced the

rulers of Naples, Tuscany and the Papal States to send troops in support of an Italian uprising against Austria. When these combined forces were on the verge of defeating and driving out Austrians from the Italian soil, the pope ordered the withdrawal of the troops from Venetia and Lombardy at this crucial period.

The Pope of Roman Catholic church had always been against Italian unity, fearing that a United Italy might threaten papal power and territory. Following the pope's order of troop's withdrawal, other Italian states also withdrew their troops from fighting. However, Piedmont alone confronted the Austrian force. As the result of this the Austrians easily defeated the army of Piedmont and restored their domination in Lombardy and Venetia.

The Pope's betrayal of the Italian cause arouse bitter opposition to the papacy. In November 1848 an angry mob forced the pope to flee Rome. The insurgents proclaimed Rome a republic and called Mazzini to the capital to lead the government. Mean while, Napoleon III sent troops to capture Rome. Thus, the pope was restored to his authority. After this, the French troops stayed in Rome until the Franco- Prussian war of 1870- 71.

A nationalist patriot dedicated to Mazzini's plan of an Italian republic was Giuseppe Garibaldi. The outcome of 1848 uprisings discredited both Mazzini's republic and the federation of Italian states under the papacy. But the plan of uniting Italy from the north, under the monarchy of Piedmont, won much popular support. Thus, the unification of Italy became the main task of Piedmont and its rulers, King Victor Emmanuel, and Cavour, the Prime Minister.

The leading personality in the unification of Italy was Count Camillo Cavour (1810-1861), who became Prime Minister of Piedmont in 1852. He believed

that the unification of Italy could not be achieved before driving the Austrians out of the Italian peninsula. To expel the Austrians, he needed the support of foreign powers like France and Prussia. Hoping to win such aid, Cavour sent his army to fight on the side of France and Britain against Russia in the Crimean war (1854-1856). By this move, Cavour won the good will of the great powers, particularly of the French ruler, Napoleon III. Finally Napoleon III promised support for the expulsion of Austria from Italy. In return Cavour promised to cede the provinces of Nice and Savoy to France.

In 1859 war broke out between Austria and Piedmont. Napoleon III kept his promise and joined the war against Austria. In June 1859 France and Piedmont won two victories at the Battles of Magenta and Solferino. But Napoleon ignored his promise to Piedmont and concluded a separate treaty with Austria. By this agreement Lombardy was given to Piedmont and Venetia remained under Austrian rule.

Cavour bitterly resented Napoleon III's betrayal though he had already won the war against Austria. The news of victory and betrayal of Napoleon incited nationalist revolts in north and central Italy. The Italians in Tuscany, Parma, Modena and Romagna rose up against their Pro-Austrian rulers and demanded union with Italy. To annex these states Cavour appeased Napoleon III by surrendering Nice and Savoy to France. Thus, in 1860, the states in north central Italy were united with Piedmont under Victor Emmanuel II.

In the same year, 1860, a popular uprising took place in Sicily. In May 1860 Garibaldi hurried to the south leading his famous volunteer army of one thousand known as the "thousand" or "Red Shirts". Sicily and Naples came under his control within a short period of time. In the interest of the nation Garibaldi put aside his republican sentiments and proposed that the two Sicilies unite with Piedmont under Victor Emmanuel II. While Garibaldi conquered the two Sicilies, Cavour ordered Piedmont's troops into the papal states; the nationalist groups in those states welcomed them. Then, central Italy was overrun. Cavour announced the annexation of the Papal States. The whole peninsula, except Rome and Venetia, was united under one government. In 1861 the kingdom of Italy was proclaimed. Venetia and Rome were also restored as a result of international politics. Italy allied with Prussia in the Austro-Prussian war of 1866. By the peace treaty after the war, Austria ceded Venetia to Italy.

In 1870 because of the war with Prussia the French troops supporting the pope were withdrawn. Then Italian troops seized Rome in September 1870. Thus, the unification of Italy was completed and Rome became the capital of united Italy in 1870. However; Italian nationalists believed that Italian

unification was still not complete, because Austria still ruled the Trentino province and the city of Trieste, where many Italians lived and Italy wanted this area. This demand became known as Italian “irredentism”

2.2. German Unification

Terms to Know

- Compensation
- Political crisis
- Uniform tariffs
- Diet
- Predominant

- Unification
- Junker politician
- Neutrality
- Zollverein

Unification of Germany

Developments leading to German Unification:

1. The Napoleonic wars
2. Development of capitalism
3. Rise of nationalism
4. The creation of German confederation
5. The formation of the Zollverein

In the late 18th century some German people began to think to themselves as distinct nationality and agitated for a unified father land. As the result of the wars of Napoleon, German nationalism aroused. The wars also weakened Austrian authority by abolishing the Holy Roman Empire and reducing the number of German states from more than 300 to less than 100.

The ground for German unification was laid by two important developments that happened in the first half of the nineteenth century. The congress of Vienna in 1815 reduced the number of German states to 38 and organized them into an Austrian dominated German confederation. The confederation was weak, in effective and incapable of providing Germany with a unified government. This failure stirred the Germans to seek unity by over means. Austria and Prussia were the most power full German states. They competed with one another to play the leading role in the movement to unify Germany. Despite the contest between Prussia and Austria, the creation of the Confederation promoted closer ties among the German states.

Secondly, in 1819 Prussia formed a German Custom Union which became known as the Zollverein or Customs Union. It was realized in 1834 and by the 1840s it included all the German states except Austria. This was designed by Prussia to isolate Austria from other German states. The Zollverein maintained free trade between member states by removing trade barriers among German states. But it imposed high tariffs against non-members. As the result of the establishment of the union, uniform tariffs were set up and many other restrictions were abolished. The removal of internal tariff barriers benefited German merchants and manufacturers, and promoted the country's economic unity. In consequence, railways were built and this strengthened economic ties among the German states. This in turn promoted a sense of national identity that was essential for political unification.

Austria emerged from the congress of Vienna as an influential central European Empire containing many different peoples. The Austrian rulers did not like the growth of nationalism in Germany fearing that this might inspire subject nationalities to seek independence. Austrian rulers also realized that they would lose their influence over German affairs if Germany achieved unification.

The rulers of the smaller German states feared that German Unification might lead to centralization of government power which in turn lead to end of their authority. French leaders feared that a unified Germany would be powerful to challenge France's leadership in Europe. France felt militarily more secure with weak and disunited neighbours. A series of revolts were carried out in 1848 aimed at ending autocracy and unifying Germany. These revolts were led by liberals who sought constitutional democracy. However, they lacked the military power to enforce unification, without the support of the king.

After all these, the way was open for the successful attempt at German unification under autocratic leadership. Wilhelm I became king of Prussia in 1861.

He was convinced that he need to have large army in order to be leader of the Germans. In view of this Wilhelm I presented a request for a large army budget to the Prussian parliament and this met with opposition by the liberal majority who opposed militarism. This created political crisis in 1861 and 1862. In 1862 Otto von Bismarck (1815- 1898) was appointed prime minister of Prussia. Bismarck belonged to the dominant landowning aristocracy, the Junkers. He was a reactionary and despised democracy. He shared William's conviction that Prussia needed a strong army to lead the German people to political unity.

Bismarck in his famous speech said "Germany is not looking for Prussia's liberalism, but its power...The great questions of our time will not be decided by speeches and majority decisions-that was the mistake of 1848 and 1849-but by "Blood and Iron"

He made this famous speech to the finance committee of the parliament to get the approval of the army budget. But his appeal to the parliament was not fruit full so he ignored the parliament and pushed the program of raising taxes.

What were the steps taken by Bismarck to achieve German unification?

In order to achieve the German unification Bismarck waged three wars against Denmark, Austria and France. In 1864 he declared war on Denmark over the principalities of Schleswig and Holstein. These principalities were located on the border between German and Denmark. The population of Holstein was entirely German and that of Schleswig was the mixture of German and Danes. These territories had maintained an independent existence for about four centuries. In 1863 King Christian IX of Denmark annexed Schleswig to his empire. The Germans in both principalities bitterly opposed and appealed to all the German people for their support. Bismarck wanted to intervene and exploit the crisis for his own political aim. He asked the support of Austria and jointly declared war on Denmark. The war was fought for three months and finally the Danish army was defeated. Prussia and Austria administered these two provinces jointly. In 1865 both Prussia and Austria reached to an agreement that Austria took the administration of Holstein, while Prussia took that of Schleswig.

The agreement of 1865 was a temporary halt to Bismarck's move against Austria. Bismarck knew well that Austria was the main obstacle to German unification. In order to create ground for the inevitable conflict with Austria, he diplomatically approached the following countries and won their support during the war against Austria in 1866. These countries were Russia, France and Italy.

The Austro-Prussian war broke out in June 1866. This war was provoked by Bismarck who sent army to Holstein when Austria presented the question of Schleswig-Holstein before the Diet of the confederation. After seven weeks of fighting the Austrian army was defeated at the battle of Sadowa in 1866. This victory enabled Bismarck to isolate Austria from Germany. On the other hand, the victory of Bismarck ended the chance for a united Germany under Austrian control. By the treaty of Prague, the German confederation, where the Austrian influence was strong, was dissolved. In 1867 Prussia set up a new north German confederation in which Austria was not allowed to join. Following the Austro-Prussian War, Bismarck annexed several north German states and compelled the remaining ones to join in a Prussian dominated North-German confederation. The South German states remained outside the confederation were also tied to Prussia by the Zollverein and defensive military alliance.

Thus all German states north of the Rhine joined the confederation. In this respect, the new confederation was a stepping stone for the unification of the German empire. What was required to complete the unification was only the inclusion of the south German states.

The completion of German unification required the elimination of another obstacle, France, which opposed the emergence of a strong and united Germany in the center of Europe. On top of this, Bismarck did not fulfill his promise of compensation for Napoleon III's neutrality in the Austro-Prussian war of 1866. Because of this, Napoleon III was determined not to allow the completion of German unification. On the other hand, war with France was also part of Bismarck's plan because without crushing the military power of France the unification of Germany could not be completed. For this reason Bismarck provoked France into declaring war on Prussia.

The Franco-Prussian war (1870-71)

Bismarck used different issues to provoke Napoleon into declaring war on July 19, 1870. The south German states joined the war on the side of Prussia. Napoleon III, who was pushed by his wife, personally led the French army. On September 2, 1870, Napoleon and his 100,000 troops were defeated

and surrendered at the battle of Sedan. Napoleon III was captured and made a war prisoner. The news of the defeat of France incited the people of Paris (Parisians) to revolt and the Second Empire collapsed. France surrendered in early 1871 and gave up her two provinces of Alsace and Lorraine at the Treaty of Frankfurt.

After a smashing victory over France, Bismarck obtained the agreement of all German states to establish a German Empire with Prussia at the center. On January 18, 1871 a united German Empire was proclaimed in the French palace at Versailles. Wilhelm I became Emperor of Germany. Bismarck was also proclaimed as Chancellor of the German Empire. Bismarck continued to dominate the politics of Germany as well as Europe for another twenty years up to his resignation in 1890.

2.3. The American Civil War (1861-1865)

Key Terms

- Abolition
- Confederacy
- Socio- economic
- Civil war
- Declaration of independence
- Secession
- Representative
- Institution

- Slave trade

The American Civil War of 1861-1865

The United State of America was in a civil war from 1861-1865. The main cause of this civil war was the contradiction between antagonistic socio-economic Systems that existed in the U.S.A. Northern and western America developed a capitalist system. But the south maintained large plantations and used slave labour. Slavery existed since the days of the Atlantic slave trade.

During the war of independence (1775-1783) a progressive document known as the "Declaration of independence" (1776) had been issued. The opening paragraph of the declaration stated that: "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness".

This noble statement, however, failed to bring about the abolition of slavery in America. After independence slavery and slave holding continued to be a legal institution in the southern part of the U.S.A. Plantation owners invested their capital in land and in slaves. The main crop was cotton, and the slave owners considered this crop as "king", that is very important to the US economy and to Europe. In general, slavery was so important to the socio-economic and political life of the southern slave owning states, and any opposition to this system was ruthlessly suppressed. On the other hand, capitalism developed in the north and the western part of the USA. In the north manufacturing showed a rapid growth, while mechanized agriculture expanded in the west. In the 1850s both the north and the west drew closer to each other. Rail roads connected the northeast and the northwest. This modern means of transportation facilitated the exchange of products between the two regions.

From the northwest food and raw materials were carried to the northeast, while manufactured goods were transported to the northwest. These areas shared common socio-economic system, and both

belonged to one bloc. Thus the north and west stood in contrast to the south. The north constituted Free States and the south slave states. This socio-economic difference between the north and the south became the main cause for the bloody civil war that came to plague America. Free States and slave owning states representatives in the congress quarreled, because both representatives had different views on the question of slavery.

The election of Abraham Lincoln in 1860 was a break through that led to the beginning of civil war in America. With, this the slave states feared that the election of Abraham Lincoln, who opposed slavery, would lead the government to follow anti slavery policies. In fact, their fear was not groundless. On the eve of the civil war many Americans, both in the north and in the south, shared Lincoln's view that the union could not survive "half slave and half free". Americans in the north determined to stop the expansion of slavery into other US territories. These Americans even hoped at some future time to eliminate the institution from the south where it existed legally. The slave owners of the south were equally determined to preserve the anachronistic system. This was the condition that existed in the USA when Abraham Lincoln was elected as a president.

In 1860 presidential election Abraham Lincoln (1809-1865) was elected president of the United States of America. Lincoln was a democrat and one of the opponents of slavery (abolitionists).

Following Lincoln's election, Carolina State declared secession from the Union. Finally, eleven slave owning states seceded from the USA. In February 1862 the slave- owning states formed a new state called the Confederacy the confederate Southern States of America. Colonel Jefferson Davis was elected president of the confederacy. Before Lincoln was inaugurated to office in March 1861, the government of the Confederacy was building its power by recruiting an army and raising funds. After Lincoln's inauguration, the north took up arms and the civil war broke out between the Union and the Confederacy.

When the civil war started both groups anticipated that the outcome of the war would be decided in a brief conflict. But contrary to this anticipation, the war dragged on and lasted for four years (1861-1865). In the war, the two sides had different advantages. The north had large resources, material as well as human, while the south lacked both. But the slave owning states compensated these shortcomings by well experienced officers and trained soldiers. Thus, at the beginning of the war the Confederacy had the upper hand over the North. In this respect, the major problem of the Union was at first lack of competent generals. Finally Abraham Lincoln appointed efficient Generals like Ulysses S. Grant and William T. Sherman.

Did Lincoln's Emancipation proclamation law help the Union to defeat the south? Explain.

At the beginning of the civil war the North fought primarily to preserve the Union. However, as the war dragged on, the issue of slavery in the South became the focus of the conflict. The contradiction in the North against the South grew hostile. Taking this advantage, Abraham Lincoln issued two proclamations. The first was "Emancipation Proclamation" and the second was the "Homestead law". In the first he declared slaves in the south to be free as of January 1, 1863. And the second decree allowed

all citizens including the freed slaves to own plots of land for personal use. Both proclamations had the effect of bolstering the union army. Freed slaves were invited to serve in the union army. By the end of the war more than 186,000 black soldiers had served in the union army, many of them as officers. These Proclamations played decisive roles for the victory of the Union over the separatist south because they possessed great revolutionary significance and attracted many recruits to the Northern army.

The long years of combating created disadvantage on the part of the south. This was because, they faced shortage of man power, artillery, munitions, food and medical supplies. In addition to this, they suffered because of poor transportation. France and Britain refused to recognize the Confederacy, which dealt psychological blow to the Confederacy. The combination of these and other factors brought about the defeat of the South. By the spring of 1865 the South army was finally routed. The war came to an end in April 1865 when Robert E. Lee surrendered to Ulysses S. Grant, the commander of the Union Army.

On April 14, 1865, five days after the Southern army had capitulated, president Abraham Lincoln, who had led the American people throughout the critical years of the civil war, was shot by John Wilkes Booth, agent of the defeated slave owner and died on April 15, 1865.

Map 5. The United States of America

What were the effects of the war?

Major effects of the war were:

- * Abraham Lincoln was shot dead by an agent of the slave owners.
- * The south was defeated as the result of the civil war.
- * Slavery was abolished.
- * Capitalism expanded in the USA very rapidly.
- * The unity of American states was maintained.

2.4. Nationalism and Multi National Empires

Terms to Know

- Armed struggle
- Discrimination
- Atrocities
- Protectorate
- Bulwark
- Liberation struggle
- Constitutional monarchy
- Nationalism
- Dead look
- Suzerainty

Nationalism and Multi National Empire

The demand of national groups for independent states of their own is often called nationalism. Most of the time, this demand has only been fulfilled by armed struggle. This was the way in which the Italians and the Germans succeeded in forming their own national states. In the Balkan region also the subject peoples of the Ottoman Empire took up arms against their rulers.

Where do we find the Balkan region?

The Balkan region is found in the south and southeast of Europe, around the Balkan mountain. The list of Balkan countries include: Bulgaria, Albania, Rumania, Serbia, Montenegro, Herzegovina, Greece, etc.. Through out the nineteenth century, the liberation struggle of the Balkan peoples strongly affected the international politics of Europe. The liberation struggle of the Balkan peoples and the great power politics that accompanied it was one aspect of the so- called Eastern Question.

The Eastern Question and the Balkan crisis affected the politics of Europe for several centuries. It originated the Turkish conquest of the Balkans in the late middle ages and the subsequent decline of Turkey (the Ottoman Empire). The Eastern Question was a term used to describe the diplomatic problems posed in Europe during the 19th century and early 20th century regarding the decline of the Ottoman Empire. The strategic location of the Ottoman territories, which included the Balkan peninsula and the area that is now Turkey, made it of great importance to the other European powers.

Among the European powers, Britain, Austria and Russia were deeply involved in the Eastern Question. Before the eighteenth century, Europe was worried about the expansion of Ottoman power. At that time, Austria stood as a wall of protection against the westward expansions of the Ottoman Empire. On the other hand, from the reign of Peter the Great (1682-1725), Russia had been ambitious to expand to the lower Danube and the banks of Bosphorus River.

Beginning from the late seventeenth century Ottoman Empire underwent a decline which created the Eastern Question. The interests, policies and rules of some European powers were changed. Russia

did not give up the lower Danube, and aimed at controlling the Slav peoples of the region. This created rivalry between Austria and Russia, because the latter feared that the realizations of Russia's ambition would create problem in Austria's own Empire, which had a great number of Slavs. This changed the role of Austria in the region.

Before the eighteenth century, Austria's role had been primarily containing the westward expansion of the Ottoman power. But after the eighteenth century, it became a wall against Russia's southward expansion. In other words, the existence of the Ottoman Empire served the interest of Austria. Britain wanted the preservation of a weaker Ottoman power. This was to safe guard her empire in India and her interest in the Mediterranean Sea. And this was the main reason for the involvement of Britain and France in the Crimean War of 1854-1856. They fought the Crimean war against Russia to protect Ottoman Turkey. Britain and Austria saved the Ottoman Empire from external danger. But they were unable to save it from internal danger that undermined the power of the Ottoman state from within. The internal danger was created by the rise of bitter nationalism among the peoples of the Balkan region.

The struggle of the Balkan peoples for national liberation complicated the Eastern Question. The crisis in the Balkans went beyond the European powers and finally led to the emergence of five independent Balkan states. This Balkan multi national states which achieved their independent were Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia, Rumania and Montenegro. Albania also emerged independent as a result of the Balkan wars of 1912-1913.

The Ottoman Turkish Empire

Terms to Know

- Autocratic rule
- Loosely organized
- Champion
- Multi-national state
- Frequent wars

The nomadic Seljuk Turks became prominent in Asia Minor, Palestine and Arabia before the Ottoman Turks. The Ottoman Turks accepted Islam and soon became powerful after their conquest of Persia (1040) and Asia-minor at the end of 13th century. They replaced the Seljuk Turks in the region around 1299. The Ottoman Turks got their name from their leader, Osman (Ottoman). In the first half of fourteenth century, the Ottoman Turks controlled Persia, Arabia, Palestine and Asia Minor.

The other states found in Europe around the 14th century were multi-national states that were loosely organized. This was mainly true of the Holy Roman Empire, which was under the control of German and the Italian princes.

The states of England, France, Portugal and Spain also emerged as states during this period. Strong monarchical empires were formed in Britain, France, Portugal and Spain.

Ottoman Turkey became most powerful and won victory over European lands i.e. Andrianopol in 1353, Solonika in 1389, Bulgaria in 1393, Venetia in 1402, the Greece Peninsula in 1402, and captured Constantinople, the capital of the Eastern Roman Empire in 1453. Later Constantinople was renamed Istanbul by the Turks. After dominating all of the Balkan states, the Ottoman Turkish leader, Sultan Muhammad II became the ruler of a vast Empire from Constantinople.

The Ottoman Empire continued its expansion until 1556. Turkey conquered Egypt and other North Africa countries beginning from 1517. Turkey captured Hungary (Magyars) in 1526. Under Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent, Ottoman power reached its climax. His reign lasted from 1520-1566.

The Ottoman Turks imposed Islam, autocratic rule and Turkish culture over the conquered people and the Sultan had both political and religious power. The Ottoman Turks controlled trade routes that run from the Mediterranean Sea to the Far East, Particularly to India and China. The Turks obstructed the European merchants from going to the Far East for luxury goods. The Arabs used to be intermediaries in the trade between the Far East and Europe. The Ottoman Turks and Venetians established their monopoly over the trade of this region.

The European powers were unable to crush the powerful Ottoman Empire because they had their own internal problems, political and religious conflicts. They were exhausted by frequent wars among themselves.

Portugal and Spain, which were the two great powers of Europe in the fifteenth and sixteen centuries, looked for allies outside Europe against the Ottoman Turkey. For instance, Portugal undertook the search for the Prester John of the Indies by land and sea. For this purpose, a Portuguese delegation was sent seeking aid from Christian Ethiopia. In addition to this the Europeans began the great discoveries to find out a new sea route to India. This was because the Turks blocked the trade route on land to Far East and India.

Austria-Hungary Empire

Another Multi- National Empire was Austria- Hungary also known as Dual Monarchy. It was ruled by the Habsburg Monarchy from 1867 to 1918. The Empire of Austria, as an official designation of the territories ruled by the Habsburg monarchy, dates to 1804 when Francis II, the last of the Holy Roman Emperors proclaimed himself Emperor of Austria. Two years later the Holy Roman Empire came to an end. After the fall of Napoleon Bonaparte (1814-1815), Austria became once more the leader of the German states. But the Austro- Prussian war of 1866 resulted in the expulsion of Austria from the German Confederation and caused Emperor Francis Joseph to reorient his policy toward the East and to consolidate his heterogeneous and multi-national Empire.

The outcome of negotiation was the compromise *Ausgleich* concluded on February 8, 1867. The agreement was a compromise between the Emperor of Austria and Hungary. Hungary received full internal autonomy, together with a responsible ministry. In return, they agreed the Empire should still be a single great state for the purposes of war and foreign affairs. Francis Joseph thus surrendered his domestic prerogatives in Hungary, including his protection of the non-Magyar peoples, in exchange for the maintenance of dynastic prestige abroad.

The "Common Monarchy" consisted of the Emperor and his court, the Minister of foreign affairs, and the Minister of war. There was no common Prime Minister (other than Francis Joseph himself) and no common cabinet. The common affairs were to be discussed by the delegations composed of representatives from the two parliaments. There was to be a Customs Union and a sharing of accounts, which was to be revised every ten years.

The *Ausgleich* came into force when passed as a constitutional law by the Hungarian parliament in March 1867. The Reichsrat (the Imperial parliament) was only permitted to confirm the *Ausgleich* without amending it. In return for this the German liberals who composed its majority, received certain concessions: the rights of individual were secured and a genuinely impartial judiciary was created. Freedom of belief and of education were guaranteed. The ministers, however, were still responsible to the Emperor, not to a majority of the Reichsrat.

The official name of the state shaped by the *Ausgleich* was Austria-Hungary. The kingdom of Hungary had a name, a king, and a history of its own. The rest of the Empire was a casual

Map 6. Part of old Austria-Hungary Empire

agglomeration without even a clear description. Technically it was known as “the kingdoms and lands represented in the Reichsart” or, more shortly, as the other Imperial half.

Greece was the first Balkan country to achieve independence. The liberation struggle of the Greeks started with an uprising of 1821. This uprising gradually developed into a war of independence. When the war started, the major European powers stayed neutral. But in reality both Britain and Austria deeply felt the need to maintain the integrity of the Ottoman Empire for their own advantage. The Ottoman army was unable to defeat the war at sea. The Greeks were determined to continue their struggle until they got or achieved their independence.

Why did the British and Austrians fear a continuation of the war in the Balkan region?

Britain and Austria feared that they would not stop Russia from intervention if the war continued indefinitely. Therefore, these powers had to appease Greek Nationalism. To resolve the deadlock, the great powers of Europe finally recognized the total independence of Greece in 1833.

Why did the European powers stand on the side of Turkey in the Crimean War of 1853 – 56?

Throughout the nineteenth century, the European statesmen, particularly the British, developed fear of Russian expansion. Their fear developed when Russia determined to take over the old

provinces of Ottoman Empire, particularly, Constantinople. So to the rest of Europeans Russia remained a source of fear which always invests an unknown and unpredictable force.

In 1853 Tsar Nicholas I stated that "...we have a sick man on our hands," it is metaphorically referred to Turkey.

Thereupon Russian armies anticipated the "sick man's" demise by occupying the Turkish provinces, like Rumania. Then the British government decided to aid the Turks. Meanwhile, a dispute had developed between France and Russia concerning the claims of the Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox monks over controlling Holy Places in Jerusalem. The French Emperor, Napoleon III needed the prestige of successful war; he was annoyed at Tsar Nicholas, because the latter had declined to greet him as "my brother" when he made himself Emperor of France. Besides this Napoleon III hoped to please the Catholics in France by claiming the right to protect Catholics.

In the Turkish Empire, with little cause but no justification, he declared war on Russia. Britain joined France in order to fight for the preservation of Ottoman Empire in Europe.

Which were the major warring nations in the Crimean War?

The two fighting nations in the Crimean war were Turkey and Russia. But due to the fact that we have discussed, Turkey was supported by the great powers like Britain, France and Italy (Piedmont-Sardinia).

In 1854 the two powers, France and Britain dispatched an expedition to the black sea to besiege the Russian fortress of Sebastopol on the Crimean Peninsula. After heavy losses and terrible sufferings on both sides, the Russians evacuated from Sebastopol in Sept. 1855. Then, the Allies of Turkey, France, Britain, Piedmont agreed to suspend hostilities.

Despite the heavy losses, Napoleon was satisfied with his victory such as it was, the British who had conducted their share of the war with heavy casualties and tragic inefficiency, would willingly have continued it. As for the Russians, they had never desired war and they were resentful with the attitude of Austria because the Russians expected the Austrians to come on their side.

What were the outcomes of the war?

The Crimean war was terminated by a congress of diplomats who met at Paris to work out a new settlement for the Near Eastern Question, to hold Russia in check the victors ordained, thus the Peace terms were:-

1. No great power to maintain war ships in the Black Sea.
2. Moldavia and Walachia were to be evacuated by the Russians and to be autonomous principalities while remaining under Turkish suzerainty.
3. Danube River to be open to all trading nations' ships.

The Bulgarians were another Balkan people subjected to Ottoman rule. The Bulgarian nationalism in the Balkan region was very slow than others to develop. In 1870s, the Bulgarian nationalism experienced a sudden rise partly due to external influence. This external influence was the result of an insurrection in Herzegovina in 1875. The insurrection rapidly spread throughout the Balkan Peninsula. The Bulgarians were also involved in the uprising which was ruthlessly suppressed by the Turkish military force in 1876.

Of Bulgaria (Batak), the Turkish army massacred a large number of Bulgarians with out discrimination of age and sex. This event came to known as "the Bulgarian Atrocities". The Bulgarian Atrocities intensified the struggle of the Bulgarians for independence.

Russia, which regarded herself as the protector of the Slavs, declared war on Turkey in 1877. In 1878, at the Treaty of Berlin the war came to an end. As the result of this treaty European powers made a territorial settlement. Thus; Bulgaria was set up as an autonomous principality under the suzerainty of the Ottoman sultan. This treaty also reconsidered the Treaty of Paris, 1856. The treaty of Berlin (1878) did not satisfy the Bulgarians because it left many Bulgarians out side the new state.

What were the major causes of the Balkan Wars of 1912-1913?

The most aggressive nationalism in the Balkans was that of the Serbs. The kingdom of Serbia had been set up late in the nineteenth century. This was the period when the Serbs fought for their independence from the decaying Turkish Empire. This was not enough for the Serbian nationalist; they planned to create a Yugoslavia (South Slavia) by joining all Slavs south of the Austrian Empire. To the German speaking rulers in Vienna, the creation of Yugoslavia would mean the end of their empire. If the Southern slaves were allowed to break away, it would be only a matter of time before Czechs, Poles, Hungarians and Slovaks went their separate ways.

The annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria- Hungary in October 1908, crated boundless indignation in Serbia. Another effect of the Young Turks revolution was the creation of the League of the Balkan states against Ottoman Turkey. The aim of the League was to get control over Macedonia by force of arms. At this time, Ottoman Turkey was preoccupied with an Albanian revolt as well as with the war against Italy. This further encouraged the Balkan League to act against Ottoman Turkey.

In the meantime, European powers were much worried by the measures taken by the League not to see any modification in the territorial arrangements regarding Turkey. In 1912, Four Balkan states- Montenegro, Serbia, Bulgaria and Greece declared war on Ottoman Turkey. Thus, the first Balkan War started. In this war of liberation Turkey was defeated and the treaty of London was signed on May 30, 1913. Turkey was forced to surrender large territory to the Victorious Balkans States. But the Balkan Allies soon quarreled over the division of the large territory they had won in the war. This quarell was responsible for the outbreak of the Second Balkan war in 1913.

The outbreak of the Second Balkan War was in the interest of Austria-Hungary and Italy. Bulgaria was the one that provoked the Second Balkan War. On June 29, 1913, Bulgaria opened an attack on Greece and Serbia. Bulgaria's adventure had a negative impact. Serbia and Greece were joined by Rumania. The combined forces of the three Balkan states defeated Bulgaria and forced her to go for peace. The treaty of Bucharest that ended the Second Balkan War was signed on August 10, 1913. However, this treaty only created further conflict.

2.5. Colonization of Africa since 19th Century

Terms to know

- Assimilation/Association
- Colonial conquest
- Divide and rule
- Colonial administration
- Colonial expansion

Questions for Discussion and Practical Work

1. What kind of relation existed between Europeans and Africans before colonization?
2. What was the main factor for Britain to take over of Egypt in 1882?
3. What is colonization?
4. What situation aggravated or intensified the need for African colonization?

Before 1870, the Europeans had trade relation with Africa. The trade items were gold, ivory, coffee, salve, and so on. But with the development of capitalism (1769-1870), the need for raw materials and market places for finished goods (surplus products) became very important. Meanwhile, the slave trade and un explored part of Africa became obstacle to fulfill their need in Africa. On top of this, the major European powers were preoccupied with domestic problems. For instance, Germany and Italy did not complete their unification until 1870, France had revolutionary out breaks in 1789, 1830, 1848, and in 1870-71. Among major powers Britain did not fall in the internal political disturbance. Thus, it was busy in colonizing and giving more attention to Far East and South East Asian region like India, New Zealand, and Australia. This region seemed to be more attractive, rich and had less resistance than Africa. Under these circumstances few coastal areas of Africa were occupied by France and Britain. In 1830 France occupied Algeria and later Senegal. On the other hand, Britain also occupied Cape colony and Gold Coast (Ghana). Portugal was deeply involved in Mozambique and in Angola. However, all colonial powers did not establish firm administration in the above areas except in Cape Colony and in part of Algeria. The coastal posts had been established primarily to serve the purpose of trade particularly, the Atlantic slave trade. The names given to these posts indicated that the Europeans were more involved in trade activities than colonization before Industrial Capitalism. Thus, some of these trading posts were named as Slave Coast, Gold Coast, Pepper Coast and the like.

What intensified the partition of Africa after 1882?

There were two main factors for the growth of the desire for the colonization of Africa in the middle of 1880s. The first was the British take over of Egypt in 1882. Since the opening of Suez Canal in 1869, Egypt had become the focus of British and French political and economic interest. The canal was built by the French engineer called Ferdinand de Lesseps. Thus, France owned a big share in the Canal Company. Britain had also bought the Egyptian share of the company from Khedive Ishmael, the then ruler of Egypt, sold the share to overcome the bankruptcy he faced as the result of his venture of colonial expansion. Moreover, the opening of the Suez Canal increased the importance of Egypt especially to Britain. The Canal was a strategic link with British Indian Empire and the Far East.

To secure their loans, Egypt's two big creditors, Britain and France created Dual Control over Egypt since 1879. The Egyptian nationalists who opposed foreign influence rose up in armed rebellion. This revolt was led by a senior Egyptian officer, Colonel Ahmed Urabi (Arabi Pasha). In May 1882, Urabi and the Egyptian nationalists successfully gained control of certain part of the country. At this stage of time the British force intervened in the internal affairs of Egypt and crushed the force of Urabi. Due to change of government in France and the French could not participate in the intervention. Therefore, Britain

alone intervened and occupied Egypt in June 1882. Then, France as European power moved to act quickly to make colonial conquests in other parts of Africa.

The Second factor was the involvement of two European powers, Germany and Belgium in the colonialization of Africa.

A) Germany involved in colonial rivalry, mainly to intensify the colonial competition between France and Britain. Thus, Bismarck hoped that the rivalry between the two powers would divert the French from a war of revenge for their humiliation in the defeat of 1870-71 by Germany. But after involvement national interest and prestige and hope of economic advantage forced Germany to continue with policy of colonial conquest.

B) The other power in the colonial, rivalry was King Leopold II of Belgium, independently of the Belgian Government, King Leo Pold II employed H.M. Stanley, the famous explorer to explore the Congo basin since 1876.

The appearance of Germany and King Leopold of Belgium made other powers like Britain, France and Portugal-already engaged in African coastal areas to move quickly in to the interior before the whole continent was occupied by the new rivals. Meanwhile, there occurred clash of interests among these colonial powers in many parts of Africa .The first of such conflicts arose over the Congo basin, In order to solve the Congo issue and other crisis an international conference was held at Berlin in 1884-85.

What was the main outcome of the Berlin Conference?

In the conference held at Berlin the representatives of fourteen European powers as well as the USA were present. This conference remained in session for six months. At the end the conference two important resolutions were passed. The first and most important was the part that dealt with the colonial conquest of Africa. It was agreed that all powers had to notify others about their claim over a portion of territory and to establish "effective occupation" in these areas. Thus, the Berlin conference paved the way for African colonization or "legalized" the partition of Africa. This conference enabled European colonialists to partition Africa without going to an armed clash amongst each other.

The second resolution was about the right to trade on the Congo River. The partition of Africa had already been started before the Berlin Conference. Thus, Leopold II of Belgium was able to get international recognition over the Congo Free State in 1884. The Belgian king won recognition by promising an unrestricted freedom of trade in the Congo basin for all.

In 1883, France had controlled territories in the Upper Niger. But the same move of France in the lower Niger failed. In subsequent year, France and Britain partitioned West Africa between themselves.

Between 1883 and 1885 Germany occupied many terriers in South West Africa, Togo land, the Cameroon and East Africa. Britain moved Northward from South Africa to central and East Africa. Britain also moved southward from Egypt and controlled Eastern Sudan. The rest of Africa was partioned among Europeans in the last years of the nineteenth century. By 1900, with exception of Ethiopia, Morocco (until 1912) and Liberia, the whole continent of Africa was virtually under European colonial rule.

How did Africans react to European colonial rule?

Before establishing colonial rule in Africa, Europeans had to overcome the African resistance. The Africans did not at all welcome the European rule. Infact, the African reaction to the imposition of colonialism was not the same everywhere. In some parts of Africa, the Europeans got the collaboration of Africans that they used divide and rule system to occupy the areas they desired.

Some Africans developed strong military institutions based on centralized political system. It is possible to consider two examples of African resistance. from East and West Africa. In German East Africa, in what has now become mainland Tanzania there was a resistance against the German colonialism and it was named the Maji- Maji Rebellion (1905-1907). This rebellion started in 1905 when Africans refused the imposition of forced labour. Within short period, the rebellion engulfed much of German East Africa. The rebel warriors attacked all foreigners with out discrimination. The rebels caused much destruction and killed several foreigners. In 1906 the Germans started a cruel suppression. The rebel villages were burned and their crops were destroyed. In 1907 the rebellion came to an end and over 26,000 Africans were killed as the result of this revolt. In addition to this tens of thousands lost their lives due to hunger or sickness.

Another example is Samore's struggle against the French expansion in West Africa (1882-1898). He was a Mango warrior who confronted the French around the Niger River. His clash with the French started in 1882 with the first armed conflict which took place at Keniera. He did not only fight the French with arms but through diplomatic means as well. He tried to play off the British against the French. Samore was able to get modern weapons from Sierra Leone on the coast. Later he was cut off from his supply of arms, and finally he was defeated by the French in 1898.

There were also other several instances of Africa resistance to European colonial expansion. Nevertheless, Ethiopia was the only African country which succeeded in warding off European colonialism.

Why did Africans fail in their resistance to European colonialism?

Several factors accounted for the failure of African resistance. Firstly, Africans were not united to challenge the European conquests. Secondly, the Europeans had the advantage of modern fire arms which the Africans did not possess. European troops were disciplined, experienced and well trained. Thirdly, Europeans signed deceptive treaties with Africans, like for instance, the Treaty of Wuchale, a

Treaty signed between Emperor Menilik and Italy. Because of the factors mentioned, Europeans were in a better position to crush African resistance. In many cases, European colonial rule in Africa lasted for about sixty or seventy years. During this period the Europeans employed different forms of colonial administration.

The British Administration Policy

The British Administration policy came to be known as “indirect rule”. The architect of this policy was Lord Frederick Lugard. He had practiced this policy on large scale for the first time in Nigeria as colonial governor there. Due to shortage of the administrative staff, he exercised this policy. He continued this system of indirect rule when ever it served the colonial interest in controlling Africans. Thus, behind the traditional rulers the British governors directed the system of administration. The British also practiced a divide and rule policy, which was very important to weaken African resistance against the British colonialism.

The French Colonial Policy

The second form of colonial administration was the one followed by France. The French policy of colonial administration came to be known as “direct rule”. This policy was designed by the French colonial Minister, Albert Sarraut. According to this system, French officials filled administrative posts in the colonies.

The French also believed in the policy of assimilation or association. This was designed to make Africans copy French culture and French way of life so as get French citizenship. In short, this policy was designed for the elites to denounce their culture and identify themselves with France. Other European colonial powers like Portugal, Italy, Belgium and Spain followed largely preferred direct rule.

Effects of Colonialism in Africa

- Economy and culture of the Africans were destroyed,
- Africans lost their freedom,
- The Africans were exploited and oppressed,
- The Africans were disunited and were forced to accept foreign culture, etc.

Summary

The development of capitalism to its highest stage of advancement brought about enormous changes in economic, social and political spheres of life. One of the immediate results of the development of capitalism or development of industrial capitalism was the final triumph of capitalism as dominant socio-economic system.

The development of capitalism affected every part of world. Most of events and changes that occurred in different parts of the world in 19th century were direct result of the expansion of the capitalist economic system.

National liberation movements in the Balkan region had some of their origins and the expansion of capitalist system. In Europe particularly in the South and South East of Europe new national states emerged or came into being. The advancement of capitalism in the USA, abolished slavery and this laid the fertile ground of further expansion of capitalism in the USA.

The colonization of Africa was the direct effect of the development of capitalism. The industrialized nations of Europe embarked empire building in order to secure source of raw materials, new market places and spheres of capital investment. As the result of this fact, they imposed colonialism upon Africans on a large scale from 1880s on wards. And as the result of the development of capitalism and colonialism, slave trade was undermined.

Review Questions

Part I. Say True or False

1. To unit Germany, Bismark made three wars.
2. The second Empire was the reign of Victor Emmanuel of Italy.
3. The German confederation included states North of the Rhine River.
4. Napoleon III of France was an obstacle to the German unification.
5. Piedmont-Sardinia stood on the side of France during the Crimean war.
6. Prior to the unification of Italy, the states of Venetia and Lombardy were under the domination of Austria.
7. The French troops evacuated Rome in 1870.
8. In the 1860s different socio-economic systems existed in the USA.
9. Albania was the first Balkan country to achieve its independence from Turkish rule.
10. The Ottomans took their name from their leader Osman.

Part II. Matching

Match from section "B" to section "A"

A

B

1. Custom Union

A. Seljuk Turks

2. king of Prussia

B. Britain and France

- | | |
|--|-----------------------|
| 3. nomadic tribes | C. William I |
| 4. Byzantine Empire | D. Constantinople |
| 5. One of ottoman Empires | E. Portugal and Spain |
| 6. the two great powers of Europe in 15th and 16th century | F. Zollverein |
| 7. dual control over Egypt | G. Egypt |

Part III. Choose the correct answer

1. Which one of the European countries was more concerned with the Eastern Question?

- a. France b. Britain c. Turkey d. Germany

2. Which one of these countries was not included in the Balkan Region?

- a. Serbia b. Greece c. Albania d. Prussia

3. Who was the king of Russia from 1682-1725?

- | | |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| a. Napoleon III | c. Peter the Great |
| b. Cavour | d. Otto von Bismark. |

4. The Unification of Italy was completed in ----year.

- a. 1870 b. 1861 c. 1878 d. 1918

5. Who was the designer of direct rule in Africa?

- a. Lugard b. Colonel Ahmed c. Albert Sarraut

Part IV. Give short answers

- What was the main factor for the intensification of African colonization?
- Give concert examples of the social, political and economic consequence of the development of capitalism?
- Explain how the unification of Italy was completed?
- Which Balkan states formed the League?
- When did the Ottoman Empire begin to decline?
- The completion of German unification required the elimination of which countries?
- What were the main out come of the Berlin Conference of 1884-2885?
- Explain the policies and interests of Russia, Austria and Britain in the Balkan region During the 19th century?

9. Describe the causes of the Crimean War?

10. Describe the causes for the failure of African resistance against the imposition of European colonial rule.

V. Fill in the blank spaces

1. Austria was defeated by the allied forces of France and Piedmont at the battle of _____ and _____

2. The two French provinces ceded to Germany at the Treaty of Frankfurt were _____ and _____

3. Napoleon III was surrendered to the Germans at the Battle of _____.

4. Turkey captured Constantinople in _____ year.

5. The British take over of _____, intensified colonialism in Africa.

6. Russia and Turkey fought at the battle of _____ from 1854-1856.

7. Greece achieved her independence in _____ year.

8. The European countries which had Dual control over Egypt were ____ and ____

9. The colonization of Africa was legalized in the treaty of _____

10. The rebellion against German colonialism in Tanganyika came to be known as _____.

UNIT THREE

THE MAKING OF THE MODERN ETHIOPIAN EMPIRE, 1855-1935

Introduction

This unit discusses the historical process of the building of the modern Ethiopian Empire, between 1855 and the beginning of the 20th century. It explains the methods and policies employed in that endeavor. Socio- economic conditions and the political crises of the early decades of the 20th century are dealt with. So is the evolution of the absolutist state. In the unit are also discussed Ethiopia's relations with the outside world. During the period which is the subject of discussion in this unit, Ethiopia had to defend herself from foreign external aggressions. Those external aggressions were intended to destroy its independence. And the unit also covers Ethiopia's several wars, which were fought to defend its independence against Egyptians, Mahdists and Italian colonialists.

The unit covers a crucial period in the historical development of Ethiopia. In fact, it is concerned with the birth and the shaping of the modern Ethiopian Empire state. An understanding of present-day Ethiopia would be very difficult, without an indepth knowledge of the events unfolded during the period under discussion.

Objectives

After successful study of this unit, you will be able to:

- * analyze the methods and policies used in as well as the process of the building of the modern Ethiopian Empire, in the second- half of the 19th century;
- * elaborate the external wars of aggression by Egyptian, the Mahdist Sudan, and the Italian colonialists against Ethiopia, during the second- half of the 19th century;
- * appreciate the sacrifices made by patriotic Ethiopians in the defense of their country from foreign challenges to its independence;
- * explain the significance of the survival of Ethiopian independence in the era of the scramble for Africa, both to Africans and black peoples all over the world;
- * elaborate on some of the outstanding events which had a profound impact on the making of modern Ethiopia;
- * indicate on a map of Ethiopian some of the major battle sites where the Ethiopians fought against foreign invaders;
- * discuss the political crises that the ruling circles of Ethiopia faced, in the first few decades of the 20th century;
- * describe socio-economic conditions in Ethiopia, in the early decades of the 20th century; and

* explain the birth of the absolutist state under Emperor Haile Selassie I in Ethiopia.

3.1. Rise of the Modern Ethiopian Empire

Terms to Know

- Askaris
- Autonomy
- Aggression
- Fief
- Legations
- Mahdist Sudan
- Siege
- State-of-war
- Treaty
- Campaign
- Centralized state
- Empire
- Modern state
- Regional lord
- Semi-autonomous
- Territorial expansion
- Vassal

3.1.1. Attempt at Reunification Through the Use of Force, 1855-1868

Imperial power had an old history in Ethiopia, despite occasions of considerable resistance and challenge to central authority. A good example is the period known as the Zamana Masafent (1769-1855), which you have learned in Unit Nine of the Grade 11 history text book. During this period the kings of the Gondarine Kingdom virtually lost their supreme power and authority. Instead they fell at the mercy of powerful Masafents (lords). They were indeed puppet kings with very little or no political, economic and military power. Many regions became semi-autonomous while the region of Shewa became completely independent from the central government at Gondar. A parallel development to this decline of imperial power was the simultaneous strength of regional powers. The shift in the balance of power in favour of regional lords created a fertile ground for political fragmentation, civil wars and subsequent social, economic and political disorder. This period of national crisis came to an end with the rise of Kasa Haylu who was crowned Tewodros II in 1855.

The early career of Kasa Haylu was full of ups and downs, some of which left remarkable influence on his future imperial policies and reforms. He was born to a family with no claim at all of descent from the royal house. As a child he grew up in the care of his half-brother Dejazmach Kinfu. Early in his life, he got church education and military training. As a young man he was denied governorship over his family fief the district of Quara. Following the death of Kinfu, Kasa became a bandit on two occasions in the same region where he later fought against Egyptian troops. In 1848, at the battle of Debarqi, Kasa Hailu suffered the only serious defeat in his early

career. This defeat in the hands of Egyptians shaped the attitude of the future Tewodros with regard to foreign policy, discipline and modern firearms. His persistent challenges to the regime in Gondar resulted in a political marriage with Tewabech Ali, daughter of the guardian and the last of the Yeju Oromo Ras-Bitwodeds. He was also given the governorship of Quara intended to appease him.

The sense of mission Kasa Hailu later felt about himself as a man born and elevated for the revival of a strong Ethiopia might have started from these successive military victories. Probably, he took the throne name Tewodros considering a prophecy contained in the medieval book Fekare Iyasus. In this book, it was prophesied that a king by the name Tewodros would come to rule and bring peace to the people after a period of troubles. When he was crowned king of kings of Ethiopia in February 1855, Kasa used the throne name Tewodros to tell the message that he was the expected king who would relieve the people from the problems of the Zamana Masafent.

Building political reunification on the remains of the Zamana Masafent was however, a very difficult project for Tewodros. That was especially true when Tewodros who rushed into its realization with a rigid approach - the use of force to bring the regional lords under control. The first military expedition for political reunification was directed against the region of Wollo. But, Wollo did not easily submit to the imperial army. The first campaign in Wollo, which was fought even during fasting and rainy seasons, lasted for six months. Even then this campaign failed to bring about the submission of Wollo. The continued local resistance drove the emperor to launch further expeditions accompanied by very harsh treatment of captives throughout his reign.

The campaign in Wollo was followed by another serious war with the autonomous Kingdom of Shoa, which lasted for five months. Here too, there was a bloody encounter with the imperial army of Tewodros. Shoa too, experienced harsh treatment in the hands of Tewodros. In November 1855, Tewodros returned to Maqdala with the belief that he had settled matters in Shoa. However, local rivals rebelled against a hand-picked appointee of Tewodros, Meridazmach Haile Michael, and from 1865 onwards Shoa regained its independence with King Menelik, who had escaped from Maqdala in that year.

The emperor went on subduing one region after another through protracted and punitive military expeditions. In all cases, he secured military victories. For some regions he recognized loyal members of regional dynasties to administer their respective regions. In other regions, such as Gojjam, he appointed his own men from high-ranking civil and military officials. Nevertheless, recognition of local dynasties does not mean continuity with the old practices in the old way. Unlike the practice during the Zamana Masafent (1769-1855), local hereditary chiefs during the

time of Tewodros were only those who obtained his approval and thus they were subordinates to him.

The initial military victories of Tewodros did not result in political stability and effective, central control. The legacies of the Zemene Mesafint did not die out soon and the attempt at centralization proved to be a difficult task to achieve. Local dynasties did not want to lose their traditional economic, military and political autonomy. Nor did the hand-picked royal appointees of Tewodros tolerate too much imperial control over them. As a result, the emperor's policy of reunification met stiff resistance throughout his empire. Even his former allies turned their backs against him and rebelled one after the other. This made the emperor and his army extremely busy traveling from one trouble spot to the other. He treated rebellious regions very harshly, punishing most commonly with the cutting off captives' limbs, burning houses and harvests to ashes and looting the local people. The more harsh Tewodros became, the more multiplied were the rebellions and his unpopularity. This in turn provoked more tyrannical measures by the emperor. Thus, a vicious circle was created, the cumulative effect of which was a complete failure of his policy of unification.

The anti- Tewodros propaganda of the clergy, following their conflict over some issues, harmed the emperor considerably. Emperor Tewodros actually broke the tradition of exemption of church land from tax. He saw that his programs of modernization and reforms such as establishing a national and salaried army, arms manufacturing, defence of the country against Egyptian aggression, etc. could only be met by increasing the revenue of the state. To this end he reduced the number of priests and deacons in each church to a maximum of two and three, respectively. He also reduced the size of church land that used to be exempted from tax by taking away church land that he believed was in excess and giving it to tribute paying peasants. His policy on church land brought the emperor into direct conflict with one of the potential allies of the state in the work of empire building and political unification. Church-State conflict reached its peak in 1864. In that year the emperor imprisoned the bishop Abuna Salama who died in prison three years later.

Tewodros was very eager to build a strong modern national army. Above all, he wanted to import the technical know-how for manufacturing firearms locally. When his tireless struggle to get skilled personnel from Europe turned fruitless, he gathered European missionaries living in his country and persuaded them to manufacture firearms at his gun foundry of Gafat, near Debre Tabor. Obeying the king's orders the missionaries repaired broken firearms and manufactured several cannons, including the mortar named Sebastopol. The captivity of Europeans however provoked anxiety, in Europe, mainly in Britain and France. Tewodros was advised to release the European captives and was "promised" to get the skilled personnel asked for. However, he refused to do as asked. The British sent their military expedition led by Sir Robert Napier to Maqdala in the fall of 1867.

The first and last major encounter between the two forces took place on the plains of Eroge in April 1868. The battle of Erogee was fought between un equals. About 2000 well-armed British troops and between 4000-7000 ill-armed Ethiopians-ended in the shattering defeat of Ethiopians. The event hastened the downfall of Tewodros which had already been weakened by internal factors, mainly the opposition of the regional lords and the clergy. Refusing to accept a British demand for unconditional surrender, Tewodros committed suicide on 13 April 1868. The British were satisfied with the success of

their mission, with all European captives of Tewodros released, began to withdraw the country with out delay.

Far worse than the destruction and the bloodshed, the British expedition caused was the organized looting of the Maqdala treasury that forced the country to lose quantities of historical relics including the emperor's crown. Before leaving Ethiopia General Robert Napier, the commander of the British expedition, handed over a large quantity of firearms to Kasa Mercha (later Yohannes IV). He did that because Kasa Mercha had not opposed Napier's march against Tewodros. Moreover, Kasa gave guidance and material support to the British troops. This acquisition of firearms was a major factor in Kasa Mercha's later victory over Emperor Takla- Giyogis at the battle of Assam in 1871.

Tewodros attempted lots of reforms, many of which did not last longer. He tried to stop divisions within the Church, the slave trade, banditry and looting of peasants by troops. He also tried to stop polygamy and other social evils. He wanted to see his countrymen learn from the technical advance made by west European countries, as could be evidenced by his small workshop at Gafat. Above all, he worked hard to build a united and very well administered nation capable of resisting foreign, aggression.

Tewodrose neither used flexible method nor he tried alternative means. His promise to the peasants to put an end to their sufferings never realized as not only the rebles but also Tewdrose's troops continued looting them. As the result, people gave up their support to him. Even the already controlled regions came out of his hand one after the other. Finally, Tewdrose left Ethiopia as divided as he got it. However, the idea of unification survived him.

Despite the instability and struggle for power that followed his death, there was no return to the Zamana Masafent. The war was above all fought for emperorship. Three contenders for the throne, Wagshum Gobaze of Lasta, Ras Mekowanent Kasa Mercha of Tigray and Negus Menelik of Shoa, all aspired to become emperor after Tewodros. They reigned in that order with the throne names Takla-Giorgis (1868-71) Yohannes IV (1872-89) and Menelik II (1889-1913). The legacy of Tewodros thus lies in the urgent drive of his successors for imperial leadership over a united Ethiopia.

3.1.2. New Approach to Building Imperial Power, 1872-1889

The first three years that followed the death of Tewodros were not eventful. Emperor Takla-Giorgis (1868-71) had control of the central Amhara regions, but he did not exercise power over the rival regions of Tigray and Shoa. His attempt to extend his control over Tigray ended in his own defeat at the battle of Assam in July 1871. He was defeated and captured by Kasa Mercha. In consequence, the latter also took over the throne with all the challenges of regional forces and the threat from outside.

Like Tewodros, Yohannes IV began the process of reunification by directing military expeditions against the regions of Gondar, Gojjam, Yeju, and Hamasen so as to get their submission. However, the submission of some regions was only temporary, and they rebelled against the emperor. In Gojjam, for instance, the local power contender, Adal Tasamma, assumed power by killing his rival Dasta Tadla who had already obtained royal recognition. Unlike Tewodros, however, Yohannes was flexible and did not often fight repeated wars with the same regions. For instance, he made peace with Adal and recognized his authority over Gojjam. By so doing, the emperor turned an enemy into a friend. Adal was rewarded by being crowned as King of Gojjam and Kefa, with the name Takla Haymanot in January 1881.

What Yohannes did in Gojjam was exemplary of his tolerance for regional dynasties, so long as he ensured their tributary status. He was ready to share power with regional lords, in as far as they recognized his over lordship. This was the same even in his relations with the strongest regional power, Menelik of Shoa. From the time Yohannes was crowned, Menelik was calling himself king of kings, expanding his territories towards Wollo and contacting foreign countries independently. He also did not pay tribute to the emperor. Yohannes was preoccupied with the threat from Egyptian aggressors which forced him to postpone a showdown with Menelik. However, the difference between Yohannes and Menelik was resolved by the Leche Agreement of 20 March 1878. The peace initiative came from Menelik because of the probable military superiority of Yohannes. The emperor, too, did not want to see bloodshed from an internal challenge at a time, as we shall see below, when his country was invaded by an Egyptian army.

According to the Leche Agreement, Menelik agreed to pay tribute to Yohannes, drop the title king of kings and to use only the title king of Shoa, and to stop his independent dealings with foreigners. As a reward, he got recognition for his authority over Wollo and hereditary kingship over Shoa. In addition, both Yohannes and Menelik agreed to help each other against common enemies. By this peaceful arrangement, Yohannes ended the independence of the Kingdom of Shoa which had lasted for many decades in the past.

However, Yohannes was not able to win the absolute loyalty of Menelik. As later events were to show, Menelik continued to prepare himself to take the imperial throne for himself. Even Takla-Haymanot did not remain loyal to Yohannes throughout his reign. For instance, in 1888 there was a wide-spread rumour about a plot against the emperor which involved Menelik and Takla-Haymanot. That was at a time when the emperor was troubled by the double threat of Italian aggression and Mahdist hostility in the north and north west respectively. Compared to Tewodros who had had established only a temporary control over Shoa in the south, Yohannes got permanent control over Shoa through his proxy, Menelik. He was able to get control, of territories as far as the southwestern provinces of present-day Ethiopia, in addition to the old central and northern provinces.

Yohannes never applied the flexibility and liberalism he showed in the field of politics over religious issues. In religion he sought complete unity as the guiding principle. He thus ended the century-old religious divisions within the Orthodox Church at the Council of Borumeda in May 1878. Yohannes gave state support to the upholders of the Karrra Haymanot (Two Births) camp. While the unity of Church was maintained through “open discussion”, the Emperor was very harsh towards Islam. Following the Borumeda Council, all Muslims were ordered to embrace Christianity under the threat of persecution and confiscation of property. The Muslims of Wollo were the main victims of

compulsory conversion. This severity towards Ethiopian Muslims in Wollo worked against the emperor’s policy of political and national unity.

3.1.3. Resistance to Egyptian and Mahdist Aggressions

Foreign threat against Ethiopian independence, though manifested even earlier, reached a peak in the second half of the nineteenth century. It came from several directions; Egypt, Mahdist Sudan and Italy. The causes, course and consequences of the first two aggressions will be discussed here in this section, and the latter in another section, farther below.

Ethiopia and Egypt had a long history of relationships which involved cultural, commercial and religion. This relationship was affected since the turn of the 19th century as Egypt embarked on a vigorous expansion into the Horn of Africa, which included Ethiopia as the source of the Blue Nile.

The age-old ambition to control the Nile drainage system was the main interest of Egyptian rulers. Thus in 1821 Egypt occupied Sudan. Despite fierce resistance, the military superiority of the Egyptian army and internal conflicts among local people left Sudan an easy prey to the Egyptian

conquerors. As the source of the Blue Nile, Ethiopia was also victim of Egyptian expansion. Indeed, Sudan served as a base for Egyptian encroachment into the north-western Ethiopian regions like Semen, Dambya, and the Sheikdoms of Assosa and Beni –Shangul. Early Egyptian threats coincided with the period of the Zamana Masafent. The internal crisis of the period provided an opportunity for Egyptian periodic attacks and penetrations into the Ethiopian border regions. In the absence of a well organized national defence, the individual attempt of local chiefs to check the advance of Egyptian troops in their respective regions could not bring a lasting solution. Consequently, for over half a century Egypt posed a serious problem on the social, economic and religious life of the peoples along the Ethio-Sudanese border. Egyptians imposed heavy taxes on regions they occupied. They looted and enslaved the local people, and burnt fields and homes to ashes, when they faced resistance to their expansion.

Ethio-Egyptian conflicts were intensified during the reign of Emperor Tewodros. In 1865 the Egyptians took over the possession of the port of Massawa from the Ottoman Turks on the basis of a lease contract. The Egyptians then began to collect heavy taxes from Ethiopian merchants and blocked the import of firearms. Even worse, from 1872 onwards Egyptian troops began to advance into and control other Red Sea ports and coastal regions, as well as the border provinces of Matamma and Bogos.

The then ruler of Egypt, Khedive Ismail (1863-79), intensified the traditional Egyptian expansion to a more aggressive attempt at occupation of all Ethiopia. The grand ambition of Egyptian rulers was to build a Greater Egypt in North-East Africa. They aimed at becoming masters of the Nile basin and the Nile sources. The pretext of eradication of the slave trade and “extension of western civilization” into Africa were used by the rulers of Egypt to justify expansionist ambitions. Khedive Ismail was able to get support from European powers using these arguments. Indeed, the strategic significance of Egypt, due to the newly opened Suez Canal in 1869, was more attractive to Europeans than Christian Ethiopia. However, Egyptian rulers seem to have underestimated the military strength of Ethiopia. Egyptians were misled into believing that Ethiopia was weak. Their calculations were based on the observation of the ease with which the 1868 British military expedition to Maqdala had been completed and the subsequent internal political conflicts, following the death of Tewodros. But by the middle of the 1870s, Ethiopia was not anymore politically divided and weak as before. The Egyptian image of a weak and disunited Ethiopia, and the absence of European opposition towards Egyptian expansion in the Horn of Africa encouraged a large scale invasion of Ethiopia in 1875. The ports of the Gulf of Aden and Massawa served as launching pads for the three-front invasion of Ethiopia by Egyptian troops in 1875.

An Egyptian army commanded by Mohammed Rauf Pasha occupied the Muslim City State of Harar in October 1875 with very little difficulty. A Swiss- German named Werner Munzinger, often referred to as the architect of Egyptian aggression in Ethiopia, advanced to the center from the direction of Tdjura. However, Munzinger and his army of about 500 men, were ambushed and destroyed by the Afar people on their way to Shoa. Another very well armed Egyptian contingent led by a Danish colonel, Arendrup, moved into the interior Mereb Melash region from the port of Massawa. By late October 1875 his army had reached the banks of river Mereb.

In July 1872, Yohannes had written to Khedive Ismail a letter in which he defined his boundaries in the north and coastal regions. He also demanded the withdrawal of the Egyptian troops from his country. In the absence of a positive response, on the part of Egypt, Yohannes turned to seeking European diplomatic intervention. He sent letters to the rulers of France, Germany, Russia, Austria and Britain. He let them know the unlawful invasion of his country by Egypt and the intention of the Egyptian ruler, as he claimed, to Islamize and enslave his people. With full confidence, he expressed his hope that Christian European nations would not tolerate the 'Muslim unjust attack' on a Christian nation and requested fair justice for his people.

Nonetheless, the emperor's expectation of Christian solidarity was no more than wishful thinking. Europeans gave deaf ear to his protest. Consequently, Yohannes resorted to a defensive war against Egypt. On 23 October 1875, he issued a mobilization order. In command of 20,000 troops, Emperor Yohannes crossed the River Mereb. On 16 November he fought with the Egyptian army at the battle of Gundet. About two hours of effective attack on the encircled Egyptian troops resulted in an instant victory for Ethiopians. Colonel Arendrup and about 1320 Egyptian troops were killed in the

battle. A large number of Egyptian troops and firearms fell into the hands of Ethiopians. Although Egyptians suffered a humiliating defeat, Ethiopian victory at Gundet did not result in the restoration of the Ethiopian regions occupied by Egyptian forces. Instead, Khedive Ismail began preparations for another attack on Ethiopia to avenge his earlier setback. The following year, about 15,000 well-armed Egyptian troops under the command of Mohammed Ratib and the American General Loring invaded Ethiopian territories in the north. Thus the second Ethio-Egyptian battle was fought on 7-9 March 1876 at a place known as Gura, not far from Gundet.

The battle of Gura resulted in heavy losses on both sides, but once again victory went to Ethiopians. With the loss of about 3500 dead and 2500 taken as prisoners, the surviving Egyptian troops retreated. Ethiopians, too, lost about 4000 dead but with no prisoners of war lost to the enemy. Ethiopians collected a significant booty of arms. Egypt's military defeat in Ethiopia had resulted in a grave political consequence for the country. The fall of Khedive Ismail in 1879 and the British occupation Egypt in 1882 were partly the results of the Ethio-Egyptian war.

The military victories of Gundet and Gura, however, failed to bring about significant gains to Ethiopia considering the reasons for which they were fought. The Egyptians remained in control of occupied regions and ports. Yohannes did

not want to risk his victory by continuing his attack on Egyptian troops with an exhausted army. He also wanted to know the reaction of the European powers to the crisis. Thus, he preferred postponing further war and pushing his victory to its logical conclusion. Instead, he once again chose to try a peaceful solution.

The strange thing, in the immediate post-war year, was that Egypt behaved like a victor. Although Ethiopia showed an unreserved interest for a peaceful solution, Egypt proposed terms unacceptable for a sovereign country like Ethiopia. Egypt demanded reparation payment, release of prisoners of war and cession of occupied Ethiopian regions. These terms made the conclusion of the conflict by a formal peace treaty far from being achievable. Eventually, a period of no peace and no war continued for the next eight years.

From the early 1880s, however, Egypt sought a diplomatic alliance with Ethiopia. Two events accounted for this change of stand. Firstly, Egypt fell to British occupation in 1882. Secondly, the rise of a religious revivalist and nationalist movement in the Sudan by the Mahadists, began to dismantle Egyptian control of that country. Starting from the western Sudan, the Mahdist attack defeated Egyptian troops in the Sudan. In the process, some of the Egyptians could not make it out of the Sudan, rather they were encircled along the Ethio-Sudanese border. Both Egypt and its protector, Britain, were not able to stop the energetic Mahdist attack. Instead they sought another means to relieve the trapped Egyptian troops. Hence, they wanted to sign a peace treaty that would end the Ethio- Egyptian conflict, and make use of Ethiopian assistance in this endeavor.

To this end a British envoy, Rear – Admiral Sir William Hewett signed a treaty, later called the Hewett Treaty, with Yohannes on 3 June 1884. The Hewett Treaty is also known, from the name of the place where it was signed, as the Adwa Treaty. It ended the Ethio-Egyptian conflict through British diplomatic intervention. The first two major articles of this treaty promised to Ethiopia free-transit via the port of Massawa and restoration of occupied regions to Ethiopia following the withdrawal of Egyptian troops. By the third article, Ethiopia promised to facilitate the evacuation of the Egyptian troops from their encircled position in eastern Sudan, through Ethiopian territory to Massawa, and then to Egypt.

On the surface, the Hewett Treaty seemed to be more rewarding for Ethiopia than the military victories of Gundet and Gura. It promised restoration of occupied regions and opening a sea outlet. Yohannes thus chose to become an ally of Egypt. But this earned Ethiopia a serious enemy, Mahdists of the Sudan. For Yohannes, what he needed further was British diplomatic support to restore the port of Massawa to Ethiopia. Yohannes wrote to Queen Victoria of England to help him get back Massawa.

On his part, in fulfillment of the terms of the Hewett Treaty, Yohannes ordered Ras Alula to rescue the Egyptian army trapped in the Sudan. Ras Alula accomplished his mission fighting with Mahdist troops at the battle of Kufit in January 1885. However, this Ethio-Egyptian alliance provoked a number of Mahdist attacks on north-western Ethiopian territories. The Mahdists launched a series of attacks characterized by looting, material destruction and enslavement of people.

Egypt only partly fulfilled her promise. Bogos was returned to Ethiopia, but Massawa was handed to Italy. Egyptian troops also withdrew from Tajura, Zeila and Berbera. But, shortly after the withdrawal of the Egyptians these coastal regions fell easy prey to colonial European powers competing in the region. The British, who had already been in control of Aden since 1839, occupied the ports of Zeila and Berbera. They expanded into the interior and created their colony of British Somaliland. The French did the same and formed their colony of French Somaliland by expanding from their 1862 possession of Obock. The port of Assab which was purchased by a private Italian Shipping Company (the Rubbatino Company) in 1869 had already been taken by the government of Italy in 1882. Against the claim of Yohannes and in violation of the Hewett Treaty, the British government secretly invited Italy to occupy Massawa. Italy took control of Massawa when the Egyptians left it on 5 February 1885. Even worse, it blocked import of arms to Ethiopia, collected heavy customs duties and began to expand into the highland region of Mareb, Melash of present day Eritrea. The British who wanted to check the French expansion in the Red Sea region wanted to strengthen Italy and favoured her expansion in the region, which was contrary to the terms of the Hewot Treaty.

However Yohannes did not give up hope of a diplomatic solution. He once again wrote to Queen Victoria protesting the violation of the treaty and the unlawful Italian advance into his territory. He sought explanation on whether or not the British were backing this Italian adventure. The response of Britain was negative. Yohannes was advised to live in love and peace with the powerful Italians.

But, in 1888 the Mahdists, again, started attacks through the western borders. The danger intensified in 1889. And Yohannes turned towards the Mahdist threat and marched to Matamma. On his way, he tried a peace initiative but there was no positive response on the part of the Mahdists. War became inevitable, and on 9 March 1889 the Ethiopian army and the Mahdist troops or Ansars fought at the battle of Matamma. Despite initial success the Ethiopians lost the battle, because Yohannes was fatally wounded and his army retreated. Yohannes died the next day. His corpse was beheaded by the Ansars as a sign of Mahdist revenge and they seemed to be content. In any case, they, too, had suffered heavy losses.

Map 3. Major battlefields in Ethiopia in the 19th century

Activity

3.2. Imperial Expansion to the South, South-West and South-East

Terms to Know

- Buffer zone
- Kefu Qan
- Tributes
- Coronation
- Naftagna
- Territorial expansion
- Famine

- Revenues
- Vassal

As you have studied in your previous lessons, the process of empire building was an agenda of priority for both Tewodros II and Yohannes IV. Both used different approaches to achieve their goals of national reunification. While Tewodros failed, Yohannes was relatively successful in building an empire with regional dynasties enjoying internal autonomy.

The process of Ethiopian empire formation was however, completed under Emperor Menelik II. Menelik had learned a lot from the experiences of his predecessors. At the root of his expansion lay the traditional interest in land, tribute and control of trade routes.

Fig. 3.4 Emperor Menelik II (1889-113)

Menelik's expansion was directed against independent peoples and states in the area of present southwestern, southern and southeastern Ethiopia. His expansion was different from that of his predecessors in its intensity and unprecedented degree of success. Moreover, his territorial expansion coincided with the colonial expansion of European powers in the Horn of Africa. His conquests of border regions of present-day Ethiopia were marked by fierce competition with European colonial powers. Finally, as a contender for the throne for two decades, Menelik needed to build up his military muscle through conquest of the prosperous regions of southern Ethiopia, which possessed valuable items of trade.

The process of Menelik's expansion began when he was King of Shoa. First, he subdued the Oromo of Shoa in the early 1870s. Then, his army got the peaceful submission of the northern Gurage people known as the Kistane. This peaceful submission was a result not only to their being co-religionists (Christians) and their geographical proximity Northern Shoa, but also owing to their traditional protracted wars with the neighboring Oromos. The situation in southern Gurage, more properly the Silti, was, however, different from that of the north. Here, Menelik's army faced fierce resistance from the Muslim Gurage organized under a local leader known as Hassan Enjamo. A religious revivalist movement influenced by the Mahdists and by the Muslim exiles of Wollo, who had faced the forced conversion edict of 1878 by Emperor Yohannes IV, strengthened local resistance among the Muslim Gurage. Thus, this region was subdued by the army of Ras Gobena only in 1888 after years of unsuccessful resistance.

The regions beyond the Gibe basin were a bone of contention between the rival troops of the two kings, Menelik of Shoa and Takla-Haymanot of Gojjam. Actually, the latter was authorized by Yohannes IV to conquer the region with the intention of stopping the expansion of Menelik to the region. As a result the southwestern regions became a battle ground for the two rival kings. After a minor clash between their troops in Limu, a decisive battle was fought at Embabo (in Wallaga) on 6 June 1882 in the presence of the two kings. The bloody battle was concluded by the victory of Menelik and the captivity of Takla-Haymanot. Thus, the battle of Embabo allowed Meneilik to establish a firm control over the southwestern region which subsequently was given recognition by Emperor Yohannes. Menelik

faced no strong local resistance here. Local rulers were persuaded to accept peaceful incorporation and were rewarded by internal administrative autonomy. Aba Jiffar II of Jimma, Jote Tulu of Leqa Qellam and Kumsa Moroda of Leqa Naqamte belong to the list of local rulers who submitted peacefully with their local autonomy respected, in the years 1882-84.

On the contrary, the campaigns of Menelik's army in the south and southeastern regions were very costly and bloody. The region of Arsi was subdued in 1886 after four years of struggle, during which six unsuccessful military expeditions were sent against that region. The final battle of Azule was won by the army of Ras Darge, the cousin of Menelik, due mainly to its superiority in the possession of modern firearms. The fate of the Emirate of Harar was no exception. It was subdued after the bloody battle fought between the army of Menelik and Emir Abdullahi at Chalanqo, early in January 1887.

After Harar, the conquest of new regions was temporarily halted until 1894. Menelik gave priority first to his ambition for the throne, and after his coronation, to do something about Italian colonial expansion in northern Ethiopia. Thus, his conquests after he became emperor were motivated by the urgent need for preparation against Italian colonialism. Moreover, expansion to the south was also sought as a solution to the devastating Great Famine (1889-92) also known by the name Kefu Qan, which had seriously afflicted the northern and central regions of Ethiopia.

The immediate cause of the famine is attributed to a cattle disease, called rinderpest, imported with infected cattle from India. The cattle epidemic spread from north to south and killed hundreds of thousands of cattle and made farming very difficult. This caused famine that in turn led to epidemic disease claiming the life of large numbers of Ethiopians. The famine caused a great damage disrupting production and trade. It also caused a great population movement from north to south. Menelik not only recruited soldiers from survivors of the famine-hit northern region, but also settled northerners in the relatively little affected region of southern Ethiopia.

One of the areas in the south, whose rich resources attracted the army of Menelik, was Wolayta. The conquest of Wolayta in 1894 was one of the bloodiest of the campaigns of Menelik. Local people under their king Kawo Tona, defended Wolayta from the combined army of notable war leaders of Menelik such as Ras Michael, Fitawrari Gebayehu, Liqa Makwas Abate, Dejach Balcha, Ras Wolda-Giorgis and Aba Jifar II. It was, therefore, a battle between unequals, which resulted in immense loss in human life and material wealth, and the looting of tens of thousands of heads of cattle by the invaders. Kawo Tona was wounded and captured to become a prisoner for the rest of his life.

Similarly, in 1897 the old Kingdom of Kaffa was incorporated after great bloodshed in the war between the local people, under their ruler Tato Geki Serecho, and the army of Menelik under Ras Wolde Giorgis. For the campaign, Wolde Giorgis had enlisted the support of the armies of Ras Damese

of Wallaga, Aba Jifar II of Jimma, Ras Tasamma of Illubabor and the rulers of Kullo and Konta. Geki Serecho was defeated and captured after nine months of fugitive life and ended up in prison.

The support of local rulers of newly incorporated regions in the following conquests of Menelik was also evident in the conquest of Assosa, Beni Shangul and Komosha areas along the Ethio-Sudanese border. Here, Dejach Jote of Qelem and Dejach Gebre Egziabher (baptismal name of Kumsa) of Naqamte gave military support to the army of Ras Mekonnen. The defection of Sheik Abdurahman Hojale to the side of Ras Mekonnen aborted the united resistance of the local people against the army of Menelik. Following the conquest, Menelik reinstated loyal rulers to power as vassals.

Expansion into the border regions of Borana and Ogaden, likewise along the western borders, seems to have been in competition with the neighboring colonial powers which had adjacent colonies with Ethiopia.

Menelik wanted to create a buffer zone between the fertile interior and neighboring European colonies by conquering border lowlands. His famous military victory at the Battle of Adwa intensified his competition with the colonial powers, and by the turn of the 20th century he had completed the process of empire formation.

The incorporation of the southern, southwestern and southeastern regions involved both peaceful submission through persuasion and devastating wars of conquest. The nature of their administration was related to the way they were incorporated. Regions that resisted the army of Menelik were treated harshly. Local dynasties were uprooted and replaced by appointees of the central government. Local people were mostly alienated from their land. The conquered people were subjected to severe economic exploitation and brutal treatment by the settlers from the north protected by an armed men known as the Neftegnas. Regions that offered no resistance, however, faced little difficulty. Here, local rulers retained their traditional power and continued as vassals of the emperor. However, national oppression was common to all conquered people.

The political stability that followed the establishment of an expanded empire facilitated the revival of local and foreign trade. Addis Ababa was founded by Empress Taytu in November 1886, and became the centre of government and economic activities. Elsewhere in the south, south-west and south-east, a significant number of garrison centers of the expanding army of Menelik evolved into administrative and commercial centers.

Activity

3.3. Italian Aggression against Ethiopia and the Battle of Adwa

Terms to Know

- Aggression
- Fortification
- Torch-bearer
- Protectorate
- Sovereignty
- Pan- Africanism
- Treaty
- Independence
- Court martial
- Colony
- Diplomacy
- Ethiopianism
- Mobilization order
- Circular Letter
- Nationalism

During the second –half of the 19th century, a third and major source of aggression against Ethiopia was Italy. Italy had colonial designs over Ethiopia. Therefore, her colonial ambitions led her to occupy territories in the north, establish the colony of Eritrea and fight the Battle of Adwa against Ethiopia in 1896.

3.3.1. First Strongholds of Italy in Ethiopia

As indicated in pages above, the Italian Government took control of Assab from the Rusbatino Shipping Company in 1882. Then, in 1885 Italy occupied Massawa, and began attempts to penetrate into the interior from the coast. The Italian attempts to encroach into the highlands of the Mereb Mellash (Eritrea) region was unacceptable both to Emperor Yohannes IV and his commander, Ras Alula Engida. Alula was also Governor of the province of Mereb Mellash. Therefore, the Italians came into direct conflict with Yohannes and Alula.

On 26 January 1887 Alula, at a place called Dogali, crushed an Italian contingent consisting of about 500 Italian soldiers, which were going as reinforcements to the Saati fortress that he had attempted to attack. This was actually the first serious blow to Italian colonial advance in Ethiopia. Thus, it created great anxiety and provoked Italian desire for revenge. It equally offended the British government.

However, while Italy wanted military revenge, Britain intervened as a peace broker, of course, on behalf of the aggressor. A British envoy, Gerald Portal, met Yohannes in November 1887 and proposed a war indemnity for Italy, official Ethiopian apology for Alula's attack, and cession of occupied coastal regions to Italy. Portal's mission failed. Yohannes declared his choice of war rather than accept these proposed terms of peace. He also wrote to Queen Victoria condemning British diplomatic dishonesty and unfairness.

Ras Alula's rejection of conceding Ethiopian territory to Italy was also firm and made war inevitable. Shortly afterwards Emperor Yohannes called his people to arms.

Within a few weeks, about 80,000 men followed Yohannes on his march across the Mereb river to fight the Italians at their fortress of Saati in March 1888. The Saati confrontation did not turn to actual fighting, however, because the Italians refused to come out of their fortified position and meet the Ethiopian army in the open field. A deadlock was created that lasted for a month. The Ethiopian army, consisting largely of peasants short of supplies, could not stay long at Saati. They had to return home to their farms. Nor was the supply of provisions enough to keep up the confrontation for long. Yohannes had to choose between retreat or strike on the Italians in their fortress.

The arrival of news from the other direction reduced the options to one. Yohannes was informed of the destructive invasion of Mahdist troops as far as Gondar, as well as the rebellion of Negus Menelik and Negus Takla-Haymanot against him. He also heard about the friendly relations Menelik of Shoa and the Italians, which was established on the basis of the Convention of Neutrality they signed in October 1887. All these things, combined with the un-willingness of Italians to come out for an open battle, made Yohannes decide to postpone the war with Italy. He chose first to punish the internal plotters and then fight the Mahdists.

Yohannes attacked Gojjam first and after a bloody destruction got the submission of its king. The plan to fight Menelik was dropped, however. Instead, the emperor and Menelik made an agreement to help each other against their common enemies. Both had mutual interest in peace, because Yohannes did not want a bloody civil war at a time when his country was invaded by two foreign enemies- the Mahdists and Italy. Menelik, too, realized the military superiority of Yohannes. The Italians, who aimed at subverting Menelik against Yohannes, had already won his neutrality in the event of war between them and the emperor. This was agreed in the Convention of Neutrality signed in October 1887, in which they promised to give Menelik 5000 rifles. Nevertheless these rifles had not reached Menelik. Therefore, Menelik had good reason not to fight with Yohannes.

3.3.2. The Birth of the Italian Colony of Eritrea

It is often claimed that the Treaty of Wuchale, signed between Emperor Menelik and the Italian envoy Count Pietro Antonelli on 2 May 1889, directly led to the creation of the Italian colony of Eritria. But that was preceded by long years of Italo-Shoan friendship. The official contacts between Menelik and the Italians go as far back as 1876, with the coming to Shoa of an Italian Geographical Society led by Marquis O. Antinori. Antinori's mission had the objective of investigating the chances for colonial expansion under the cover of scientific study. As a region close to the Italian base at Assab, and since the Shoan king was a rival of Emperor Yohannes, Shoa was considered as another appropriate base or ally for

Italian colonial ambitions. On his part, Menelik needed the friendship of Italy as a means of acquisition of firearms from abroad with which he could fight his way to the throne.

Thus, while Menelik gave a resting place near Ankober called Let Marafya to the Italians, the latter agreed to post an agent at Assab who would buy firearms for Menelik. This initial alliance was further cemented by the Treaty of Commerce and Friendship. This treaty was signed between King Menelik and Antonelli of Italy in October 1883. The treaty included provisions about consular exchange and an agreement on free trade, free movement of their nationals and freedom of religious propagation. The third Italo-Shoan treaty came in 1887, following the Dogali Incident when Italians needed the help of Menelik more than he needed theirs. It appears that the Italians tried to win the consent of Menelik to help them in future unavoidable war against Yohannes. Due to his unwillingness to fight Yohannes, however, the Italians persuaded him at least to remain neutral, in the event of war between Italy and Yohannes. As indicated above, he agreed to this through a treaty later called the Convention of Neutrality, which was signed in October that year, 1887.

The above friendly relations between Menelik and the Italians seem to have been based on their interest in securing each other's support for the Ethiopian crown and colonial expansion, respectively. Though Menelik did not support Italian colonial expansion in principle, the presence of Yohannes as an obstacle on his way to the imperial throne gave Menelik the drive to seek the friendship of Italy. The Treaty of Wuchale, although signed after Menelik declared himself emperor, was an extension of their old mutual interest and friendship. The Wuchale Treaty was drafted by Antonelli and signed by Menelik and Antonelli in May 1889, in Menelik's current camp, in Wollo.

The Treaty of Wuchale had twenty articles, but the two very significant ones in terms of their contribution to the subsequent Italo-Ethiopian conflicts were articles III and XVII. Article III, delimited the boundary between Italian-occupied regions of Mereb Melash and the rest of Ethiopia. The villages of Arafaili, Segeneiti, Asmara, Adi Yohanis-from east to west-served as a boundary line for the Italian possessions. Thus, the Italians got legal recognition over much of the lowland and some of the highland regions beyond the river Mereb.

The territorial cessions of Menelik to the Italians were far from satisfactory to the Italian colonial dream. They began, to push beyond the borders defined in Article III of the Wachale Treaty. Even more they cheated Ras Mekonnen, the cousin of Menelik, who went to Italy to get the ratification of the whole treaty. They persuaded him to sign an additional Convention on 1 October 1889. This was aimed

at advancing further towards the River Mereb under the cover of delimiting the boundary, on the basis of effective occupation. Indeed, against the protest of Menelik, the Italians occupied the whole region as far as the Mereb river, which they declared as their colony of Eritrea on 1 January 1890.

3.3.3. Italian Ambition over the Rest of Ethiopia

To make matters even worse, the Italians pursued a diplomatic campaign to make the whole of Ethiopia their protectorate. To this end, they used a calculated contradiction in the Amharic and Italian version of Article XVII of the Wuchale Treaty. The Amharic version of this article reads that Ethiopia can use the help of Italy in her diplomatic relations with other European powers. However, the Italian text contained an obligatory commitment of Ethiopia to use the good offices of Italy for her relations with Europe; and thereby it denied Ethiopia her sovereignty. Further more, Italy notified the great powers of Europe that, by Article XVII of the Wuchale Treaty, Ethiopia had become an Italian protectorate.

Menelik learned of the Italian tricks when response to his letters, written directly without the knowledge of Italy, came from Britain and Germany. In these letters from Europe he was advised to contact them only through his “protector”. This led to a major friction between Italy and Ethiopia. Menelik wrote to King Umberto of Italy protesting against the Italian claim. He asked the Italian government to correct Article XVII. Italy was not willing to correct it. Menelik, however, turned to a wider diplomatic campaign, and in April 1891 he dispatched a circular letter to all European powers. He informed them about Italian diplomatic dishonesty and that he had no obligation to respect Italian protectorate rights. That was because Ethiopia was independent and not a protectorate of Italy. Even more, he defined the Ethiopian boundary as extending as far as the sea. And Menelik requested the help of Christian powers to get at least an outlet to the sea. But there was no help from Christian Europe.

On its part, the Italian government followed the twin policies of persuasion and subversion in Ethiopia. The first refers to the Italian unsuccessful effort to induce Menelik to agree to the Italian version of Article XVII. This effort was completely aborted when, in February 1893, Menelik abrogated (cancelled) the Treaty of Wuchale. Italian subversive activities among dissatisfied nobles did, however, have initial success mainly in northern Ethiopia. For instance, by the Mereb Convention of December 1891, the Italians achieved the temporary defection of the Tigrean chiefs under the leadership of Ras Mengesha Yohannes, the person chosen by Emperor Yohannes as his successor.

Nonetheless, the subversive activities of the Italians proved a complete failure. Ethiopian collaborators of the Italians soon understood the hidden colonial motive of the Italians. This became even more clear, with Italian racist attitudes in the settlement pattern of their citizens in Eritrea. The first significant blow to the subversive plan of Italy came in June 1894, when Ras Mengesha and Ras Alula renewed their loyalty to Menelik. Even worse for the Italians, in December 1894, Dejazmach Bahta Hagos, their former collaborator and governor of Akale Guzay in Eritrea, started a peasant rebellion against the Italians. This rebellion was suppressed, but it gave the spark to an armed resistance that

followed against Italian colonialism. Ras Mengesha and Ras Alula crossed the river Mereb and fought the Italians at Qoatit and Senafe early in 1895. As a revenge, the Italian army invaded the whole of Tigray, in September 1895. Italy openly began to use military means to realize the dream of becoming a colonial master over Ethiopia.

On the Ethiopian side, the inevitability of war had already become obvious. Apart from the Emperor, his wife Empress Taytu herself was an advocate of an armed solution to the Italian diplomatic dishonesty. Thus, Menelik began preparing for the final showdown with Italy. Internally, he continued his expansion into the prosperous regions of present day southern Ethiopia, mainly

to build up his human and material resources, as you have seen in the preceding pages. Internationally, Menilik did his best to win allies mainly for the import of firearms, particularly from France and Russia. On 17 September 1895, Menelik issued a mobilization order in which he stated the Italian unlawful invasion of his country. He got a positive response from his people which enabled him to lead an army of about 100,000 recruited from all classes, ethnic groups and regions including the newly conquered areas of south, southwest and southeast.

Indeed, Menelik led a united Ethiopia against Italy. An Italian writer who saw the positive response of soldiers, peasants, young and old, men and women, for Menilik's mobilization order wrote, It looks as if the whole population was moving for war. The then bishop and the clergy themselves accompanied the army to the battlefield. Empress Taytu had started preparation for war since long ago. She had gathered women in the palace to prepare food, drink, utensils, traditional medicines, bandages, etc. She had already sent messages to her vassals of northern Ethiopia to supply food to the army while passing through their respective regions. She also mobilized an army of 5000 troops under her command, and followed her husband to the campaign. The total number of

Ethiopian women who went to Adwa is not exactly known. But one French writer reported that there were about 1200 women. These women not only gave moral support to the combatants, but also gave service as fighters, nursing the wounded, supplying food and drinks to fighters, clearing roads, guarding camps, etc.

3.3.4. The Battle of Adwa

The Battle

Before the final decisive encounter at Adwa, the Italian and the Ethiopian troops fought at two places. The first battle was fought on 7 December 1895 at Amba Alage, in southern Tigray, between a contingent of the Ethiopian vanguard force led by Fitawrari Gebeyehu and an Italian force under the command of Major Toselli. The Italians were completely defeated and lost about 2000 troops, including Major Toselli himself, from the total of 2350 Italian troops. Local sources suggest 286 dead and about 300 wounded on the Ethiopian side. Thus, the Italians were forced to retreat northwards to their strong fortification at Maqale which was defended by 4 cannons.

Under the command of Ras Makonnen, the Ethiopian army, which consisted of the combined troops of different regional lords, encircled the Italian fortress of Maqale. Attacks on the enemy began later when Menelik reached the fortress, but this brought no immediate success since the Italians had built a strong fortress difficult to break into. Meanwhile, the Ethiopian army was advised to control a small stream near the fortress, which was a source of water for the Italian troops. The author of this tactic is said to have been Empress Taytu; and indeed the stream was then controlled by 900 soldiers from her own contingent. Between 7-21 January 1896, Maqale was under siege. The Italian army stationed there suffered a great deal from shortage of water. The Italians were forced to surrender the fortress. Menelik allowed the Italians a safe evacuation. That was done not only hoping for a peaceful solution for the conflict, but also as a plan to advance further within Tigray under the cover of a peace gesture, if the war was to continue.

The Italians did not, however, agree to any peace. About 20,000 troops formed into four brigades, under the supreme command of General Oreste Baratieri, were ready for war. Half of the Italian troops consisted of askaris from Eritrea. Numerically, the Italian army was only one fifth of the Ethiopians. But the Italians had the advantage of better firearms than Ethiopians. They had also modern training and professional military leadership. Three Italian brigades were led by Generals Albertone, Arimondi and Dabormida respectively. General Albertone was in charge of the rearguard. Despite good preparations, however, the Italian military leadership had no exact knowledge about the number and the tactics of the Ethiopian army. The role of the local people as double agents to both the Italians and the Ethiopian side was very helpful to the Ethiopian army. They helped by providing faulty information to the enemy. For instance, Sunday March 1, 1896, the day of commemoration of St. George, was selected as the date of the major battle, after two weeks of tension and confrontation between the Ethiopian and the Italian troops. This decision was made by General Baratieri misled by a wrong advice by the double agents. A delusive advice that Ethiopian armies never fight on holidays was given to him by Basha Awalom, (a double agent). The general was also told of internal conflicts among the generals of Menelik and shortage of food among his troops.

At Adwa, the battle began at day break on 1 March 1896 with the Italian strike on the Ethiopian camp. An extremely bloody battle was fought until mid-afternoon. The Ethiopian army fought bravely and scored a smashing victory. The Italians lost about 7000 of their men dead, 2500 badly wounded and 3500 made prisoners of war. The Ethiopian army also suffered heavy casualties but with no prisoners of war. Losing the battle, Baratieri ordered a general retreat and his surviving troops cleared out of the whole province of Tigray. The Italian dream of reducing Ethiopia to a colony ended in failure. Therefore, Italy was left only with her control over Eritrea.

Factors for the Ethiopian victory at Adwa were Italian faulty reading of maps, false information from local “spies”, underestimation of Ethiopian unity, wrong military strategy and poor leadership. Much of Menelik’s army was also well equipped with good imported firearms. There was serious lack of coordination among the different Italian brigades. On the contrary, the Ethiopians had the advantage of strong unity, strong morale and commitment to the cause of Ethiopia’s sovereignty. There was efficient co-ordination among the different troops of regional lords. The moral support rendered by the clergy, women, minstrels (traditional singers), etc, and the proper knowledge of topography also contributed a great deal to the victory of Ethiopian troops.

The Consequences and Historical Significance of the Adwa Victory

- Explain the national significance of the Adwa victory.

Ethiopia entered the twentieth century as one of the very few independent nations in Africa. Liberia, and until 1911-12 Morocco, were the other independent states; though Liberia did not fight any war of independence as Ethiopia did. However, it must be remembered, that a part of Ethiopian territory (Mereb Mellash Eritrea) remained in Italian hands, when Ethiopia entered the twentieth century. The sovereign status of Ethiopia got international recognition. This recognition was expressed in two ways. Firstly, different powers opened their legations in Addis Ababa: Italy (1896), Britain and France (1897), the USA (1903), Germany (1905), etc. Secondly, European powers possessing colonies adjacent to Ethiopia delimited their respective common boundaries between Ethiopia and their colonies, in the years between 1897-1908. This gave birth to the present shape of Ethiopia.

Adwa seems to have drawn the attention of the international community to Ethiopia, the country that had scored the first major black victory over the whites. It is true that in southern Africa the Zulus had also scored a victory in a battle against whites in that century. But although the Zulus had defeated and destroyed a British force in 1879 at Isandhlwana, Britain succeeded in winning the overall Zulu War. On the one hand; journals and newspapers published in Europe for some weeks after Adwa produced the pictures of Menelik and Taytu on their front pages. They criticized, from many angles, the “tragedy” (for Italy) of the loss of the colonial battle. On the other hand, after Adwa, foreign travelers, merchants and other Europeans from different nations came to Ethiopia. Therefore, the Adwa victory has been a symbol of national pride. Indeed, it has made succeeding generations of Ethiopians more determined to guard the independence of the country at all costs.

The effect of military defeat for Italy on the other hand, was disastrous. It created a profound shock, and anxiety in Italy and there were widespread disturbances. In major cities of Italy, there were demonstrations, some of them bearing slogans like, Viva Menelik! Viva Taytu!. The demonstrators demanded the court-martial of General Baratieri, the release of Italian prisoners of war and the withdrawal of Italy from Africa. The government of Crispi, the Italian Premier, fell amid abuse and serious criticism. In consequence, Crispi resigned immediately. Baratieri had to leave the army and ended up in prison.

An Italian diplomatic mission came to Ethiopia and signed the Treaty of Addis Ababa with Emperor Menelik on 26 October 1896. The treaty concluded the Italo-Ethiopian dispute. Italy agreed to the cancellation of the Wuchale Treaty and recognized the complete independence of Ethiopia. Ethiopia, too, agreed to the continuation of Italian colonial control over Eritrea and the release of Italian prisoners of war. Of course, the government of Italy did not withdraw from Africa, despite the anti-colonialist protest at home. But it was forced to reduce the colonial budget for some years and postponed its colonial ambitions in Ethiopia.

The echo of Adwa was very well heard in Britain as well. The concern Britain showed to this black victory against a white colonial power was understandable. Britain had many colonies in Africa in general, and was a colonial neighbor of Ethiopia, in particular. Moreover, the success of the British plan of blocking possible expansion of France towards the White Nile became questionable with the defeat Italy suffered. Therefore, Britain was forced to revise her former policy of wait and see with regard to Mahdist Sudan (1885-96). As a result the British government hastened to conquer Sudan in the name of Egypt, and a joint army of Britain and Egypt invaded the Sudan in 1896. The Battle of Omdurman (1898) marked the fall of the Mahdist state and the establishment of the so-called Anglo-Egyptian Condominium rule over the Sudan.

Nonetheless, this British success did not stop the French from moving to the White Nile, simultaneously from west and east Africa. Menelik wanted to exploit the Anglo-French rivalry over the White Nile for his own plan of expanding his empire. From west Africa, a French Captain named Marchand led an expedition to the upper Nile. A small French force under Marchand and a large British force faced each other at a place called Fashoda in the Sudan in 1898. Bloodshed at Fashoda and war between Britain and France were avoided by the withdrawal of the French. This left Sudan to the colonial rule of Britain, though it was called Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. Thus, it could safely be said that the fear and anxiety the Adwa victory created among European colonialists precipitated the colonization of Sudan, an African neighbor of Ethiopia.

Another expression of the value given to Adwa victory as a torch-bearer of black nationalist struggle was the emergence of religious separatist movements collectively known as Ethiopianism. At face value, the movement seemed religious, using such names like Coptic, Abyssinian and Ethiopian. The essence of the movement was, however, firm resistance against white domination.

Activity

3.4. The Ethiopian Empire State in the Post-Adwa Period, up to 1935

Terms to Know

- Autocracy
- Coup
- Exile
- Absolutist state
- Constitution
- Gabbar
- Bureaucracy
- Diarchy
- Modern education
- - Cabinet of ministers

- Embezzlement
- Modernization
- Rivalry for royal successions

The period that followed the victory of Adwa to the Fascist Italian invasion in 1935 witnessed several important developments in Ethiopia. Although peasant socio-economic conditions showed practically no improvement from the past, modern trends started to be introduced gradually in certain socio-economic sectors. Indeed, elements of modernization were introduced in transport, trade, education and urbanization. This is not to mention the still insignificant advance made in such non-socio-economic sectors like government and the army.

3.4.1. Socio-Economic Conditions

The first three decades of the twentieth century saw relatively better socio-economic developments. Those were in one way or another related to the legacy of the major events of the 19th century Empire formation and struggle against foreign aggression.

In this section, a brief discussion of these developments will be given with particular emphasis on socio-economic aspects, which had undergone some changes. The first is the gebbar system which was the basic means of surplus appropriation of the feudal class. In its pre-twentieth century usage, a gebbar was a land holding peasant who had to pay gibir or tribute to the state. The type of tribute varied from one region to another. But, in most cases, it was paid in kind and in the form of unpaid labour service. Tribute in kind had different titles based on the purpose for which it was paid: like for land use, for the church, payments to the recipients such as when they received promotions, to congratulate local chiefs on important occasions, in the fasting seasons and at other times. Free labour service was given by the peasant and his family in times of grain production, construction, transportation, guarding prisoners and domestic services like grinding grain and fetching water and firewood for local chiefs. All these were exacted with little fairness and sense of humanity.

To make matters worse, the formation of the empire state and the administrative system established in the newly incorporated regions made the life of peasants very miserable. In the southern regions-peasants were gradually alienated from their land. This began with the introduction of land measurement known as qalad. That action resulted not only in the appropriation of much land by the state, but also facilitated privatization of land. It also increased state revenue, since it classified land tax based on fertility rates. But it pushed poor peasants down to the status of insecure tenants. Poor peasants who could not afford to buy land or those driven away from their land were forced to become landless or migrate to cities to become beggars. However, it does not mean the peasants remained passive. In some cases there were open rebellions. In others, there were protests to the local officials or to the Emperor in the capital though they got no fair justice. The cumulative effect of the exploitative nature of the modes of surplus appropriation was negative on the economic development of the country. It, seriously affected agricultural productivity.

Even worse than the gebbar system, for the peoples of Ethiopia, was the continuation of the slave trade and slavery. There had been a centuries-old history of slavery and the slave trade in Ethiopia. Besides the economic rewards of the slave trade to both the merchants and rulers, slavery had also a social aspect. The possession of many slaves signified the high status of the owners. Slaves were also used for different kinds of domestic services. Although the practice was old, it was the frequent wars of conquest in the process of empire formation that gave additional encouragement to the practice of the slave trade and slavery. Thus, in the first two decades of the 20th century, members of the royal family and the nobility were reported to have had “thousands” of slaves at their disposal, though, this may seem a little exaggerated.

The overall effect of the slave trade had been disastrous. To start with, it depopulated the most productive elements of the defeated, as it was the youth who were sought more than the old ones. It also killed the morale for production as there was no security of life and property in the regions, which were targets of slave hunting expeditions. The prevalence of the slave trade also brought foreign interference over the country. The European colonial powers, which had colonies adjacent to Ethiopia, imposed an arms embargo, accusing Ethiopia of using modern firearms for slave hunting expeditions. Of course, their major concern was that slavery was an obstacle for their capitalist investments and the markets they foresaw in Ethiopia. That is why they tried their best to make the abolition of slavery a precondition for Ethiopia’s admission into the League of Nations.

As with slavery, the gebbar system met both internal and external opposition. Internally, it was criticized by the early Ethiopian educated elite as one of the major factors responsible for Ethiopia's backwardness. Thus, a combination of internal and external challenges brought some changes to the two institutions (slavery and the gebbar system). A year after Ethiopia's admission into the League of Nations, on 31 March 1924 a decree which freed slaves and prohibited the purchase and sale of slaves was enacted. Forced labour service was abolished in 1935. The same is true of the payment of honey as tribute. Moreover payment of tribute in cash was introduced at the rate of 30 birr per gasha.

The consequences of slavery and the gebbar system on the network of trade was, however, relatively less negative than their direct effect on productivity and social security. Indeed, from the turn of the twentieth century, a variety of factors seems to have contributed to the revival of internal and external trade. Trade revived mainly because of the general peace and political stability that followed the completion of the process of empire formation and the Adwa victory. Moreover, the colonial powers surrounding Ethiopia, also encouraged external trade as part of their capitalist interest in the region. The extensive diplomatic relations established between Ethiopia and different countries also created fertile ground for more trade links than before the Adwa victory.

In fact, the direction of trade changed gradually to the east and west, owing first to contemporary military and political factors. The Shoa victory at the battle of Embabo in 1882 was followed by the political centrality of Shoa during the reign of Menelik. As a result, the northern trade was pulled to the south, so that the main trade routes tended to pass through the Shoa region. Furthermore, the Mahdist invasions, for a time discouraged the trade through the old northern outlets. All these factors combined with the opening of the Djibouti-Addis Ababa Railway, made the port of Djibouti the major outlet for Ethiopia's external trade throughout the first half of the 20th century. Besides Djibouti, there were other outlets through the British colonies of Sudan, Kenya and Somalia. The British trading station, established at Gambella in 1902, was a major outlet of Ethiopia's external trade only next to Djibouti. Around 1920, the Gambella trade constituted a large part of Ethiopia's external trade, due mainly to the export of coffee, produced in western Ethiopia. Unlike the port of Djibouti, the major entry for imported goods, Gambella was mainly an export outlet. The items of trade also saw some changes. The old major exports like ivory and civet began to be dominated by coffee, while on the import side textiles and beverages began to dominate.

The merchants that had dominated the import-export trade were mainly foreigners from different countries, who flocked into Ethiopia after the Adwa victory. They consisted of French, Indians, Greeks, Americans and Jews. On the Ethiopian side local traders were mainly engaged in domestic trade. Although they represented only an insignificant number, some members of the ruling classes were attracted to business, mainly in the first quarter of the 20th century. Menelik and Taytu are known to have been money-lenders. The Empress also opened the first hotel in Addis Ababa, which bore her own name (Itege Hotel) in 1907. Moreover, Taytu is known to have established a local bank for the

development of trade and agriculture in cooperation with the bigger nobility. The governor of Gojjam, Ras Hailu, is known for beginning a cinema and a taxi business in the capital. The son-in-law of Emperor Haile Selassie Ras Desta Damtew, was involved in selling water. Ras Teferi himself is said to have been business-minded, and was a shareholder in some companies.

As a simultaneous process to the revival of trade and empire formation, urbanization also saw a relatively fast development. Some garrison centers, established during the expansion of Menelik, grew to become important towns such as Gore and Goba. Moreover, the construction of the Djibouti-Addis Ababa railway, which reached Addis Ababa in 1917, also resulted in the emergence of railway towns such as Dire Dawa, Nazareth and Modjo. Of course, the railway did more than encourage trade and urbanization. It became a means of modern transportation for people and a channel for the import of modern ideas, luxury goods and fashions.

On the whole the first three decades of the twentieth century are known to have been years during which the foundation for modern Ethiopia was laid. Modern novelties introduced in the early 20th century included the motor car (1904), printing machinery (1912) and the aeroplane (1929). Telegraph and postal services were introduced before the close of the 19th century. A hospital was founded in 1910. Besides the above, some factories like those for timber, ammunition, and food processing were opened during the same decades.

One means of combating backward traditional outlooks and to spread modernization is the introduction of modern education. It was during the post-Adwa period that modern education was introduced, and groups of modern intellectuals started to appear in Ethiopia. At first, modern schools were established by European missionaries in the country, at the end of the 19th century. And the

foundation of such schools continued in the period after. European missionaries in Ethiopia sent to Europe some Ethiopian students for farther education.

The Ethiopian state, too, was interested in establishing modern schools in the country. That was because the expanding bureaucracy needed not only educated officials for service in the diplomatic field but also various types of clerks, accountants, etc. Therefore, schools were established by the state, which were to serve as means to produce educated civil servants.

In 1908, the first modern school, Menelik II School, was opened in Addis Ababa. It was staffed by Egyptian Coptic Orthodox Christian teachers. In Dire Dawa and Addis Ababa the Alliance Francaise schools were established in 1912. In 1925, the Tafari Mekonnen school was founded by Ras Tafari Mekonnen (later Emperor Haile Selassie I). The school had French directors. In the curriculum of the time, there was greater emphasis in languages than in other subjects. Unlike the period after 1941, during the pre-1935 period, French was the medium of instruction in the schools. By 1930, a Ministry of Education had been created. And in the 1930's, it opened a number of schools, both in Addis Ababa and the provinces. It must also be remembered that a few Ethiopian students were sent abroad for education, and about 200 students finished their studies in Europe, between 1920 and 1935.

During the period, the spread of modern education, however modest, trained some skilled manpower for the state bureaucracy. It also contributed to the spread of modern ideas in the country. The early modern educated intellectuals called for changes. Among them were Hakim Workneh (Dr. Charles Martin), Professor Tamrat Amanuel, Afework Gebre Iyesus (the author of the first Amharic novel, *Tobia*), Takala-Hawaryat Tekle Maryam (the man who drafted the 1931 Constitution of the Imperial Ethiopian Government), Heruy Wolde Selassie, Deressa Amante, and Gabre Hiywot Baykedagn (the author of the two Amharic books *Atse Menelik ena Ethiopia* and *Mengist ena Ye-hizb Astedader*, written in 1912 and 1919, respectively). They asked for changes and modernization in the socio-economic order. They called for improvement in peasant conditions, using the *Berhanena Selam* newspaper (founded in 1925) and other means.

Activity

3.4.2. Political Conditions

Between the years 1896 and 1953, major political developments took place in the Ethiopian Empire. Initially, between 1896 and 1930, consolidation of power by the state and the ruling class were the major political pre-occupations. With that settled, between 1930 and 1935, the autocracy of Emperor

Haile Selassie I was in full force leading to the emergence of a absolutist state in Ethiopia. Another aspect of political developments concerning Ethiopia was the revival of Italian colonial designs that led to the Fascist Italian aggression of 1935. You will examine all of those developments on the pages below.

Consolidation of Political Power

During the immediate post-Adwa years, between 1896 and 1909, the ruling class of Imperial Ethiopia, headed by Menelik II, enjoyed the triumphant mood the Adwa victory created. It was secure in its position. The sovereign independence of the country was recognized by states near and afar, including Italy. Following the Adwa victory, European nations opened legations in Addis Ababa and were interested, above all, in peaceful trade. The United States and Germany sent diplomatic missions, in the first decade of the 20th century.

During this same decade, Ethiopia's boundaries with neighbourly countries were delimited by boundary agreements with the European colonial powers that were in control of those colonies. The boundary with the Italian colony of Eritrea was delimited by a series of agreements concluded with Italy in 1900, 1902 and 1908. Similarly, by the agreement with France in March 1907 the boundary with French Somaliland (Djibouti) was delimited. The boundaries with Anglo-Egyptian Sudan and British East Africa (Kenya) were delimited by a series of agreements with Britain in 1902 and 1907, respectively. In 1908 the boundary with Italian Somaliland was delimited by an agreement with Italy. Therefore, Ethiopia had secured her borders and gained international recognition for them.

The ruling class centered itself at Addis Ababa. It collected tributes in various forms from the newly incorporated areas of the south, south-east and south-west. Prominent members of the ruling class, resided in Addis Ababa and began to enjoy the comforts of urban life.

Addis Ababa, which had been founded as capital in 1886, as indicated above, got permanence due to the following factors:

- * Issue of land charters, to land owners in Addis Ababa by the state starting from 1970 guaranteed security of tenure. And that led owners of land in the city to invest in the construction of buildings as well as other desirables.
- * The introduction of the eucalyptus free from Australia helped to solve the problem of the shortage of fire wood in Addis Ababa. Had that not happened, it would have been difficult for Addis Ababa to remain as capital city for long.

- * The railway connection between Addis Ababa and the outside world since 1917 gave Addis Ababa great importance as a centre of commerce, new ideas, etc.
- * The residence of foreign merchants in Addis Ababa also helped in the increased importance of the city.
- * The opening of foreign legations in Addis Ababa increased Addis Ababa's importance as a diplomatic centre for the country.

Inception of Political Rivalry and Foreign Threat

By 1906, though the monarchy was strong a power struggle among the members of the ruling class, was started beginning from 1906. One major factor that led to a power struggle in the palace was the issue of succession. The problem of succession began to disturb the political stability of Ethiopia following the illness of Menelik in 1906. From then on, Menelik no longer exercised his usual political authority until his final death in 1913. Even worse, the expected heir of Menelik, Ras Mekonnen, died in 1906. This crisis of leadership paved the way for a serious power struggle. Equally worried about the problem of succession were the European powers having colonies adjacent to Ethiopia: Britain, France and Italy. Germany their strong rival of Britain and France in Europe had come to Ethiopia and opened her legation in 1905. This had already upset this powers. They were concerned with the smooth running of their economic interests in Ethiopia. They did not like the challenge Germany might pose and anticipated a political crisis upon the death of Menelik.

As a result, the Tripartite Treaty was signed by Britain, France and Italy in December 1906. The main objective of this treaty was to avoid possible conflict of interest among the signatory powers in case a crisis situation set in, and shut off other rivals such as Germany from economic activities in Ethiopia. But, for Ethiopia it was the first serious challenge to her independent status after the victory of Adwa. The treaty contained mutual recognition of the signatory powers for each other's zone of economic influence in Ethiopia. The area through which the railway line passes was given for France. The Nile basin and its source came under the influence of Britain. Italy was allowed to construct a railway connecting her two colonies - Eritrea and Italian Somaliland.

Though sick, Emperor Menelik was not passive when confronted by threats, both internal and external, to his empire. He did two things, in order to ensure the efficient running of government and the political stability of his state in the event of his death. Firstly, in October 1907, he established the first Council of Ministers consisting of nine ministries for War, Commerce and Foreign Affairs, Public

Works, Agriculture, Finance, Justice, the Pen, the Palace, and the Interior. Ministers were recruited from high-ranking civil and military officials. There was no new group of educated personnel for this modern bureaucratic arrangement. The newly appointed ministers were largely the same old palace officials assuming European style titles. Thus, there were confusions of duties and responsibilities among the different ministries. Yet, the establishment of the cabinet not only ensured continuity of government but also laid the ground for the birth of modern bureaucracy in Ethiopia.

Secondly, in May 1909 Menelik designated heir to his throne and a regent aiming at a smooth power transition upon his death. However, he did not find it easy to make his decision public due to the clash of interests between his wife, Empress Taytu, and the Shoan nobility.

The Challenge of Taytu

Empress Taytu had no offspring and thus saw future political power for herself and her relatives in the candidate for the throne. That was why she had already married her niece, Mentwab Wolle, to Ras Mekonnen. But Mekonnen's death upset her long term plan. Similarly, she married her nephew, Gugsu Wolle, to the daughter of Menelik, Zewditu, considering her candidature for the throne in the event of Menelik's death. She hoped to secure political power for her family through this marriage tie. Menelik seems to have understood that the political ambitions of Empress Taytu would bring a challenge to the political supremacy of the Shoan dynasty. Therefore, in 1909 Menelik designated his grandson, Lij Iyasu Michael, as heir. Iyasu was the son of Shewareged, (Menilik's daughter) by her husband Ras Michael, the ex- Muslim chief of Wollo. As Iyasu was only 12- years old, Menelik also appointed Ras Bitwaded Tessema Nadew as regent. The different legations in Addis Ababa were formally told to acknowledge Menelik's chosen heir and the regent. The decree was announced in 1909, years before the death of Menelik in 1913.

Both choices of Menelik were based on his genuine attempt at satisfying different interest groups in general, and Taytu and the Shoan nobility in particular. The Shoan nobility were not happy with Iyasu, as he was the son of the strong regional lord of Wollo. They feared that Ras Michael might use the position of his son, who was still a minor, for his own political ascendancy. Yet, the fact that it was the order of Menelik, and the choice of a Shoan noble as regent minimized their fear. For Taytu, however, the choice of Iyasu was a source of great anxiety. His father Ras Michael had hostile relations

with her brother and ruler of Yeju, Ras Wolle. Menelik tried to appease the empress by a marriage arrangement of her grand niece, Romanworq Mengesha Yohannes, with Lij Iyasu. However, this effort bore no fruit. Taytu worked hard to build up a power bloc centred around her family through arranging webs of political marriages, and after 1909 through making shum shirs (promotions and demotions). Indeed, against the interest of the Council of Ministers, Taytu behaved as an actual head of state making decisions on behalf of her sick husband. Her shum-shirs included the old nobility like Fitawrari Habte Giorgis and Negadras Haile Giorgis, Ministers of War and Commerce respectively. On the other hand, her relatives and those related to her by marital ties were promoted to key positions.

The Shoan nobility, therefore, saw Taytu as a threat to their political power in the central government. Ras Michael of Wollo was also worried about the future of his son and thus joined the Shoan nobility, in a secret plan to remove the Empress from power. The nobility disappointed by Taytu's shum-shir formed the nucleus and stood at the forefront in the opposition against Taytu. Moreover, in an attempt to give the opposition the character of a public movement, the Mehal Sefari were agitated to lead a demonstration. The latter consisted of different military units attached to the palace. The opponents of Taytu obtained the blessing of the then bishop, Abuna Mathewos, to remove Taytu. In March 1910 Empress Taytu was removed from government affairs, she was restricted to taking care of her dying husband.

The first response of Taytu was bitter. She expressed her resentment to the bishop, the regent and some of the spokesmen of the mass protest. Then, she requested the permission of her opponents to retire back to her northern kinsmen. The Shoan nobility refused to allow her to go to the north. The Empress then appealed to the major churches of Addis Ababa and the different legations to help her convince her opponents. Both responded to Taytu that they had no intention to intervene in government affairs. Thus disgracefully removed from politics, Taytu stayed in the palace with her sick husband, for sometime. And since 1910 she was exiled to the Church of St. Mary at Entoto, where she stayed until her death in 1918.

The coup against Taytu was followed by reshuffling of political power on behalf of the Shoan nobility. The powers of the regency and the cabinet were reinstated. However, the regent, Ras Tesema Nadew died in April 1911. Unexpectedly Lij Iyasu refused to accept another regent. This situation marked the beginning of a second phase of power struggle and political instability in the leadership.

Lij Iyasu 1913-1916: Reforms and the Coup D'Etat against Him

The death of Ras Tessema gave Iyasu the opportunity to exercise political authority on his own. But, he was not crowned even after the death of Menelik. Despite this, however, he exercised full political power from 1911 to 1916. The only serious challenge to his power came from Ras Abate Buayalew, a Shoa noble man.

Abate attempted to break into the palace forcefully, but failed because of the strong defence put by the imperial guard. A possible bloodshed was avoided by the intervention of the bishop. Abate was imprisoned at Mekdala, where he stayed until the fall of Michael (1916), who from the desire to support his son, strongly stood against Abate.

The reign of Lij Iyasu lacks fair and objective documentation in the existing literature, written mainly during the reign of his successor Emperor Haile Sellassie. Indeed, there was emphasis on his weaknesses, such as lack of responsibility, play-boy character and polygamous marriages. In reality, however, though too young to rule an empire, Iyasu introduced significant social and economic reforms. To his credit, Lij Iyasu, tried to give Ethiopian Muslims equal status through integrating them into his administrative hierarchy. He gave financial support for establishing mosques, and later on, established

marriage alliances with local Muslim dynasties. These polygamous marriages of Iyasu, however seem to have had some elements of political motive.

Moreover, Lij Iyasu established a system of auditing government property, and formed a municipal police nicknamed Terunbule. He established a separate Department of Education. Before that arrangement had been made by Menelik in which the affairs of education were placed under the control of the archbishop. Iyasu's measure was the first attempt at the secularization of modern education in Ethiopia.

Other reforms of Lij Iyasu included those related to the improvement of traditional practices of Leba Shay (method of thief detection) in which a young boy took a drug and was let loose in the neighborhood of the house from where things had been stolen. The owner of the house before which the drug-intoxicated boy might fall was then accused of the theft. This unreliable method was slightly improved by searching for reliable evidence in the house indicated by the boy.

Fig 3.9 Leba Shay

Iyasu also ended the practice of Quragna in which both the accuser and the accused were chained together until justice was delivered. The ruler also stopped the abuses of Asrat Safari, by which government tax known as Asrat (tithe) was collected based on the estimation of a government official

who used to do it before harvest. Obviously, the practice aimed at controlling possible cheating by some taxpayers, who used to report a yield reducing the total amount of their harvest. Under Iyasu, however, the peasants were allowed to harvest before their fields were visited by government officials. Unlike before, the tax would be collected based only on the amount reported by the taxpayers who, of course, swore to the reliability of their report.

The above progressive measures of Lij Iyasu were, however, overshadowed, partly by some of his weaknesses and partly by the opposition coming from victims of his reforms. For instance, his friendly gesture towards Ethiopian Muslims was a radical departure from the past tradition of very close church-state relations. It was later interpreted as a challenge to the predominant position the Orthodox Church enjoyed. The auditing of government property exposed the embezzlement carried on by old officials, who became enemies of Iyasu when they were ordered to pay back what they had misappropriated. Iyasu's choice of the company of younger officials in his frequent tours of

provinces, in place of members of the old nobility, created among the latter a feeling being unwanted whose total elimination was fast approaching. These victims of Iyasu thus worked hard to accuse him, using his weak points. To the advantage of his opponents, Iyasu did not bother at all to improve his

weaknesses. Nor did he appease his potential rivals through some reconciliations.

Indeed, Lij Iyasu continued to build a polygamous family, continued his adultery, and showed disrespect and contempt for the old nobility. He was absent from the capital so often owing to his frequent wandering in the provinces. All these were issues taken up by his enemies to charge him with immorality and irresponsible leadership. However, his personal weaknesses were not the real causes for his conflict with the Shoan nobility. Rather, the latter saw Iyasu as a serious challenge to their political power. This challenge seemed more threatening, when he gave high position to his father Mikael. In 1914 Lij Iyasu crowned his father as Negus over the northern provinces of Tigray, and Wollo. In 1915 Gojjam and Begemdir were added to them. Lij Iyasu did more than this to threaten the political future of the Shoan Mekwanints (nobility). His relatives, friends and those with whom he had marital ties were promoted at the expense of the old nobility. He took Sidamo from Dejach Balcha Safo, and gave it to a new ally and brother-in-law, Negadras Haile Giorgis. The latter was also given the top rank of Chairman of the Council of Ministers which had been held by Fitawrari Habte Giorgis Dinagde. The son of Ras Mekonnen, Dejach Teferi, was removed from his family fief, Harar, and transferred to Kaffa. The combination of these actions dissatisfied the nobility in general, and the Shoans in particular to unite in the common cause of removing Lij Iyasu.

The plot that ultimately removed Iyasu was not the work of local opponents of the young ruler alone. It also came from the Tripartite powers who rallied behind the Shoan nobility in the struggle against Iyasu. These colonial powers had good reason to seek the removal of Iyasu from power. Firstly, Iyasu appeared to become a close friend of Ottoman Turkey and Germany, who were mortal enemies of the Tripartite powers in the First World War (1914-18). Iyasu's friendship to the Central Powers might seem insignificant, but it was considered by the Tripartite Powers as a dangerous move in the region where they had colonies. Even more offensive to the Allied powers was Lij Iyasu's moral and material support to the leader of a Somali nationalist movement, Sayyid Mohammed Abdullah Hassan. As the Somali leader was operating in the colonial possessions of Britain, France and Italy in the Horn of Africa, the three powers allied with Ethiopian internal forces against Lij Iyasu. Their help ranged from forging pictures as evidence against Iyasu to giving some munitions to his opponents in support of the coup d'état against him. As in the anti-Taytu move, the Mahal Sefari acted against Iyasu, and the Abun and the Echege, too, blessed the coup. With all these support, Iyasu was deposed on 27 September 1916.

Lij Iyasu was not ready to defend his power. He was in Jijiga, when the coup was being carried out in the capital. He made an attempt to reverse the coup but he was defeated at the battle of Mieso, located on the way to Harar. The Shoan army defeated his troops heading to the capital. His father, Negus Michael, also made a more determined attempt to reinstate his son to power. In command of about 80,000 troops from Northern Ethiopia, Michael scored a minor victory in the initial encounter at the battle of Tora Mesk on 17 October 1916. But he was completely defeated and made captive at the decisive and bloody battle of Segele near Sheno, town on 27 October 1916. Negus Michael died after two years of captivity and imprisonment. Iyasu remained a fugitive, until he was finally captured in Tigray in 1921 and imprisoned first at Fitcha. In 1932 he attempted at escape but failed. Therefore, he was transferred to Garamulata, in the province of Hararge, where he died in prison in 1936.

The Diarchy 1917 – 30

The battle of Segele, which claimed the life of more than 12,000 troops from both sides marked the bloody completion of the struggle against the challenge of Lij Iyasu. The fall of Negus Michael brought an end to the administrative autonomy of the province of Wollo. The fall of Iyasu also marked the restoration of Shewan political supremacy. The coup makers crowned the daughter of Menelik, Zewditu, as Empress on 1 February 1917. Ras Teferi Mekonnen was made heir to the throne.

For the Shoan nobility Zewditu was an ideal choice, because she was the daughter of Menelik and was politically conservative. She had no son, and to avoid succession disputes, an heir was chosen. Teferi was the best choice as heir. He was himself a member of the great Shoan nobility and of

the Shoan royal family. He had administrative ability, shown particularly in his governorship of Harar. He was young and active. His modern education and interest in modernization were regarded as valuable assets in dealing with foreigners and their legations.

For some years, Zewditu and Teferi worked well together. Zewditu presided over all deliberations in which important decisions were taken. And Teferi referred all major issues to her for decision.

Therefore, at first at least, the diarchy or dual rule marked the unity of Shoan forces in the central government. The Council of Ministers was reorganized under the chairmanship of the Minister of War, Fitawrari Habte Giorgis.

However, problems came as the power of Ras Teferi started to grow up progressively at the expense of the Empress and the Council of Ministers. Though only an heir, Ras Teferi began to exercise the role of a 'regent'. His influence in administration and military affairs and external relations exceeded that of the Empress. Indeed, more and more power began to concentrate in the hands of Ras Teferi. In the long run, the political ascendancy of Ras Teferi not only worried the Empress, but also was a threat to the old nobility in general and members of the Council in particular.

The traditionalists nobility represented by the Emperess turned to be conservative. They disliked Teferi's modernizing activities. Teferi represented the interests of a progressive group of the young educated Ethiopians and the more "enlightened" feudalists.

While the traditionalists had the spiritual support of the bishop, Teferi and his supporters had the appreciation and support, of the European legations. The latter saw in the rise of Teferi a bright prospect for capitalist investment in Ethiopia. Thus, the struggle between the conservative and the progressive groups came to be a dominant feature of the diarchy for several years, until the balance of power gradually shifted in favour of Teferi as time went on.

Ras Teferi's natural gifts of patience, capacity to hide his motives and plans, determination and cunning, added to his rich political experience, made significant contributions to his rise to power. His

successful use of diplomacy and the group of the young educated elite around himself explain his constant successes against people who stood in his way. The chief events in his rise to power were the following, in chronological order.

- * In 1918, though the role Teferi played behind the scene is not clear, the most formidable opponents of his growing power, consisting of twelve members of the Council of Ministers, were removed from power by order of the Empress in response to a public demonstration represented by the Mehal Sefari. The ministers were accused of corruption and embezzlement. Only the Minister of War, Fitawrari Habte Giorgis, remained in power.

- * The capture of Lij Iyasu in 1921 eliminated one rival for the throne.

- * In 1923 Ethiopia became a member of the League of Nations under the precondition of abolition of the slave trade and slavery. To this end, two decrees were issued in 1923 and 1924, respectively. Other than the advantage of collective security, Ethiopia's admission into the League was a step forward in facilitating Teferi's extensive diplomatic relations. In 1924 Ras Teferi and some of his nobility made a grand tour to Europe, seeking first hand exposure to western civilization as well as trying to get access to the sea for Ethiopia. The latter objective did not materialize. But the visits made to Britain, Greece, Jerusalem, France, Italy, Belgium, Luxemburg, Switzerland, Sweden and Egypt, mainly focused on schools, factories, hospitals and churches, and were sources of great inspiration to the Ethiopian visitors. Ras Teferi's interest in modern technology, administration, military training and other institutions, though strong before his overseas visits, became even stronger after the tour of Europe.

- * The natural deaths of Fitawrari Habte Giorgis and Abune Metewos in 1926 were also a golden opportunity for Ras Teferi, as the two very strong military and religious challengers to his political ambitions were removed in succession. He took over the army of Fitawrari Habte Giorgis and distributed his large tract of land to allies.

- * In 1927 Ras Teferi succeeded in getting the unconditional surrender of another strong opponent to his growing power, Dejach Balcha Safo, the governor of Sidamo. That prosperous province was given first to an ally and then to the son-in-law of Ras Teferi, Ras Desta Damtew.

- * In 1928 Dejach Aba Wujaw, commander of the Imperial Bodyguard, revolted against Ras Teferi in defence of the decreasing power of Empress Zewditu. But, he was soon forced to surrender and he was at first sentenced to death, though later this was changed to life imprisonment. This was skillfully done by Teferi, who persuaded the Empress to intervene, accusing Aba Wujaw of disturbing the palace and provoking bloodshed while encamped at the mausoleum of Menelik.

Meanwhile, the Mahal Sefari pressed Zewditu to crown Teferi as Negus. In October 1928 Zewditu formally crowned Tefer Negus. He was made "king of Ethiopia, Heir to the Throne"

The last serious opponent to Ras Teferi from the traditional group was the ex- husband of Empress Zewditu, Ras Gugsa Wolle. The divorce of Zewditu and Gugsa in 1917 is said to have been effected by the Shoan Mekwanints at the time of her coronation. Though Zewditu made Gugsa the governor of Begemdir, in 1918, he remained hostile to Teferi whom he suspected of having been responsible for the divorce. There was also a conflict over the tax from Metemma that was under the jurisdiction of Gugsa, which Teferi

wanted to centralize. The rise of Teferi to the top of the political hierarchy was thus a threat to Gugsa. On his part, Teferi was waiting for a pretext to eliminate Gugsa, and this came when Gugsa refused to carry out the order of Ras Teferi to assist the suppression of the 1929 rebellion of the Raya and Azebo Oromo. The Raya and Azebo in southern Tigray and northern Wollo were used to have a measure of local autonomy in administration. Whenever, they felt that was threatened, they often became rebellions. The 1929 rebellion was one such occasion. Zewditu intervened to try to avoid bloodshed between Teferi and Gugsa but she failed, as Gugsa refused to surrender. On 31 March 1930 the imperial army under the command of the new Minister of War, Ras Mulugeta Yigezu, fought the army of Gugsa at the battle of Anchem, near the Lasta- Begemdir border. The first two air crafts of Ethiopia were engaged in dropping bombs and leaflets. Gugsa died in action. Two days later Zewditu died, reportedly of diabetes. Teferi was crowned Emperor Haile Sellassie I of Ethiopia on 2 November, 1930 by an impressive coronation ceremony.

Fig 3.15 Ras Gugsa Walle

Activity

3.4.3. The Emergence of the Absolutist State, 1930-35

Right after his coronation, Haile Sellassie embarked upon laying the ground for an absolutist state in Ethiopia. The essence of his absolutism was the formation of a highly centralized unitary state. In this state, the regional dynasties (Mesafints) had to submit to the supreme authority of the Emperor in exchange for royal recognition of their economic privileges, i.e, hereditary right over tributary lands known as *riste gult*. By so doing, Haile Sellassie was trying to do away with the forces of regionalism and build his own autocratic power on a firm economic basis.

To this end, the Emperor took very significant measures. First, in 1931 he laid a legal basis for the absolutist state by issuing the first written Constitution for Ethiopia. The Constitution was claimed to have the objective of bringing political modernity, stopping the traditional problem of succession and building national integration. It was also claimed to have aimed at providing “fair justice” for the Ethiopian peoples. The content of the Constitution, however, shows major emphasis on building the absolute power of the Emperor and guaranteeing the right to succession to his descendants. Other provisions included, such as a parliamentary system and civil rights, were not put into practice and were

included in the document only to impress Europeans by showing signs of modern political transformation.

Therefore, the Constitution confirmed the Emperor's divine right to rule as well as the right to issue laws for his people by his own will. It established a bicameral Parliament having a Senate, which was an upper chamber of nobles, appointed by the Emperor, and the Chamber of Deputies elected by local notables from among the local feudal lords. The Emperor's absolute power also included the right to appoint and dismiss members of Parliament and other civil and military officials, to declare or end wars, and to grant land and honours.

Secondly, based on his absolute constitutional right, Haile Sellassie completed the process of building centralized administration. Most of the southern regions, it is to be recalled, had already fallen into the hands of royal appointees during the reign of Menelik. A similar process of centralization was also pursued by Haile Sellassie. As a result, the autonomous province of Wollo was given to his eldest son, Asfa Wossen, after the battle of Segele. Following the battle of Anchem, Begemdir came under the appointee of Haile Sellassie, Ras Kasa. Similarly, the local autonomy of Gojjam and Jimma came to an end in 1932 and 1933 respectively. The hereditary rulers of these regions, Ras Hailu Tekle Haymanot of Gojjam and Abba Jobir Abba Jiffar of Jimma were removed and the regions came under direct control of the central. The region whose autonomy remained intact was Tigray, which continued to be ruled by two grandsons of Emperor Yohannes IV: Ras Seyoum Mengesha and Ras Gugsa Araya. Though he did not succeed in winning their absolute loyalty, Haile Sellassie tried to tie the Tigrean princes with the Shoan dynasty, through arranging political marriages with the Shoan royal family.

Fig 3.16 Dejach Seyoum Mengesha (on the left)

Thirdly, the absolutist state worked hard at fiscal centralization, mainly in customs administration. The government thus eliminated the old provincial kellas (customs posts), and replaced them by a few recognized and centrally controlled customs posts. The government also controlled the customs from external trade.

Finally, the emerging absolutist state gave due attention to the modernization of its army. The process of administrative and political centralization laid the basis for establishment of a modern national army. But its effective transformation called for modern training. The process of modern military training had already begun in 1920, by sending young educated Ethiopians abroad. In 1930 Belgian officers were put in charge of training the Imperial Bodyguard consisting of three battalions of infantry. Moreover, in 1934 the Ethiopian government opened the first officer training school at Holeta Gannat by recruiting its teaching staff from Swedish officers. This cadet school had a programme of three years training which was, however, interrupted by the Italian invasion of Ethiopia in 1935.

Summary

At the end of the Zemane-Mesafint, Ethiopia was a land of several independent states. Through great efforts and, often, hard-fought battles under Emperors Tewodros, Yohanes IV and Menelik II, the modern Ethiopian Empire was built out of the diverse states and ethnic groups. That was achieved in the face of external threats and from expansion of Egypt, Mahdist Sudan and European colonialists. Indeed, Ethiopia survived as a sovereign state by defending her independence from Italian colonialism at the decisive Battle of Adwa in 1896.

The independence of Ethiopia survived on precarious grounds. If Ethiopia was to continue as an independent state among the nations of the world, it had to modernize itself. However, incomprehensive and limited some elements of modernization were introduced, especially in the fields of education, trade, transport the army and government. But, it was not enough, as it would be proven shortly in 1935.

The lag was not only in socio-economic development, but also problems abounded in the political conditions Ethiopia found herself, particularly between 1906 and 1930. Rivalries for political and royal power among different members of the ruling class led to military conflicts and coups, creating instability. It was only with the emerging absolutist state of Emperor Haile Selassie that political stability was restored since 1930.

Review Questions

Part I. Choose the best possible answer from the alternatives given for each question

1. Which of the following was not a cause for the Great Ethiopian Famine of 1888 to 1892?

- a. Man- made problems
- b. Natural difficulties
- c. Disease-infected cattle imported from Egypt
- c. Epidemic disease

2. Between 1930 and 1935, Haile Selassie's emerging absolutist state was characterized by
- a. build- up of a civilian bureaucracy
 - b. build- up of military power at his service
 - c. attempt to systematize revenue collection
 - d. All of the above
3. Which of the following was a basic cause for the Battle of Adwa?
- a. Treaty of Wuchalle
 - b. Italian ambition to colonize Ethiopia.
 - c. Menelik's destruction of an Italian force at the Battle of Amba Alage.
 - d. Election of Francesco Crispi as Italian Prime Minister.
4. The Hewett Treaty of 1884
- a. led Emperor Yohanes IV to more problems than it solved for him.
 - b. was directed against Egypt
 - c. was proposed first by France
 - d. was responsible for the seizure Asmara by Italy
5. Which of the following emperors did not contribute for the creation of the modern Ethiopian Empire?
- a. Yohannes IV.
 - b. Tewodros.
 - c. Menelik I.
 - d. None of the above
6. The two main vassals of Yohannes IV, which revolted against him in 1888, were
- a. Menelik and Muhammad Hanfare
 - b. Abba Jifar I and Bakare Godana
 - c. Tekle Haimanot and Menelik
 - d. Tekle Giyorgis and Muhammad Hanfare.
7. The commander –in-chief of Italian forces at the Battle of Adwa was
- a. Dobormida
 - b. Galliano
 - c. Baratieri
 - d. Arimondi
8. In Ethiopia, the government of Italy first took control of
- a. Massawa
 - b. Dogali
 - c. Assab
 - d. Zulla

9. Menelik's territorial expansion to Southern Ethiopia was done mainly, because the south

- a. had started expansionist wars against Northern Ethiopia r. 1800
- b. was rich in agricultural produce, as well as other marketable items such as gold.
- c. followed Traditional Worship
- d. had skilled manpower

10. Mahdist Sudan was interested in

- a. spreading Islam into new territories
- b. the conquest of all Africa
- c. controlling Mecca and Medina
- d. occupying Egypt

Part II. Say "True" if the statement is correct, and "False" if the statement is incorrect

1. Emperor Tewodros united all of present-day Ethiopia, though he lost control of some parts towards the end of his reign.

2. The Orthodox Church stood against Emperor Tewodros, chiefly, because he took away Church land.

3. The 1931 Constitution of Ethiopia democratized the country, and ended the autocracy of Haile Selassie I.

4. Lij Iyasu was overthrown largely because he proved to be a danger to the Shoan political power in the central government.

5. As a result of Battle of Adwa, Ethiopia recovered all her territories which had been lost to Italian colonialists.

6. The Battle of Adwa was won by the sacrifices paid both by North and South Ethiopians.

7. As a result of Menelik's expansion to Southern Ethiopia, the region was saved from European colonialism.

Part III. Match the items in column A with those in B.

A

B

1. Gaki Serocho

A. Battle of Gundet

2. Tewodros

B. Bench

3. Egyptians

C. Wolayita

- 4. Menelik
- D. Kafa
- 5. Mahdist Sndanese
- E. Holeta Military School
- 6. Haile Selassie
- F. Battle of Deresge
- 7. Tona
- G. Battle of Embabo

H. Fitha Nigest

I. Battle of Kufit

J. Djibouti

Part IV. Fill in the blanks with correct responses

1. The two main sources of opposition to the reforms of Emperor Tewodros were _____ and _____.
2. Emperor Yohannes IV fought against _____, _____ and _____, in order to defend Ethiopia's independence.
3. In 1885, the European power that co-operated with Italy to enable the latter to occupy Massawa was _____.
4. Alula Abba Nega was _____ of Emperor Yohannes' army.
5. The Neftegna were _____.
6. Hassen Enjamo was a leader of the _____ people against Menelik's territorial expansion.
7. _____ was a famous Oromo general that commanded Menelik's army in the expansion to Southern Ethiopia.
8. In 1910, a coup was organized against Taytu, because _____.

Part V. Give short answers to the following questions

1. In what sense could the 1931 constitution of Ethiopia be said a progressive document?
2. List down the positive reforms of Lij Iyasu.
3. Why did Emperor Yohannes IV succeed in his efforts of reunification of the Christian state of Ethiopia, while Emperor Tewodros had failed?
4. Why is Menelik often referred to as the architect of the modern Ethiopian

state?

5. What was the Tripartite Treaty?
6. Give the important factors that enabled Addis Ababa to remain permanent capital of Menelik's Empire.
7. List down the reasons for the expansion of Menelik to Southern Ethiopia.
8. Describe some of the attempted modernizing reforms of Emperor Tewodros.
9. What did the conditions of Ethiopian peasants look like at the beginning of the 20th century?
10. Why did Emperor Yohannes II come into conflict with Mahdists?

UNIT FOUR

THE FIRST WORLD WAR, 1914-1918

Introduction

To this day war has still been one of the dominant feature of human history. But the First world War was exceptional from the wars that preceded it in terms of the of nations involved, the destruction it caused. It was a global war, because more than thirty nations were involved, and it was fought by land, sea and air.

The First World War (1914-1918) was basically the result of economic and political rivalries arised among the industrialized nations of Europe. These rivalries gave rise to conflicts that led to the formation of mutually antagonistic military alliances. The war started between a few nations belonging to the two hostile military blocs, and eventually dragged in several others to take part.

In many countries, the war brought about far reaching political and economic consequences. As the result of the war, Russia experienced a revolutionary upheaval that gave rise to the first communist state in the world.

This war also affected the peoples of Africa. Many Africans fought in the war on the side of their colonial masters. At the end of the war, they came back home filled with new ideas such as freedom and equality. It was the spread and maturation of these ideas that partly created the ground for the birth of African nationalism.

Objectives

After studying this unit, the students will be able to:

- * explain the main causes of the First World War;
- * explain the course of the war;
- * identify and analyze the effects of the war;
- * identify and explain the fundamental causes of the Russian Revolution;
- * describe the major events that took place in the course of the Russian Revolution.

4.1. The First World War (W.W.I)

Terms to Know

- Armistice
- Demilitarized zone
- Reparation
- Arms Race
- League
- Trench warfare
- Assassination
- Maculate
- Ultimatum
- Belligerent nations
- Militarism
- Unilateral

I. The basic causes of the First World War were:

A. Imperialist rivalries

B. Colonialism

C. Militarism

D. Creation of military alliances (bolcs)

E. Nationalism

A. Imperialism and rivalry for colonies

One of the basic causes of the First World War was the economic and political rivalries among industrialized nations of Europe. The economic and political rivalries were the result of the development of capitalism. The development of capitalism gave rise to an intense economic competition among the major powers of Europe to establish and expand empires. In Europe countries like Germany, France, Britain, Austria- Hungary, Russia and Italy competed one another over economic interests, territory, recognition, great power status and prestige. All except Austria- Hungary and Russia also competed outside Europe for the control of overseas colonial possessions. These developed countries also competed for raw materials, new opportunities of investment and profitable market for their finished goods.

This conflicting interests and over lapping ambitions inevitably led them to clashes. On several occasions before 1914 conflicting interests drew several European countries to the brink of a large-scale war. For instance, France and Britain were in bad terms when Britain established a unilateral control over Egypt in 1882. The relation between these two countries went from bad to worse which

culminated into the Fashoda crisis of 1898, in the Sudan where these armies of the two countries were about to fight. In 1911 and 1912, Italy and Turkey fought for the control of Libya. Germany and France were on the verge of fighting for the control of Morocco. Britain later intervened on the side of France in 1911. This incident came to be known as the Agadir Crisis. These and other similar incidents further strained the existing tension.

B. Militarism and the arms race

The growing contradictions and strained relations created a sense of insecurity among European powers. At the turn of the century, the leading European powers were in a state of fierce competition to get themselves ahead of their rivals in terms of armaments and military power. The main subject of discussion in many parliaments of Europe was the issue of military budget.

France, after her defeat in the Franco-Prussian war (1870 - 1871) was busily engaged in building her military power. The French nationalists criticized the government for the defeat France suffered. Moreover, they demanded the government regain the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine which they lost to Germany in 1871. Following its unification Germany became one of the most powerful country in Europe. In order to maintain its position, Germany increased its military budget more than ever before.

Early in the 19th century Germany expanded her navy, much to the delight and pride of German nationalists and to the alarm of the British. Britain's economy depended on her trade routes. The safety of these routes depended on the strength of the Royal Navy, the British Naval force. A remarkable achievement along this line was the fact that Britain built the most powerful battleship in 1906. On the other hand, after three years, in 1909, Germany also built a similar battleship.

The European powers carefully assessed each other's strength in terms of armed forces. They increased the size of their respective armies and improved their war materials. In almost all countries of Europe, national military services had been made a standing obligation for citizens. In addition to these there was propaganda, which stirred up the national feelings of each citizen.

C. Creation of military alliance

After the Franco-Prussian war, Bismarck followed a policy of isolating France. He put this policy into effect by approaching his former enemy, Austria-Hungary, in 1879. Austria-Hungary and Germany concluded a treaty of friendship that came to be known as the "Dual Alliance". Three years later Italy joined hands with members of the Dual Alliance to form a stronger military bloc called "Triple Alliance".

The formation of the Triple Alliance created fear on the part of other European powers. In 1907 Britain, France and Russia signed a friendly understanding in what was later called the "Triple Entente". Thus Europe was divided into two hostile military camps. In both blocs the members pledged themselves to give military aid in case of aggression against one of the members. However, Britain's commitment was not clear and formal to its partners. Italy was also an unreliable member of the Triple Alliance. Of course Italy stayed as member of the Triple Alliance only until 1915. She joined the Triple Entente in that year.

D. Nationalism

In nineteenth century Europe, nationalism proved to be the main source of armed conflicts. In Italy and Germany nationalism had achieved national unity. But it had affected other European countries in some ways. For instance, the German unification had humiliated the French people. After this victory over France in the Franco-Prussian war (1870 - 1871) Germany forcefully took the French provinces of Alsace and Lorraine. Moreover, the coronation of Wilhelm (Willhelm) I as the Emperor of United Germany was conducted in the French palace of Hall of Mirrors at Versailles. This created a desire for revenge among the French and wait for an opportune time to regain their lost provinces.

More than any part of Europe, nationalism and national discontent was very high in the Balkan region. This made the region a storm center at the eve of WWI. Beginning from the 1820s, the people of the Balkans had fought wars of liberation against their oppressor, Ottoman Turkey. As a result, five Balkan states namely; Greece, Bulgaria, Rumania, Serbia and Montenegro appeared on the map of Europe as independent states. However, many of these states felt that their independence was incomplete. This was because a large number of their fellow nationals in provinces such as Bosnia, Herzegovina and Macedonia. The first two provinces were under Austria-Hungary's control since 1878. The other, Macedonia was still part of the Ottoman Empire.

Russia supported Serbian, nationalism and with Russian approval the Balkan states Serbia, Montenegro, Bulgaria and Greece formed a League what was known as the Balkan League. In the First Balkan War of 1912 the Balkan League defeated Ottoman Turkey and took Macedonia. Shortly after, members of the League quarreled among themselves over the division of the territory which they acquired from Ottoman Turkey. This quarrel led to the Second Balkan War of 1913. As a result of this war, Bulgaria lost almost all her gains from the first Balkan War. Serbia became bigger and stronger and now wanted Bosnia, which was still part of Austria-Hungary. This became the main cause for the quarrel between Austria-Hungary and Serbia that finally led to the outbreak of the First World War (W.W.I). The Balkan crises of 1912 - 1913 brought Russia and Serbia closer together, and intensified the hatred of Russia and Serbia for Austria.

II. The immediate cause of the war

The immediate cause for the outbreak of the First World War was the assassination of the Austrian crown prince, Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife Sophie on June 28, 1914, at Sarajevo, the capital of Bosnia. The assassin was Gavrilo Princip, a 19- years- old Serb nationalist. Although the assassination did not take place in Serbia, Austria-Hungary held the Serbian government responsible. This was because of the existing tension between the two that resulted from the continuous Serbian nationalist agitation against Austria.

Before taking any action against Serbia, Austria-Hungary sent her envoy to Germany to know the attitude of Germany regarding the situation. Emperor Wilhelm I of Germany assured the envoy that Germany would support any action Austria-Hungary might take against Serbia. This statement of assurance Germany gave to Austria-Hungary came to be known as a diplomatic "Blank Cheque". Thus, Austria-Hungary sent an ultimatum to Serbia. Serbia refused to accept a demand which appeared to

violate its Sovereignty. This was the demand for the involvement of Austria-Hungary's officials in the investigation of the assassination and trail of the assassin. Austria-Hungary declared war on Serbia on July 28, 1914.

Following the declaration of war on Serbia, the European powers in hostile military blocs joined the war one after another. Russia, which considered herself to be the protector of the Slavs and Orthodox states of the Balkan, came on the side of Serbia. Russia also wanted to uphold her great power interests and prestige in the Balkan region and started war mobilization order. In response to Russia's war mobilization, Germany sent an ultimatum to Russia and then to France. Russia refused to halt its mobilization and France refused to promise the neutrality required from her.

Following these development, Germany declared war first on Russia and then on France, on 1 August 1914 and 3 August 1914 respectively. Britain had not decided whether to stay neutral or join in the war on the side of Russia and France. However, Germany invaded Belgium on August 3, 1914, an action which threatened Britain's own security. Britain declared war on Germany and her allies on August 4, 1914. Britain's declaration of war, marked the official beginnings of the First World War.

4.2. The Course of the War

The war was fought between two major military blocs- the Allied powers and the central powers by the end of 1914 the warring nations had lined up as follows:

Allied powers	Central powers
Britain, bloc leader	Germany, bloc leader
France	Austria-Hungary
Russia, until 1917	Bulgaria
Belgium	Turkey
Serbia	
Italy (joined in 1915)	
USA (joined in 1917)	
Japan	

The First World War was fought in different parts of the world. However, the main theatre of the war was Europe. In Europe the war was fought on two fronts: western and Eastern. The central Powers, situated in between the British and French forces in the West and Russia in the East, were compelled to fight on two fronts. This was the situation which Germany had planned to avoid in its war strategy that was drawn sometime before 1905. This war strategy was known as the Schlieffen plan, named after its author Alfred von Schlieffen, Chief of Staff of the Germany army. The plan assumed that

Russia would mobilize slowly and the Belgians would give little or no resistance. Therefore, the Germans would inflict a sudden and crushing defeat on France, forcing her to make peace, and then would turn to the Eastern Front against Russia.

On the basis of the Schlieffen Plan, Germany started the First World War on the Western Front with a massive attack on France by going through Belgium and Luxemburg. Contrary to the assumptions of the Schlieffen Plan, the Belgians put up a heroic resistance and delayed the Germans for a little time. However, the Germans managed to push back the British and French forces that had been sent into Belgium and defeated French attacks along the Franco-German frontier. By September, a month after the beginning of the war, the Germans were close to Paris. The French government evacuated Paris and moved to Bordeaux. At this critical moment, the French commander, General Joffre, gave battle to the advancing Germans on the Marne River. The battle of the Marne lasted for nearly a week (September 6 -12, 1914) and finally the Germans were driven back, though not very far.

Despite their success at Marne, the French generals were unable to follow and expel the Germans from the area. This was the second mistake of the war in the very first week. The French believed that attacking was best than defence, thus had thrown their best troops against advancing Germans in the center and south. For this reason, they were beaten and pushed back.

Mean while, on the Eastern Front, Russia moved faster than the Germans had expected. The Russians invaded East Prussia from the south and east. They also invaded the province of Galicia in Austria-Hungary. This victory did not last long and the Russians made the third mistake. In August, the Russians and the Germans fronted one another at Tanenberg, north- eastern part of present Poland. The outcome of the battle was heavy loss and defeat for the Russians.

Map 1. World War (1914 - 1918)

Why did Italy join the war?

On Western Front, the two sides searched for each others weak points to break through. They found none. They built a long trench which ran from Belgian coast across northern France to the Swiss border. This long trench covered nearly 600 miles. By 1915 the war had reached a deadlock. It became clear that neither side could defeat the other quickly. During this time many battles were fought, but no side could claim a conclusive victory. The only significant event of 1915 was that Italy joined the war on the Allies side. The Allies won Italy by promising, that if they achieved victory, Italy would get her lost territories from Austria (her claims from Austria). They had also promised to give certain parts from Turkish Empire. Then, Italy declared war on Austria-Hungary in May 1915.

In the east, the Germans advanced into Russia and the Russians advanced into Austria. In 1916 the deadlock continued. With the entry of Italy, the Allies got little advantage. In four battles with Austria, the Italians gained little ground. The Russians also faced heavy losses in battles they fought with Austria-Hungarian and German armies in 1915-1916. The only success so far by the Allied forces was the conquest of Germany's overseas colonies. Soon Britain decided to open the offensive to the Dardanelles by taking the peninsula of Gallipoli (Turkey). The offensive was aimed at taking Constantinople. This was to put out the Ottoman Turkey from the war and it was decided that offensive would make it easier to supply Russia and strengthen Serbia and possibly leading to the collapse of Austria-Hungary. However, the Gallipoli campaign failed due to strong resistance of the Turkish army. This Turkish force was led by General Mustafa Kemal. The Allies had to give up their offensive war in 1916.

Besides this, the great fleets of Germany and Britain clashed once at the Battle of Jutland in the North Sea in 1916. Defeat for one side would have meant much more than the loss of a fleet. This would have given to the other side complete control of the trade routes to and from Europe. So they developed a war of blockade. Both sides tried to disrupt each others trade routes and prevent vital foods and raw materials reaching the enemy. This was by laying minefields at sea and by using a new kind of warship, the Submarine. The German submarines had caused huge damages on the British ships until mid-1917. The British defended its merchant ships by escorting safely across the seas by war ships. While the German navy forced the British government to ration their people's food, the British navy ensured that Germany's people suffered even worse shortages.

The year 1917 was crucial in the course of the war. In this year two significant events took place. One of these events was the outbreak of a popular revolution in Russia, in March 1917. The main factors for the outbreak of this revolution were economic hardships, and disastrous defeats the Russian army suffered on the war fronts. This brought about the downfall of the Tsarist regime and the establishment of a Provisional Government. This Provisional government was a bourgeois government. It had seized power in March 1917. This government continued the war against the will of the Russian people who were already exhausted of the war.

The Bolsheviks, who won the support of the masses, staged the second revolution on November 7, 1917 and overthrew the provisional government. Immediately, they signed an armistice (cease-fire) with the Central Powers. This armistice was signed on March 3, 1918 at the town of Brest-Litovsk. (hence the Brest-Litovsk Treaty) resulted in Russia withdrawal from the First World War.

Another event of great importance was the entrance of the USA into the war on the side of the Allies. Up to then, the USA had remained neutral in what was considered a European war. The policy of the USA which stuck to American neutrality was changed as a result of the war at sea. In the war, as mentioned above, the Allied powers aimed at blockading the Central Powers so as to force them to surrender from lack of food and supplies. But Germany responded by sinking, both war ships and merchant ships by its submarines. The German U-boats (submarines) sank many passengers and freight vessels which had many Americans on board. This inflamed American public opinion against Germany and led the USA to declare war on Germany on April 6, 1917.

America's entry into the war dramatically changed the balance of power in favour of the Allies. It boosted the morale of the Allied forces. America's fresh resources, both human and material, arrived in Europe and devastated the war efforts of the Central Powers.

In the spring of 1918 the first Unified Allied command was created in the west under Marshal Foch. The Allied forces crushed the last desperate offensive of the Germans and pushed them back. Hence, the Central Powers began to crumble one after the other. Bulgaria was the first to surrender on September 30, 1918. In October some of the subject peoples of Austria-Hungary broke away, and Emperor Charles fled the country. The same month the Ottoman Empire surrendered. In Germany on November 9 a revolution forced, Emperor, William II (Wilhelm II) to abdicate. The next day, he fled to Holland. Finally, on 11 November 1918 at 11.00 A.M on the 11th day of the 11 month, (11,11,11,1918) the Germans signed an armistice (cease -fire).

Map 2. European in 1919

4.3. End of the War and its Consequences

Terms to Know

- | | | |
|----------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| - Arbitration | - Demilitarized zone | - Trust territory |
| - Belligerents | - Disarmament | - Plebiscite |
| - Covenant | - Universality | - Unanimously |

4.3.1. Peace Treaties

The purpose of the cease-fire agreement (Nov. 11, 1918) was to stop the fighting as it did. It had been followed by a peace treaty/treaties signed by the warring nations through which they would settle their disputes and establish an enduring peace.

To this effect, a series of treaties were signed. The peace talks started with the Paris conference held in 1919. The dominant figures in the peace conference were the so called "Big Four" namely; Prime

Minister Lloyd George of Britain, Prime Minister. V. Orlando of Italy, Premier Clemenceau of France, and President Woodrow Wilson of the USA.

Allies held the view that the central powers were responsible for the destruction of the war caused and they have to be punished for it. With this in mind, the Big four came up with their own proposals. Clemenceau insisted on imposing harsh terms on Germany so as to prevent it from becoming a strong military power again. Orlando of Italy demanded the rest of the Allied powers to fulfill what they had promised to Italy when she joined the war in 1915. Lloyd George hoped to maintain a balance of power in Europe without weakening Germany too much. President Wilson stood for an enduring world peace that would be realized by applying his Fourteen Points. On the whole; the final settlement seems to have more or less satisfied British and French interests, though France was bitterly disappointed at not being allowed to annex German territory up to the River Rhine.

It was against this background the Allies signed the Treaty of Versailles, in June 1919, with the leading member of the central powers, Germany. The treaty turned out to be harsh and dictating as the victors liked it to be. According to this treaty, Germany lost all her colonies in Africa. These colonies were given to Britain, France, Belgium and South Africa as trust territories (Mandatory rule) to be administered under the supervision of the League of Nations. Germany also lost her colonies in the Pacific Ocean, which were divided among Japan, Australia and New Zealand. Alsace and Lorraine were given back to France.

In the East, Germany surrendered almost all lands of Poland which she had gained during the partition of Poland in the 18th century. Danzig with a predominantly German population was incorporated in the Polish tariff system (nominally) as free city. Germany also lost upper Silesia to Poland although a plebiscite (1921) indicated a German majority throughout the greater part of the disputed territory. Some small districts like Eupen, Moresnet, and Malmedy were transferred to Belgium and a plebiscite in the province of Schleswig gave part of Schleswig back to Denmark.

The German army was reduced to 100,000 men and the army would not possess heavy artillery, tanks and aircraft. The German navy was limited in size and number of ships and could have no submarines. Germany was also forced to pay a financial compensation called reparations that amounted to \$ 6,600,000,000. In fact, it did not pay even half of this amount. The Rhineland was made a demilitarized zone. This treaty had imposed harsh terms on Germany.

Map 3. Treaty of Versailles, 1919

Map 4. Germany after the Treaty of Versailles

Subsequently, the Allies signed similar treaties with other central power partners. On September 10, 1919 the Treaty of Saint German was signed between the Allies and Austria which had already become a state on its own.. This treaty limited the Austrian Republic to an area one tenth the size of the former Habsburg Empire. Some of Austria Hungary's former territories went to the new republics of Poland and Yugoslavia, and to the kingdom of Italy.

On June 4, 1920 a separate settlement called the Treaty of Trianon was signed between the Allied powers and Hungary which was formed as a separate from the dismembered of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

The treaty of Sevres was signed between the Allies and Ottoman-Turke on August 10, 1920. According to this treaty, the former Ottoman territories in the Middle East were given to Britain and France as trust territories. Syria and Lebanon went to France, while Iraq, Palestine and Trans-Jordan were given to Britain. The Allies even tried to partition Asia Minor, the heart land of Turkey. However, a successful movement of Turkish nationalists, led by Musapha Kemal (Kemal Ataturk, as he was known since then) aborted this plan and established an independent Turkish Republic in 1923. The Allies signed the treaty of Lausanne in 1923 with the new republic.

In general, the terms of most of these treaties were harsh and unjust which caused strong reaction and resentment in the defeated nations. Specially the Versailles treaty was extremely harsh which was denounced by the Germans as the 'diktat' i.e, a dictated peace forced on Germany. Indeed, as it is pointed out by many scholars, the Treaty of Versailles sowed seeds of future war rather than establishing peace in Europe.

4.3.2. Birth of the League of Nations

More than once, in earlier centuries, proposals aimed at the establishment of a permanent group or an international organization had been drawn up. Such an organization was expected to promote world peace. Many European statesmen had drafted plans to achieve this goal. Their dream came true when the League of Nations was established at the end of the First World War. The League of Nations emerged as the first international organization meant to keep world peace. In fact, the covenant of the League, that is its constitution, had already been incorporated into the Treaty of Versailles. The underlined objective of the League is stated to be settling disputes through peaceful means such as conciliation, arbitration and judicial procedures.

The formation of the League of Nations was the result of the tireless efforts of President Wilson of the USA and his famous 14 points. The last of his Fourteen Points states that:

"A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenant for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike". Although W. Wilson succeeded in realizing the formation of League, he was unable to get the approval of the US senate on Americas membership into the League. Thus the US did not become a member of the League. All big nations were finally became members of the League. In 1921 the League membership rose to 51, in 1932 to 57 and in 1934 to 60. However, Germany was not allowed to join League membership until 1926, and Russia until 1934.

The League's headquarter was located in Geneva, Switzerland, where the first Assembly that inaugurated the birth of the organization, met in 1920.

The League consisted of different organs, namely:

- * General Assembly
- * Council
- * Permanent Court of Justice or Court of Arbitration
- * Secretariat

Various commissions and committees. In principle, the Assembly was the highest organ of the League. In reality, however, the council was the most decisive organ of the League. The council dealt with issues related to peace and security. Members of the council were: Great Britain, France, Italy and, Japan and later the number of the council increased to nine. These council was dominated by the Big Three. For the reason that the USA declined to join the League and the Soviet Russia had not been accorded official recognition, the places reserved for these powers on the council remained vacant. But Germany was granted a permanent seat on her admission to the League in 1926. In 1933, Japan and Germany announced their intention to withdraw from membership and in 1934, Russia was admitted and received a permanent seat in the council. The Permanent Court of Justice was also concerned with legal issues, while the General Assembly was primarily an administrative organ. The commissions and committees were responsible for issues related to labor, the mandated territories and many other issues from time to time.

During the first years of its existence, the League successfully handled the mediation of some national disputes. However, as years went by the weaknesses and inefficiency of the League began to manifest. This was that the League had no effective mechanism for averting war or stopping aggression. This was because it had no armed force to enforce its decisions. Thus, when some states began to violate the principle of the League by following aggressive policies, the League was unable to stop war and this brought an end to any influence of the organization (League) for instance, it failed to stop Japanese aggression on Manchuria in 1931 and the Italian aggression on Ethiopia in 1935-36. In 1931 Japan occupied the Chinese province of Manchuria and turned it into a puppet Manchu state called

Manchuko. The League criticized Japan but nothing else and the only result was that Japan simple left the League in 1933. The League also failed to do something effective about the Italian aggression of Ethiopia.

Some other short comings which discredited of the League were:

- * The world big power, the USA was not its member (neutrality of the USA).
- * Germany and Soviet-Russia were not at the beginning admitted to the league.
- * The league was dominated by France and Britain.
- * The General Assembly had no effective power.
- * The League had no armed force to stop aggressors or to enforce it decisions.

4.3.3. Other Consequences of the War

Another important consequence of W.W.I was that the USA emerged the most powerful country in the world. But the USA was not willing to use this power in a global scale. It soon started the traditional policy of ignoring European problems, and stayed out of the League of Nations.

The war took a little more than four years, 1914-1918. It was fought in almost in all continents except on Australian and American soil. About 65 million men were mobilized. Of this figure 8.5 million were killed, about 21 million were wounded. The civilian casualties were incalculable. The aggregate expenditure of the belligerent nations was estimated at 35,000,000,000. This figure does not include the cost sustained in material destruction (roads, machines, factories, domestic and farm buildings, etc).

4.4. The Russian Socialist Revolution, 1917

Terms to Know

- Autocracy
- Liberals
- Slogan
- Coup
- Moderates
- Soviets
- Duma
- Purge

- Inflation

- Riots

The basic cause of the Russian Revolution of 1917 were the accumulated grievances of the peasantry and working people. The Russian peasant was a victim of serfdom until 1861. Even, after the abolition of serfdom in 1861, the position of the peasantry did not improve much. The Edict of Emancipation had endowed the Russian serfs with some rights, for it made a free peasant. However, the agrarian problems were further intensified by the liberation of the peasants. As the result of the abolition of serfdom, the peasants were forced to pay compensation to the landlords for the loss of the landlord's right to serf labour. The peasants were also burdened to pay different taxes to the government. Moreover, the Russian peasants suffered from shortage of land. Therefore, the Russian peasantry, who had lots of resentments easily joined the urban uprising in March 1917.

Although Russia remained agrarian and feudal in much of the 19th century, it did not escape the impact of industrialization. From the 1880s on, there was a rapid industrial growth in Russia. This gave rise to a new social class, the urban workers, in Russia. From the very beginning, however, the condition of the Russian working class was far worse than those in other major industrialized countries of Europe. This made the Russian working people a very militant group, ready to accept revolutionary ideas.

In the meantime, the Tsarist regime, rather than introducing reforms continued its attempt to preserve autocratic rule. Since 1906 he had to accept the existence of a Duma, a sort of parliament with no real law making powers. Before the war, it had been easy for the Tzar to ignore the opinions of liberals. But, as the military failures became evident, there were wide spread demands for a more democratic and efficient system of government to cope with the problems caused by the war. On the eve of the March revolution, there existed in Russia political groups such as the liberal and moderates, social Revolutionaries, the Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks.

The Mensheviks and Bolsheviks were initially together as being members of the first Marxist party in Russia called the Russian Social- Democratic Labor party. This party had been formed in 1898. One of the influential members of this party was V.I Lenin. In 1900 the party started to publish its own newspaper called Iskra, or the Spark. Soon after wards, there occurred division among the ranks on the issue of party organization. Lenin insisted on strong centralization, while others agitated for loose democratic organization. At the party congress of 1903, the majority supported and voted for Lenin's view, while the minority favored a loose democratic organization. This caused a Split in the Russian Social – Democratic Party. The supporters of Lenin called themselves Bolsheviks, which means majority, while their opponents came to be known as Mensheviks, meaning the minority. Nevertheless both continued to be called social-democrats. They were interested in urban workers whom they considered as a class to take leadership in a socialist revolution. Other Russians belonged to a non-Marxist party called the Social Revolutionary Party. The Social Revolutionaries were more interested in the peasants of the

countryside. Their main aim was to redistribute land. Some members of the social Revolutionary Party used terrorist tactics and killings as a means of struggle to bring about social change.

Immediate Cause of the Revolution

The revolutionary situation leading to the March revolution was precipitated by the First World War. Right from the start the Russian army could not stand the military muscle of its enemy. As war continued, the condition of the Russian army grew worse. This generally caused war weariness and exhaustion among the Russian soldiers. Explaining the situation at the war front, a Russian officer wrote; "Nobody wanted to fight anymore, all their thoughts were for one thing only-peace". Thus, demoralization at the war front made the situation ripe for a revolution on the home front.

In March 17 (Feb. 1917 according to Russian Calendar) there were strikes and food riots in St. Petersburg, which was the capital of the Tzarist Empire. (The name of the troubled city was changed to Petrograd, to be changed to Leningrad later in 1924). The people of Petrograd were sick of the war from which they had suffered enormous casualties. The shortage of food and high food prices aggravated the situation and gave rise to more strikes and disturbances which developed into a revolt against the war and against the monarchy. In the days that follow the people of Petrograd were joined by other workers who carried slogans that condemned the war and the monarchy. "Down with the war", Down with autocracy became the popular slogans of the day. All of the sudden, the grievances of different classes and social groups began to assert themselves soldiers for peace, peasants for land, and workers for food and improvement of their living and working conditions. At the beginning, the army remained neutral, but soon joined the revolutionary masses. On March 16, 1917, Tsar Nicholas II had no choice but to abdicate (give up) his throne. This brought an end to the Romanov dynasty which had ruled Russia since 1613.

With the downfall of the Tzarist regime, a Provisional government, was set up. This bourgeois government in character, was first led by prince George Lvov and later by Alexander Kerensky. Although the bourgeoisie tried to seize political power, the battle for the revolution was fought by workers, peasants, and soldiers. They fought for land, for bread and for peace. However, as it came to pass the bourgeois government failed to give the people what they demanded. The bourgeois government continued the war by ordering renewed offensives. Instead of improving the condition of the working class, the government took the side of capitalists. The wishes of the peasants could not be fulfilled as the government kept on ignoring the land issue. Thus, the failure of this government to fulfill the above demands prepared the ground for another round of revolutionary upsurge often referred to as the Second Russian Revolution. All classes, especially the peasantry and the working class lost confidence in this government and swayed by the propaganda of the Bolsheviks. In the meantime the Bolsheviks were agitating for the overthrow of the bourgeois government. Parallel to the bourgeois Provisional government, the March 1917 Revolution created the Soviets. The Soviets originally were Councils of workers delegates elected by factory workers of Petrograd. Later soldiers also elected their delegates and the Petrograd Soviets consisted of both workers and soldiers delegates. The workers, soldiers and peasants trusted the Soviets but distrusted the provisional government.

During the March Revolution the Bolshevik's V.I. Lenin had been in exile in Switzerland.

Bolsheviks at home were not determined to fight for the overthrow of the bourgeois government. This was because, most Russian Marxists still, believed that the next stage in Russia's social development could only be the rule of the bourgeoisie and capitalism. Misguided by this rigid Marxist interpretation, Bolshevik leaders at home remained passive until Lenin's return from exile in April 1917. Lenin could not wait that long. His arrival at the Finland station in Petrograd in April 1917 was one of the most decisive moments in the history of the Russian revolution. He all at once declared. "All powers to the Soviets!" which became the most famous slogan in the months. Lenin was determined to transform the bourgeois revolution into a socialist revolution. Yet there were many few Bolsheviks in the Soviets, who thought that their leader was mistaken.

In the months ahead conditions in Russia grew worse. Neither the government nor the Soviets could control inflation. The government failed to transfer lands to the peasants, and by harvest time many peasants seized landlords' fields and crops for themselves. The government sent troops to stop them while, in contrast, Lenin and his party supported the peasants. As the war went on, Lenin and the party spread their propaganda that the war against Germany and Austria benefited only the ruling class in Russia. Peasant and soldiers deserted from war fronts in large numbers. The Bolsheviks and their slogan "peace!, Land!, Bread!" won the party growing popular support.

General Kornilov, the new army commander, decided to put down all this revolutionary nonsense and marched to Petrograd. This action was very important in giving the Bolsheviks freedom of action. This was because, Kornilov's move created a good opportunity for the Bolsheviks, as the government relaxed its pressure on them. Thus, Bolsheviks in large factories and the Red Guards, were distributed

weapons. Kornilov was finally defeated. Shortly after, in the elections of the Soviets the Bolsheviks won control. Leon Trotsky, a right handman of Lenin became president of the Petrograd Soviets. Lenin slipped back to Petrograd. He had now over 20,000 armed men to command. The time had approached for the Bolsheviks to organize another insurrection aimed at seizing state power. On November (October according to the old Russian calendar) 7, 1917 a successful insurrection removed the bourgeois government from power and the Bolsheviks seized state power without a major bloodshed.

Upon assuming state power, the Bolsheviks at once proceeded to fulfill their promises. In a series of decrees, they took sweeping measures. First of all, the Bolshevik government appealed to all nations involved in W.W.I to stop the fighting and sit for peaceful negotiations. When the offer was rejected by the Allies, Russia opened negotiation for peace with the Central Powers on her own and signed the Treaty of Brest Litonsk (March 1918) with Germany. Thus she withdrew from the war. In another decree, landowners were expropriated and land was distributed among the peasants. The Bolsheviks proceeded to destroy the Tzarist machinery of government that had been inherited by the bourgeois Government. The Bolsheviks replaced it by a new system of administration based on the Councils of Soviets. The Soviets represented the urban workers, soldiers and peasants. In this manner, the Bolsheviks set up a new state machinery, run by new revolutionary officials.

From 1918-1921 the Bolsheviks faced attack from different directions and they fought for their existence. During this period Russia entered a bloody civil war. All social groups who were affected by the socialist revolution joined hands to form an anti-Bolshevik front. This anti-Bolshevik came to be known as "White Russians" or Whites. The Whites consist of the royalists, the bourgeoisie and the landlords. The armed struggle of the White Russians was organized and led by high ranking ex-Tzarist officers. The White Russians were also supported by the Allies, who intervened because of Russia's withdrawal from the war and hated the socialist revolution. The newly created state of Poland, which desired additional territory from Russia also intervened against the Bolsheviks.

The Bolsheviks relied upon the support from the peasants and the urban workers who formed the Red Russians or Reds, in contrast to the white Russians. The Red Army was organized and led by Leon Trotsky. By 1920 the Red Army numbered more than 3,000,000 men. Finally, after a protracted struggle of three years, the Red Army defeated the Whites. Thus, the Bolsheviks crushed the counter-revolutionary plot and survived to establish the first communist state in the world.

There were several factors that had contributed for the defeat of the white Russians and the victory of the Reds. Firstly, the Whites had no political program that could bind them together except that they hated the Bolshevik and their revolutionary zeal. Secondly, the workers and peasants, who were disadvantaged in the past and hoped for further gains from the revolution, enthusiastically supported the Bolsheviks. Thirdly, Russia's large size gave time for the Bolsheviks to protract the war and create the Red Army, which became a well organized and disciplined fighting force. Fourthly, the ruthlessness and excesses of the White army made it extremely unpopular. Fifthly, the presence of foreign armies supporting the white Russians made the white Russians appear to be traitors to Russia, and rallied patriotic elements under the Bolsheviks. Workers in the Allied countries put strong pressure to end the Anti-Soviet intervention. In consequence 'hands off Russia' movements gained momentum in the industrialized countries of the west.

Besides the domestic counter-revolutionary pressure, the Bolsheviks faced an external invasion. In 1919 Poland took the opportunity of Russia's internal difficulty and waged war against her former oppressor. This war between Russia and Poland came to an end by the Treaty of Riga in 1921. The terms of the treaty were very favorable to Poland. The Bolsheviks accepted the independence of Poland with much territory that was not ethnically Polish. By 1921 the Bolsheviks conceded the independence of Finland, Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia.

After its victory over the counter-revolutionary forces, the Soviet government undertook the task of rebuilding the country. In 1921 they introduced the New Economic Policy (NEP). The policy did not intend to build a socialist economy because attempts at socialization had already met strong opposition from Russian peasants. Therefore NEP intended, in part, to appease the peasants and partly meant to attract foreign capital, which of course did not come at all.

Russia's economic recovery was attained with the New Economic policy. However, this policy had a negative impact on the Bolshevik party because it resulted in internal division within the Bolshevik party. Many leading communists bitterly opposed the NEP. They considered it as a reversal of all the doctrines they believed in for long. Arguments about future policy led to power struggle within the party. Lenin died in 1924. With his death, the struggle among the top communist leader became open. The main rivals in the power struggle were Trotsky and Joseph Stalin. After three years of power struggle, Stalin, the then secretary of the communist party, emerged victorious and established complete control over the party and the country.

Soon after he assumed power, Stalin inaugurated a policy of forceful collectivization in agriculture. Opposition from peasants was met with force of arms. The Kulaks (rich farmers) who resisted Stalin's collectivization were deported to forced labor camps usually in Siberia. Thus, by 1933, most of the arable land in Soviet Russia had been collectivized. In meantime, large scale Soviet industrialization was also undertaken at great speed. By 1940, Soviet Russia had become one of the major industrialized states of the world.

There had been strong opposition against dictatorial rule and policies. However, he crushed all potential opposition in his political purge that took the lives of millions between 1934 and 1938. In his foreign policy, Stalin followed a seemingly militant course. Under his leadership, the Comintern (Communist International) denounced the moderates, reformist socialists, and the Social Democrats, of Western countries as "Social fascists", and as the most dangerous enemies of communism. Stalin did not proceed along this militant course for a long time. The rise of Hitler and his threat to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR), forced Stalin to modify Soviet foreign policy in the direction of collective security. This also moved the USSR to join the League of Nations in 1934. Though he couldn't succeed in stopping Hitler's aggressive plans against Russia. Stalin did succeed in creating a strong country capable of resisting Hitler's invasion in 1941.

4.5. Resistance to Colonial Rule in Africa 1900-1939 and the Impact of W.W.I on the Movement

Terms to Know

- Land alienation
- Ethiopianism
- Segregation
- Conscription
- Pacification
- Spontaneous revolt

By 1900, European colonizers did not complete the task of pacification in parts of Africa. With the establishment of colonial administration, new forms of African resistance began to take shape. But the nature of some of early forms of resistance was not clearly political. In some countries, for instance, African resistance found expression in the so-called Ethiopianism. Ethiopia, because of the Adwa Victory, inspired African resistance to colonial rule and many of the anti-colonial movements had adopted the name Ethiopia. Ethiopianism refers to the formation of separate Black Christian Churches in which religious practices learnt from the missionaries were often adjusted to suit local conditions. The members of such churches, sometimes, broke out into blind revolt against the European administrators and white settlers. One such revolt was the revolution led by John Chilembwe in Nyasaland (Malawi) in 1915.

During W.W.I, Africans in some colonies resisted forced conscription to army and labour service. In this respect the Portuguese had suppressed a great revolt among the Shona speaking people of Portuguese East Africa. The revolt was caused by forced conscription for transport services in the war against the Germans. In general, beyond such occasional and spontaneous revolts, colonial governments did not face serious challenge from Africans during the First World War.

The W.W.I affected the peoples of Africa in many ways. In the war, more than a million Africans fought on the side of their colonial masters. Many others were employed as transport carriers, stretched corps and labourers. Upon the end of the war, these Africans returned home with rich experiences and new ideas that were later to spread all over colonial Africa. Those new ideas affected African thinking and changed their world outlook. This created one other additional fertile ground upon which African nationalism began to germinate.

African nationalism developed due to socio-economic changes that occurred between the two world wars (1919-1939). During the inter war years, the colonial governments introduced many political and economic reforms and changes. The main object of colonial policy was to make maximum efforts in the exploitation of African economy. During this period, of a rapid expansion of trade was observed. Mining and industrial activities were developed. The extension of roads, railways, postal service and telegraphs, and the building of schools and hospitals were also characteristic features of the period. All these developments changed brought changes in Africa in many ways. The number of educated Africans increased. There was rapid growth in urban centers. The reforms also created new social classes like an African middle class and wage workers. In general, the changes created social forces that were destined to play a decisive role in Africans resistance against colonialism.

During the inter-war years (1919-1939), African resistance to European colonialism was centered around towns. However, the object of African resistance during the period was not for independence, but for some reforms. For that matter, Pan- Africanism, the roots from which of modern African nationalism originated, had no such objective at the time. African demands of the period were primarily centered around winning more economic and political rights for Africans. Some of the demands of the people were: African representation in colonial governments, the right to form trade unions, provision of equal opportunities in business, and an end to racial segregation as well as to land alienation. Such demands were mainly advanced through peaceful means, such as petitions and peaceful demonstrations. But the colonial rulers were not ready to accept these demands. This led Africans to conclude that as long as colonialism existed these desires could not materialize. It was this belief that gave rise to modern African nationalism specially after the end of W.W.II.

Summary

The basic cause of the First World War was economic and political rivalries among the great powers of Europe. In the last quarter of nineteenth century, all major powers of Europe were competing with one another for prestige and position in Europe. These major European powers also competed for colonial possessions in Africa. This led them to contradictions and conflicts which ended up with the creation of antagonistic Alliances and military blocs. This tense situation led them also to an arms race. This generally created a hostile atmosphere which led to the outbreak of the war that was precipitated by the assassination in Sarajevo, Bosnia.

The war was fought for more than four years. The war caused enormous damage to material property and great losses of human life.

Some of the political consequences of the war were:

* many new states emerged on the map of Europe, old ruling dynasties were abolished, (e.g the Habsburgs). The USA emerged as a leading world power.

* Russia was the first country to be affected by the consequence of the war. The war precipitated a revolutionary rising which led to the emergence of the first communist state in the world.

The war in Africa helped to create the ground for the emergence of African Nationalism. The hope and desire of avoiding any future war led to the creation of an international organization of Nations, called the League of Nations. The league, however, proved unable to stop aggressions and wars in the 1930s.

Review Questions

Part I. Say "True" if the statement is correct and "False" if the statement is incorrect

1. The economic and political rivalries were the result of the development of capitalism.
2. Before the First World War, Italy was a member of the Triple Alliance.
3. The immediate cause of W.W.I was the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand
4. The entry of the U SA in to the war changed the balance of power in favour of the Central Powers.

Part II. Match the items in column A with those in B

A

B

1. The German war plan to invade France
- A. W. Wilson
2. Fourteen Points
- B. Britain, France, Italy& the USA
3. The Russian Parliament
- C. Turkey
4. African resistance form
- D. Schlieffen
5. British take over of Egypt
- E. Ethiopianism
6. The Balkans were under
- F. 1882
7. The Big Four
- G. Duma

Part III. Choose the best possible answer from the alternatives given for each question

1. Which one of the following does not belong to the group
 - a. Britain
 - b. France
 - c. Russia
 - d. Austria- Hungary
2. Which European power gave guarantee to Austria- Hungary to take any measure against Serbia?
 - a. Britain
 - b. Russia
 - c. Germany
 - d. France
3. The Treaty of Versailles was signed between the victors and ____
 - a. Italy
 - b. Germany
 - c. Turkey
 - d. Austria
4. The last Romanov king of Russia was ____
 - a. Napoleon III
 - b. William II
 - c. Peter the Great
 - d. Nicholas II
5. Which country joined the Allied power in 1915?
 - a. Serbia
 - b. USA
 - c. Italy
 - d. Turkey

Part IV. Give short answer to the following questions

1. In what way could nationalism be considered as a cause for W.W.I?
2. Why did the Bolshevik party leaders remain passive prior to Lenin's return to Russia in 1917?
3. It is possible to say that the Industrial Revolution was a remote factor for the First World War?
4. What factors discredited the Provisional Bourgeois government of Russia and led to its downfall?
5. What was the main objective of the League of Nations?

V. Fill in the blank spaces

1. The First World War began in the year _____.
2. At the Treaty of Versailles, France was represented by _____.
3. The French provinces which were restored to France by the Treaty of Versailles were _____ and _____.
4. The first international organization which was founded at the end of W.W.I was _____.

VI. Explain the following historical terms or words

A. Wilson's Fourteen Points

B. The Big Four

C. Schlieffen plan

D. Duma

E. Soviets

F. The New Economic Policy

UNIT FIVE

ITALIAN FASCIST AGGRESSION AGAINST ETHIOPIA, 1935-1941

Introduction

This unit deals with one of the saddest chapters of Ethiopian, as well as African history. It is concerned with Italian Fascist invasion and occupation of Ethiopia between 1935 and 1941. It explains the causes for the fascist aggression, the use of weapons of mass destruction, and the failure of the League of Nations to stop the aggression. Another issue of discussion in the unit is the nature of fascist rule in Ethiopia that stayed in force in the brief period of occupation. The Ethiopian patriotic resistance and liberation are dealt with at the end of the unit, together with the consequences of the fascist occupation.

The unit is of great importance as a lesson in the value of freedom and the sacrifices that ought to be paid, if need be. It is a lesson for all that states should always be prepared to safeguard their independence.

Objectives

After Studying this unit, you will be able to:

- * analyze the causes of the 1935 Italian aggression against Ethiopia;
- * explain why Fascist Italy was successful in its invasion of Ethiopia;
- * describe the course of the war;
- * discuss Italian fascist occupation and administration of Ethiopia;
- * explain the consequences of Italian rule;
- * give an account of the Ethiopian patriotic resistance;
- * discuss the liberation of Ethiopia in 1941;
- * analyze the interplay of internal and external forces in the course of Italian aggression against Ethiopia and also the liberation of the latter; and
- * appreciate the sacrifices made to defend Ethiopian independence.

5.1. Background and Causes of the Italo- Ethiopian War of 1935-1936

Terms to Know

- Aggression
- Effective authority
- Prestige
- Appeal
- Fascism
- Protest
- Boundary
- Glory
- Revenge
- Causality
- League
- Sanction
- Colonialism
- Legitimate
- Submersion
- Compensation
- Official apology
- Treaty
- Demarcate
- Political party
- World organization

5.1.1. European Ambitions in Ethiopia in the Post - Adwa Period

As you have studied in Unit Three, Ethiopia had come out safely from the battle of Adwa, without losing her independence. But that was not to be the last attempt of Europeans to colonize Ethiopia. In fact, European governments revived their colonial interest over Ethiopia in the first few decades of the 20th century. As discussed in Unit Three, the Tripartite Treaty of 1906 among Britain France and Italy was a result of the ambitions of the three powers to divide and colonize Ethiopia when the opportunity comes. France was interested in territories along the Railway line, Britain along the Abbay river and the Lake Tana area, and Italy in the hinterlands south of Eritrea and north of Italian-Somaliland.

1. What were the major agreements included in the Tripartite Treaty?

(see Unit Three)

2. How did Emperor Menelik II respond to the Tripartite Treaty?

When Emperor Menelik II learned about the Tripartite Treaty he made a legitimate protest. But his protest passed unheeded on the part of Europeans. Therefore, in order to ensure the smooth continuity of government and peaceful succession, he took the following two steps. In 1907, he established a cabinet of ministers. And in 1908, he named Lij Iyasu, the son of Ras Michael of Wollo and Menelik's daughter Shewarega as his successor. Those steps were taken partly to block any chance of intervention by Britain, France and Italy to put through their colonial ambitions. The three European powers had agreed to step into Ethiopia and make their colonial ambitions come true at any sight of political disturbances and instability in Ethiopia according to the Tripartite Treaty.

5.1.2. The Plans of Fascist Italy

Italy's colonial interest in Ethiopia started with new energy following the rise of Mussolini and his Fascist Party to power in 1922. As far as the fascists were concerned, a combination of factors drove them into aggression against Ethiopia. One of the causes for aggression was the desire to erase the shame full scare as the result of their defeat at the battle of Adwa in 1896. Since the fascists advocated the restoration of the power and glory of ancient Rome, they had to take their revenge and erase that sense of shame. Mussolini also wanted to win prestige for himself through a military success. He wanted to be seen as the "senior" fascist dictator, as compared to Hitler of Germany. Added to this, by the 1930s Italy had serious economic difficulties as a result of the World Depression. As such, a war of territorial conquest was important to divert the attention of the Italian people from difficulties at home.

Fascist Italy had planned a war of aggression against Ethiopia since the early 1920s, but didn't reveal its plan until well into the 1930s. Rather she presented herself as good friend of Ethiopia.

In 1923 when Ethiopia applied for membership into the League of Nations, Italy did not oppose this membership as the British did. When Ras Teferi made a tour to European countries in 1924, he received a warm welcome in Italy, more than in any other European country. Furthermore, Italy signed a Treaty of Peace and Friendship with Ethiopia in 1928. All these moves served the fascists to cover their real plans right up to the eve of the invasion.

Behind the cover, however, the fascists were busy preparing the ground for the invasion of Ethiopia. The preparation consisted of two main activities. One of the activities was to conduct underground subversive measures that were aimed at creating internal divisions in Ethiopia. Such subversive

measures were carried out by the then Italian Governor of Eritrea, Corrado Zoli. He bribed and agitated the chiefs of Tigray, Wollo, Begemir and Gojjam against the Emperor. The other activity was military preparations. Italy put in place armies and war supplies in her colonies of Eritrea and Somaliland.

After such preparations, Mussolini was waiting for a pretext to launch the invasion. Indeed, by 1932 Britain and France had made the Hoare-Laval Agreement by which they offered Italy to take Ethiopia. That was done to encourage Italy not to ally with Nazi Germany. The event which served Mussolini as a pretext took place on 5 December 1934. On that day Ethiopian and Italian troops clashed at Walwal, in Ogaden. According to the 1908 boundary treaty between Ethiopia and Italy, Walwal was part of the territory of Ethiopia. After the treaty, however, the Ethiopian government did not fully exercise its authority in Walwal. The area had good water wells that were freely used by all Somali pastoralists. Because of lack of effective Ethiopian authority in the area, the Italians started to consider Walwal as part of their Somaliland colony.

The Ethiopian government finally came to know about the Italian infiltration in Walwal when the joint Anglo-Ethiopian Boundary Commission visited the area in 1934. The commission went there to demarcate the boundary between Ethiopia and British Somaliland. It discovered that the Italians had gone deep into Walwal and built a military fort. Ethiopian troops that accompanied the commission protested immediately. As a result on December 5, 1934, Italian troops and the small Ethiopian contingent clashed. This event came to be known as the Walwal Incident. In the clash, it was the Ethiopian side which suffered more casualties. Yet, the Italians demanded that Ethiopia should make an official apology and pay compensation. Ethiopia tried its best to solve the dispute by peaceful arbitration and appealed to the League of Nations. While the League made only appearances of trying to solve the conflict, Mussolini started a full scale invasion against Ethiopia almost a year after the Walwal Incident.

The League proved ineffective because Britain and France, its dominant members, secretly agreed to sacrifice Ethiopia so as not to lose Italy to Germany. Later on, the League only decided for economic sanction that did not include oil.

Activity

1. Why did Italy open war against Ethiopia in 1935?
2. Why did Britain and France support Italian colonial ambitions over Ethiopia in the Hoare- Laval Agreement?
3. Why did the League of Nations fail to stop Italian aggression in Ethiopia?

On the other hand, Ethiopia was not prepared to withstand the Italian aggression. After the battle of Adwa the Ethiopian government felt overconfident. It did not pay attention to the task of building a modern army. Emperor Haile Selassie's weak attempt was only a beginning. And it proved to be too little, too late. Moreover, the political and socio- economic conditions of the country were extremely backward. The country was still under feudalism. Unlike at Adwa, the differences in weapons, means of communications, training of troops, logistics, etc. between the Italians and

Ethiopians were very great. Ethiopia's fate was already sealed before the first shot was fired. Haile Selassie's reliance on the League of Nations and its principle of collective security also proved to be useless.

5.2. The Italo- Ethiopian War, 1935-1936

Terms to Know

- Ambush
- Campaign
- Concession
- Collaborator
- Flank
- Front
- Logistics
- Offensive
- Posthumous
- Provisional government
- Rout
- Strategy
- Traitor
- Weapon of mass destruction

The fascist invasion of Ethiopia was carried out on two fronts. Those two directions of attack were from Eritrea in the north, and from the direction of Italian Somaliland in the south. The fronts were officially known as the "Northern" and the "Southern" Fronts.

When the war started, the commander-in- chief of all Italian forces was General Emilio de Bono, until he was replaced by General Pietro Badoglio in November 1936. De Bono, and later Badoglio were also in direct command of the Northern Front. The commander of the fascist army on the Southern Front was General Rodolfo Graziani. At the beginning, the assignment of General Graziani was to stop any possible Ethiopian offensives against Italian Somaliland. Because of this, the first Italian invasion began on the Northern Front. On 3 October 1935, Italian troops crossed the Mereb River which formed a boundary line between Ethiopia and the Italian colony of Eritrea. With that, the invasion of Ethiopia began.

During the whole of October, including early November, fascist troops continued their advance without any serious resistance from the Ethiopian side. This was because the Ethiopian army was ordered to pull back and did not try to check the advancing fascist army. The Ethiopian government followed this strategy mainly for two reasons. The first was to show to the world that the Italians were the aggressors. The second was from a strategic point of view. It was meant to pull the fascist army deep into the interior of Ethiopia, in order to elongate its communication lines. In the meantime, Ethiopia appealed to the League of Nations. The League condemned Italy as the aggressor and imposed some economic sanctions on it. But these economic sanctions, did not include oil, which was the only economic sanction that could have been effective. The measures of the League did not stop Mussolini from expanding the scope of his military operations in Ethiopia. What made the League's measures more ineffective and weak was the position of the British and the French, who did not want to oppose Italy hoping to make an alliance with Mussolini against Hitler. They preferred to end the conflict by suggesting additional concessions to Italy at the expense of Ethiopia. In the face of such betrayal, Ethiopia had no other alternative than to fight the enemy on the two fronts- the Northern and Southern fronts.

Fig. 5.1. Ethiopian troops going to the war front

5.2.1. The Northern Front

The Ethiopian army on the Northern Front consisted of three major divisions. One of the divisions was under Ras Imiru's command. The army under Ras Imiru was assigned to take the left flank (side) and fight the Italians on the Shire front. The Ethiopian army under the two Rases, Seyoum Mengesha and Kassa Hailu, took the center to fight on the Temben front. The right flank, on the mountaintop known as Amba Aradom, was taken by the imperial army under the command of Ras Mulugeta Yigezu, the ageing War Minister. The overall command was placed under Ras Kassa Hailu, whom the Emperor appointed as commander-in-chief of the Ethiopian army on

the Northern Front. By the time the Ethiopian army opened up its first counter-offensive, major towns like Adigrat, Adwa and Meqele had already fallen to the fascist army. In the first counter-offensive, Ethiopian troops mainly attempted to encircle the Italians in the strategic town of Meqele. This attempt led to the first major military engagement on the Northern Front, which came to be known as the first battle of Temben. The first battle of Temben was fought between 20 and 24 January 1936. In this battle, the forces of Ras Kassa and Seyoum were defeated. About 8,000 Ethiopians were killed and wounded. From the Italian side, 60 officers, 605 soldiers of lower rank and 417 Eritrean askaris were killed and wounded. It, therefore, became clear that the Ethiopian forces were unable to dislodge the Italians from Meqele; nor could they stop the farther advance of fascist troops. The advance made by fascist troops, so far, did not satisfy Mussolini who wanted to complete the Ethiopian campaign before the beginning of the rainy season. Mussolini blamed General de Bono for the failure to make a more rapid advance, and replaced him by General Pietro Badoglio. Obeying Mussolini's orders to use any weapon at hand to complete the campaign very quickly, General Baoglio started the use of the internationally banned mustard gas (the killer gas, Yipright, as known in its scientific name).

What were the reasons for the Ethiopian army's defeat in successive battles in the Northern Front?

Following the first battle of Temben, Amba Aradom became the next target of the fascist forces. At Amba Aradom an Ethiopian army of 80,000 under Ras Mulugeta Yigezu, had been stationed. The Italians initiated the battle of Amba Aradom after days of massive air attack and artillery bombardment. The

destructive effect of the ground and aerial attack, between February 10-15/1936, forced the Ethiopian troops to evacuate the mountain top leaving behind about 6000 killed. Ras Mulugeta himself was killed in the course of that disorganized retreat. Only 36 white officers, 621 white soldiers and 145 Eritrean askaris (troops recruited from Italian colonies) were killed and wounded on the Italian side.

Fig 5.3. Amba Aradam, the mountain top where Ras Mulugeta faced a crushing defeat

In late February 1936, the Ethiopian army under Kassa and Seyoum fought the Italians in the second battle of Temben. Having already faced a crushing defeat at the first battle of Temben, the forces of Ras Kassa and Seyoum could not withstand the numerically and tactically superior Italians. In the encounter that followed, one of the major divisions of the Ethiopian army in the center was totally put out of action. The commanders themselves, with their few remaining soldiers, barely escaped from the Italian siege and joined the Emperor then stationed at Korerm, in northern Wollo. In the second battle of Temben, 8,000 Ethiopians were killed and wounded. On the Italian side, 34 officers, 350 soldiers of lower rank and 188 Eritrean askaris were killed and wounded.

On the Shire front, the Ethiopian army on the left flank under Ras Imiru had performed relatively better. It ambushed and destroyed a force of Italian troops and askaris under Major Luigi Criniti at the strategic pass of Dembeguna. However, Ras Imiru's force was not free from problems. And it lost the battle at the Shire front on April 2, 1936. Among the problems in this front was the poor fighting morale among some of the nobility of Gojjam and Semen. That was because of the grievances that the nobility

harboured towards Emperor Haile Selassie. However, Ras Imiru was successful in making an organized retreat towards Lake Ashange with an army of some 10,000 men.

The last and decisive battle on the Northern Front was fought at Maychew on 31 March 1936. In this battle, Ethiopian troops were personally led by the Emperor Haile Sellassie I. The unfortunate Emperor took the command of a ruined and demoralized army. For one thing, Ras Imiru's army, which was relatively in good shape, did not take part in this battle. The army of Ras Mulugeta had already been put out of action after Amba Aradom.

The fighting took place between March 31 and April 11, 1936. The remaining forces of Seyoum and Kassa were morally and physically damaged and were unable to make any difference in the battle. The only fresh force in the Ethiopian army was the Imperial Bodyguard with some 6000 men. Despite such odds, the Ethiopian troops made an offensive against the well entrenched Italians who had also a full monopoly of the air. The fighting lasted for 13 continuous hours. Finally, the Ethiopian forces were defeated. This was followed by merciless bombing, and showers of mustard gas from the air on the retreating Ethiopian army. It is believed that 5,000 to 8,000 Ethiopians were killed at Maychew. On the Italian side, 68 white officers, 332 white soldiers and 873 Eritrean askaris were killed and wounded. In April 1936 the fascist army entered Dessie without any opposition; and the war on the Northern Front was practically over.

5.2.2. The Southern Front

As was mentioned earlier, the commander of the Italian troops on the Southern Front was General Rodolfo Graziani. The Italian general ordered an advance into the interior of the Ogaden, just a month after de Bono crossed the Mereb river on the Northern Front. The delay was the result of his first task which was largely defensive. But Graziani could not stand missing the glories of fascist victory. He repeatedly asked Mussolini, through a series of telegrams, and later got the permission to open an offensive in the south.

The Ethiopian army on the Southern Front numbered about 80,000. It was made up of two subdivisions: the Southern and the South Eastern side. The commander of the Southern side was Ras Desta Damtew, son-in-law of the Emperor and the Governor-General of the Sidamo province. The Ethiopian army in the southeast was under the command of Dejjazmach Nasibu Zamanuel, the Governor-General of Hararge province. The Ethiopian armies on both sides were relatively better armed and supplied than were the armies of the Northern Front. Its commanders were also young men with better fighting morale than the old commanders, with the exception of Ras Imiru, of the Northern Front.

Graziani's first attack was directed against Qorahe in the Ogaden. Qorahe was a strategically situated place for moves against Jijiga and Harar towns. The Ethiopian army had a stronghold on Qorahe, under its commander Grazmach Afeworq, posthumously named Dejjazmach. Aware of the strategic

importance of Qorahe, Afewerq put up a heroic resistance until he was fatally wounded. In early November, Qorahe fell into the hands of the fascist troops.

Why was Ras Desta Damtew's campaign of Dolo Odo a mistake?

The fall of Qorahe enabled the advance of the fascist troops to Jijiga and Harar. The only significant challenge the fascists met in this advance was from the Ethiopian army under the young commander, Dejazmach Mekonnen Endalkachew. The Ethiopian army under Ras Desta on the Southern side could have reduced the pressure of the fascist troops on the Ethiopians in the Ogaden front. But Ras Desta committed a fatal mistake in ordering a disastrous campaign to Dolo Odo, a remote post on the Ethio- Somali border. The long march through a desert land, and under shortage of provisions, combined with outbreak of an epidemic destroyed almost half of Ras Desta's army. What was left of the exhausted and much reduced army gave battle to the Italians at Genale Doraya, on January 26, 1936. In hard fighting that continued for three days, the Ethiopian forces were totally routed. A week later, on 20 January 1936 Negele-Borana was captured by the Italians. Following the defeat, Ras Desta retreated to the interior of the country with a few soldiers, in order to continue one of the earliest resistance movements.

5.2.3. Italian Victory

Both on the Southern and Northern Fronts, the Ethiopian armies had been defeated and broken up. On 5 May 1936 fascist troops made a victorious entry into Addis Ababa.

Why did Ethiopian forces lose the war both on the Northern and Southern Fronts?

In the campaigns of 1935/36 the Ethiopian army was totally defeated. Several factors were responsible for the Italian victory. Firstly, the fascist armies were numerically and technically superior. They were equipped with modern rifles, guns, artillery, armored cars, and airplanes. The fascist army also used tanks and poisoned gas. In contrast, the armaments of the Ethiopians consisted mostly of outdated rifles (guns) that were left-over of the Adwa campaign. Above all, there was a severe shortage of cartridges. According to some sources, the total amount of the cartridges Ethiopians used in the whole war was only equal to the quantity Italians consumed in one or two battles. Ethiopians had only eight transport airplanes against the Italians' 400 of which most were bombers. In the light of such huge differences, it was only surprising that the Ethiopians were able to keep on fighting for seven months.

Secondly, Ethiopian forces had no organized system of military logistics. There was no organized supply of provisions and munitions. The army lacked doctors and medical supplies to care for the sick and wounded. Lack of effective radio communications prevented the Ethiopian army from making

coordinated military operations. Each division made an isolated campaign that was easily crushed by fascist troops.

Thirdly, there were differences and dissatisfaction within the Ethiopian army. This was the result of the Emperor's policy of strengthening the central government which was meant to weaken the power of the regional lords. Because of this, many of the nobility were on bad terms with the Emperor. A piece of evidence to this was Dejjazmach Haile Selassie Gugsa, a son-in-law of the emperor and Governor-General of Tigray. Early in the war, Gugsu went to the Italian side with some valuable information though he took with him only 1,200 troops and 8 machine guns. Many others fought the war with less and less conviction. Added to this, rivalries among the nobility further weakened the Ethiopian army. Ras Mulugeta, for instance, was unhappy with the Emperor for the reason that the Emperor appointed Ras Kassa as commander-in-chief of the Northern Front. As War Minister, Ras Mulugeta felt that the post should have been given to him. All of these reduced any chance of coordinated action, and the commanders mostly fought independently.

Finally, many of the commanders of the Ethiopian army were the old nobility with little knowledge of modern warfare. The nobility, including the Emperor, were more accustomed to peaceful administrative tasks than to the hard life they faced at the war fronts. They lacked the perseverance of warriors and could not give effective leadership. The main reason for this was that there had been no major war for forty years after the battle of Adwa, which reduced the military experience and capacity of war leaders. The combination of the above factors was responsible for the defeat the Ethiopian army suffered in the war of 1935-1936.

Following the battle of Maychew, the Emperor ordered a retreat in the direction of the capital. At the time, the order for a retreat was given, the army, though badly shattered, still consisted of some 20,000 men. However, three quarters of these died or left the army on the long and difficult march back to the capital. Many of the soldiers were either killed in the continuous bombings or by hostile elements along the route. Others returned to their villages believing that there could be no more attempts to fight the Italians. As a result, when the emperor reached the capital, there was only an army of 5000 men of whom most were members of the Imperial Bodyguard. Back in the capital, the Emperor and the senior officials sat to discuss what to do next. After a long discussion, it was decided that the Emperor should leave the country to appeal in person to the League of Nations. As regards to the future of the country, it was agreed to set up a provisional government at Gore with its acting head Ras Imiru, the cousin of the Emperor. Accordingly, the Emperor and his family, together with a few members of the nobility and senior officials, left the country for Europe on the Franco-Ethiopian Railway in May 3, 1936.

In Europe, the Emperor went to Geneva and appealed to the League of Nations through a powerful speech he made in front of delegates from member countries. He warned that not defending Ethiopia would encourage aggression against others. However, the Emperor's appeal met with no positive response.

The Emperor remained an exile in England, trying with fellow exiles and some English sympathizers to get support for the cause of Ethiopia. But until 1940, these efforts were in vain.

Back in the country, no sooner had the Emperor left for exile than the capital fell into chaos and disorder. There was looting and aimless shooting. Law and order broke down. Foreigners in Addis Ababa had foreseen the likelihood of such occurrences, and they shut themselves in their Legations. Ethiopians suffered worst from the disorder. After three days of confusion, law and order were restored. This happened when the fascist Italian troops, under Marshal Pietro Badoglio, made a triumphal entry into Addis Ababa on 5 May 1936.

Activity

5.3. Fascist Occupation and Patriotic Resistance, 1936-1941

Terms to Know

- Ambush
- Collaborator
- Conventional warfare
- Execution
- Firing squad
- Guerrilla warfare
- Legacy
- Liberalism
- Massacre

- Occupation force
- Patriotism
- Rural area
- Yewist Arbegnoch

5.3.1. Colonial Administration

Fascist rule in Ethiopia lasted for five years. In those years, Ethiopia was made part of the Italian East African Empire which included, besides Ethiopia, the Italian colonies of Eritrea and Italian Somaliland.

Italian East Africa was divided into six regions with their respective capitals as shown below.

Region

1. Eritrea (including Tigray)
2. Amhara (Begemdir, Wollo, Gojjam and Northern Shoa)
3. Oromo-Sidama
4. Addis Ababa (later renamed Shoa)
5. Harar

6. Italian Somaliland (including the Ogaden)

Capital

Asmara

Gondar

Jimma

Addis Ababa

Harar

Mogadishu

Each of the six regions had its own Governor-General. Each region was divided into districts and sub-districts administrated by Residents and Sub-Residents, respectively. The highest authority in Italian East Africa was held by Mussolini's Viceroy who lived in the Genet-Leul Palace in Addis Ababa. Addis Ababa was the capital of the Empire. The position of Viceroy was held by different Italian colonial officials in the following order: Marshal Emilio Badoglio, Marshal Rodolfo Graziani and Amadeo Umberto, the Duke of Aosta. The last one was considered as more liberal-minded than those before him.

Map 1. Italian East Africa (1936-41)

During the years of Italian occupation, fascist authority in Ethiopia was largely confined to the urban centers. Because of this, the fascist occupation left its impressions mostly in cities. Addis Ababa was the center of the Italian East African Empire and as such the fascists accomplished several projects in the city. The fascists introduced, services like electric light and the supply of pure water into Addis Ababa for the first time. In the southwestern section of Addis Ababa, they built the Merkato to serve as a commercial center. Several manufacturing enterprises were also built in different towns of the country. These included the cotton and cement factories of Dire Dawa, as well as edible oil factories and flour mills in many other towns. Above all, road construction was the most important legacy of the fascist occupation. In fact, road construction was given emphasis to facilitate the Italian colonial expansion and rule in Ethiopia. Nevertheless, many of the roads constructed during the fascist occupation served as a base for the expansion of the land transport network in Ethiopia in the post-liberation period.

The Italians owned the manufacturing and business enterprises. They also made substantial investments in road building, housing constructions, and in opening light scale manufacturies and businesses. In the cities, they introduced new life-styles.

5.3.2. The Patriotic Resistance

It is stated above that during the years of occupation, fascist authority was largely limited to the urban centers. This was because the rural areas were the centers of national liberation struggle. As soon as the fascist troops defeated the Ethiopian armies in conventional warfare, a rural- based anti- fascist patriotic resistance broke out throughout the country. The patriotic resistance phase was the

continuation of the conventional war against the fascist invaders. The resistance movement developed in two distinct stages. The first phase lasted up until February 1937.

What was the "Black Lion"?

The prominent leaders of the resistance at the early phase were the high-ranking nobility. Prominent among them were Ras Desta Damtew and Ras Imiru Haile Sellassie and the two sons of Ras Kassa Hailu- Abera and Asfawossen. Following the break-up of the Ethiopian army after its defeat at Maychew, Ras Imiru was not confident to continue the war against the fascists. The merciless bombing and the showering of mustard gas which caused horrific damages to his army had broken his heart. But conditions forced him to take leadership in one of the earliest resistance movements. As mentioned above, the Ras was appointed as acting head of the Provisional Government of Ethiopia to be centered at Gore, in Illubabor. After his last fight with the fascist troops on the Shire front, Ras Imiru had retreated towards Gore, where he met with some soldiers and officers. These officers, in collaboration with some educated Ethiopians, had set up an organization called "The Black Lion", in order to continue the resistance movement. The organization's military leaders were Lieutenant Colonels Belay Haileab, Kifle Nesibu and Ketemma Beshah. Although half-hearted in continuing the resistance, Ras Imiru was forced to take leadership of the movement. In its ranks, the movement included soldiers of Ras Imiru, and the landlords gathered from Wollega and Illubabor. The new force under Ras Imiru planned to advance towards the center and strike on fascists in Addis Ababa. Unfortunately, before the force could make any further advance, it faced a range of difficulties. From the outset, it met hostile elements in the region. Added to this, the countryside was infested by fascist agents to make every step of farther advance very dangerous. Consequently, after months of difficult stay in south western Ethiopia, Ras Imiru's troops were defeated and forced to surrender to the fascists near the Gojeb River.

Another leader of the anti-fascist resistance was Ras Desta Damtew. After the disastrous Dolo Odo campaign and the battle of Genale Dorya, Ras Desta retreated to the interior with what was left of his army. The significant part of this army were Eritrean askaris who had defected to the Ethiopian side at the battle of Genale Dorya. The Eritreans were determined to fight the Italians to death, because surrender to fascist forces would bring upon them death. Indeed, it was this determination of the Eritreans which greatly contributed to Ras Desta's success in fighting fascist troops for a number of months. Initially, Ras Desta also obtained some assistance from patriotic forces under Dejjazmach Beyene Merid and Dejjazmach Gebre Mariyam Gari. Against Ras Desta, the Italians organized a number of small fighting groups. They, then, sent them in various directions to hunt down the Ras and his followers. After months of search and indecisive clashes, fascist forces finally fought with Ras Desta at Gogeti- a village in Gurage-where they caught him in February 1937. With no further delay, the fascists took Ras Desta to the town of Butajira where they publicly executed him by a firing squad.

Fig 5.5. Ras Desta, being taken by fascist officers to his execution

Why did the patriots attack Addis Ababa in the summer of 1936?

The two sons of Ras Kassa, Abera and Asfa-Wossen, became famous for taking part in the abortive attack on Addis Ababa. This was a plan to end fascist rule by attacking Addis Ababa from different directions simultaneously in the summer of 1936. In this plan, rural -based patriots were to attack Addis Ababa in view of provoking a popular mass revolt in the capital. It was hoped that success in the operation would help to bring an end to fascist rule. The attack was planned to come from four directions. Patriot leaders were assigned in each direction as follows: the two brothers Abera and Asfa-Wossen from the north of Addis Ababa; Dejjazmach Balcha an old hero of Adwa from the south; Balambaras (later Ras) Abebe Aragay from the northwest; and Dejjazmach Fiqre-Mariyam Yinadu from the east of Addis Ababa. The Bishop of Wollo, Abuna Petros, an outspoken anti-fascist patriot, was a moving spirit behind the plan. Unfortunately, the attack was poorly planned and lacked effective coordination and timing. Each group attempted an isolated attack that was easily crushed by fascist

forces. The Abuna was caught and publicly executed. Abera and Asfa- Wossen retreated to Selale to the north of Addis Ababa. Afterwards they were persuaded by Ras Hailu Tekle-Haymanot, the leading fascist- collaborator, who promised them they would not be killed, to surrender to the fascists.

But the Italians did not keep their promise and killed the two brothers. Dejjazmach Balcha was killed while fighting the fascists in the southern part of Addis Ababa. At the place he was killed, a memorial hospital, Dejjazmach Balcha Hospital was late constructed and still bears his name.

The advent of the second phase in the patriotic resistance was marked by the Graziani Massacre of February 1937. The massacre was the outcome of an abortive attempt to kill Marshal Graziani, the Viceroy, by two young men named Abraha Deboch and Moges Asgdom, on 19 February 1937. In a public gathering called at the Guenete Le'ul palace to celebrate the birthday of an Italian prince, the two young men threw a bomb at Marshal Graziani and other colonial officials. The explosion wounded Graziani and killed some Italian officials. Then followed a wholesale massacre by fascist troops.

The wholesale killing in and around Addis Ababa continued for three days. Educated Ethiopians were made the first target of the massacre. They were taken and executed. This act almost totally destroyed the first generation of modern educated Ethiopians. It had a far-reaching consequence since it created shortage of manpower in the post- liberation period. About 30,000 Ethiopians were killed in the massacre, according to one estimate. And also 499 monks are reported to have been killed at the monastery of Debra Libanos.

How did the Graziani Massacre help to strengthen the patriotic movement?

The Graziani Massacre resulted in the outbreak of a country- wide anti-fascist patriotic resistance of the second phase. The patriotic resistance of this phase was different from that of the first in that it was based on guerilla warfare. This resistance, though county-wide, was especially strong in Shoa, Gojjam and Begemdir. In their struggle, the patriots employed various tactics with the final goal of bringing an end to fascist rule. Among the tactics were ambush of enemy convoys, cutting communication lines, and at times striking on fascist forces when conditions seemed favorable.

In the resistance movement, the patriots faced several problems. One of the problems was lack sufficient supplies and logistics. To minimize this problem, the patriots used different methods such as quartering the warriors on peasant homesteads, looting properties of collaborators, ambushing enemy convoys and seizing provisions as well as armaments. They also assigned some of the fighters to cultivation and , when all alternatives failed, hunting wild animals and collecting wild fruits and plants. For medicinal supply and other assistance, the patriots mostly deepened on the Yewist-Arbegnoch i.e their supporters who lived and worked with the enemy.

Of all Yewist- Arbegnoch, the most noted was a woman called Shewarged Gedle, who helped the patriots greatly. Shewarged played an important role in preparing a favourable condition for the patriots' attack on the fascist stronghold at the town of Addis Alem, about 60 kilometers to the west of Addis Ababa. As the Ethiopian patriotic resistance grew strong, it required a great effort on the part of

the Italians to try to contain it. Between 1937 and 1941, more than one trillion lire was spent for military purposes in the colonies each year by the Italian Government. Most of this money was spent in the fighting against Ethiopian patriots.

On the other hand, the patriotic resistance had some shortcomings. The most important of these were competition and rivalry among the leaders of the patriotic movement, and the defections of some to the fascists. In spite of these limitations, the patriotic resistance contributed a great deal in weakening the fascists, which were finally defeated and forced to surrender in 1941. Some of the famous leaders of the patriots were Abebe Aregay, Bekele Woya , Geresu Duki, Belay Zeleke, Amoraw Wubneh and Takele W/ Hawariat. The two Ethiopian nationals Zeraï Deres and

Abdissa Aga also showed exemplary patriotism in Italy itself.

Zeraï killed the Italian fascist soldiers at square in their own country where as Abdissa conducted a long fight against the Fascist in their own country.

Activity

Fig 5.8 Fighters of the patriotic resistance

5.4. The War of Liberation and Ethiopian Independence

Terms to Know

- | | | |
|--------------------|--------------|------------------|
| - Alliance | - Liberation | - Stronghold |
| - Balance of power | - Neutrality | - Theatre of war |

In 1940 an event of great importance for the liberation of Ethiopia occurred in Europe. This was Italy's entry into the Second World War on the side of Germany. On 10 June 1940, Italy declared war on Britain and France. Until that time, Mussolini had stayed neutral and carefully watched the balance of power in the conflict. What made Mussolini declare war on Britain and France was the speed with which Hitler's army was advancing on the Western Front. The rapid western advance of Hitler forced the French and the British to retreat. It also brought about the fall of France within a few weeks following the German invasion of France. This convinced Mussolini that Hitler was very near to victory. Therefore, he did not want to be left out from sharing the fruits of victory. So, Mussolini declared war on Britain and France on 10 June 1940, only four days before the fall of Paris into German hands.

Italy's entry into the war on the side of Hitler became a serious danger to British interests in East Africa. Britain had important colonial possessions in East Africa. These were Kenya, the Sudan, British Somaliland, Uganda, Zanzibar and the mandate territory of Tanganyika. In the same region, Italy also had a vast colonial empire, recently named Italian East Africa. Italy had 200,000 troops stationed in her East African Empire. Britain feared that, with the help of Hitler's army, Italy would expand in East Africa and take away its colonies. To avoid this, Britain had to act quickly and drive out Italian forces from East Africa. Moreover, since Britain was not yet strong enough to fight the German army on land in western Europe, it decided to fight the enemy forces on land in North Africa and East Africa. It was those

conditions that led to the British East African campaign, which finally served the cause of the liberation of Ethiopia.

Before Italy's entry into the war, the British government had ignored Emperor Haile Sellassie's request for military assistance for the liberation of Ethiopia. At that time, the British government ignored the emperor's request, so as not to push Mussolini into alliance with Hitler. However, with Mussolini's entry into the war on the side of Germany, the situation changed. Now, the Emperor, who could rally the patriotic movement in Ethiopia and outside, became essential to British plans to force the Italians out of East Africa. Soon afterwards, the British government began to supply military assistance to the Ethiopian patriots in preparation for the final campaign in East Africa.

The first military assistance to Ethiopian patriots arrived through the British colony of the Sudan. The patriots were invited to cross the border into the Sudan and collect firearms and munitions. Along with this, the British government arranged for Haile Sellassie's move by air to the Sudan. The Soba Military School was opened to train Ethiopian officers in the Sudan. From the Sudan, for a brief period, the Emperor gave instructions to the anti-fascist patriotic resistance in Ethiopia. This was followed by preparations for military campaigns to drive away the Italians from East Africa, particularly from Ethiopia.

The British campaign against the fascist troops in Ethiopia and in Eritrea were launched from the British colonies of the Sudan and Kenya. From the Sudan, the British army under General Platt made an offensive against fascist forces in Eritrea. The major theatre of war in Eritrea was the Italian stronghold of Keren where the fascist troops put up a strong resistance. Keren fell into the hands of the British forces after 53 days of bitter fighting that caused heavy damages on both sides. Another British force from the Sudan accompanied the Emperor into Gojjam, in western Ethiopia. This was the Gideon Force, under its commanders, Colonel Dan Sanford and Major Orde Charles Wingate. After crossing the border into Ethiopia, these forces were joined by different groups of Ethiopian patriots. The combined forces fought the fascist troops in Gondar and Gojjam, and continued fighting all along their way to Addis Ababa.

The third major British force was organized in Kenya, under the commander of General Cunningham. General Cunningham made a quick advance into Italian Somaliland and then to Harar and forced the Italians to surrender. Along with the British campaign, the Ethiopian patriots strengthened and accelerated their attacks against the fascist army throughout the country.

The British army under General Cunningham and the patriotic forces drove fascist troops out of Addis Ababa on 6 April 1941. A month later, on 5 May, Emperor Haile Sellassie victoriously re-entered Addis Ababa, Ethiopia was liberated after five years of fascist rule.

Summary

Ethiopian victory at the Battle of Adwa was never a guarantee that Italy would keep its hands off Ethiopia for good. Forty years later, in 1935/36, Italy opened a colonial war against Ethiopia. The League of Nations, in which Ethiopia was a member, failed to save Ethiopia from Italian fascist colonial conquest and occupation.

The Italian fascist occupation of Ethiopia lasted for five years, from 1936 to 1941. During that period, although the Italians introduced some elements of modernization, they achieved little. The Italian occupation army spent those five years largely fighting against a strong patriotic resistance movement. The Ethiopian patriots made enormous sacrifices.

In the end in 1941, Ethiopia was liberated by the combined struggle of the, Ethiopian patriots and British forces. Ethiopian independence was regained and Haile Sellassie I took back imperial power on 5 May 1941.

Review Questions

Part I. Write "True" if the statement is correct, and "False" if the statement is incorrect

1. The victory at the battle of Adwa guaranteed permanent Ethiopian independence from European colonialism.
2. In 1941, Ethiopia was liberated by the struggle of British forces alone.
3. Fascist Italian rule made no positive contributions to Ethiopia.
4. Emperor Haile Selassie's exile to Europe brought positive contributions to the anti- fascist struggle in Ethiopia.
5. Collaborators to Italian colonial rule in Ethiopia were mostly foreigners.

Part II. Match the items in column T with those in S

T	S
1. Graziani	A. Patriot in Gojjam
2. The Black Lion	B. Traitor
3. Belay Zeleke	C. Monks of Debra Libanos
4. Wingate	D. French general
5. Abidssa Aga	E. Gojeb
	F. Patriot in Italy
	G. Business enterprise
	H. Gideon Force
	I. Collaborator

Part IV. Choose the best possible answer from the alternatives given for each question.

1. In 1941 the forces that first captured Addis Ababa from Italians were those of

- a. Haile Selassie I
- b. Belay Zeleke
- c. Cunningham
- d. Wingate

2. Of the following, who was not a leader in the Black Lion Organization?

- a. Yohannes Iyasu
- b. Belay Haileab
- c. Ketemma Beshah
- d. Kifle Nesibu

3. Of the following, who was captured alive and killed by the Italians?

- a. Desta Damtew
- b. Mulugeta Yigezu
- c. Haile Selassie Gugsu
- d. None of the above

4. The February 1937 Massacre in Addis Ababa

- a. saw only a few number of deaths
- b. was the result of the attempted assassination on the life of the Italian viceroy.
- c. was ordered by Mussolini from Rome
- d. was limited to the killing of Yewist Arbgnoch

5. In 1935 Italy invaded Ethiopia to

- a. revenge the defeat at the battle of Adwa
- b. colonize Ethiopia
- c. punish Ethiopia for the Walwal Incident
- d. all of the above

6. The capital of the Italian East Africa was

- a. Rome
- b. Addis Ababa
- c. Asmara
- d. Jimma

7. The Ethiopian patriotic resistance movement was most strong in

- a. Afar
- b. Wollega
- c. Tigray
- d. Gonder

8. The Italians won the Italo- Ethiopian War of 1935-36 because

- a. Ethiopia failed to modernize her military power
- b. Italy had superior armaments

c. Italy used a modern and well trained army

d. all of the above

9. Which of the following is a weapon of mass destruction?

a. Tank

c. Poison gas

b. Artillery

d. A.K. 47

10. Which of the following did not take part in the patriotic resistance against Italians?

a. Hailu Tekle Haimanot

c. Geresu Duki

b. Abebe Aregay

d. Amoraw Wubineh

Part IV. Fill in the blanks spaces with correct responses

1. In May 1936, Emperor Haile Selassie left Ethiopia for _____.

2. Italy had decided to open a war of colonial conquest on Ethiopia as early as _____
(year)

3. _____ was the commander of British forces that entered into Ethiopia from Kenya in 1941.

4. The first Viceroy of the Italian East African Empire was _____.

5. In 1941, Italy had an army of _____ in her East African Empire.

6. _____ was an Ethiopian who fought against Italian troops in Italy during World War II

7. _____ and _____ tried to assassinate Graziani in Ethiopia.

8. _____ type of warfare was mainly used by Ethiopian resistance fighters against Italy.

9. _____ supported Italian colonial occupation of Ethiopia in 1936.

10. _____ was the Italian political party that led the colonial war against Ethiopia in 1935 - 1936?

Part V. Give brief answers to the following questions

1. Why was the secret Hoare - Laval Agreement made?

2. How were the Italians driven out from Ethiopia after their five years of occupation?

3. Why were Ethiopians unable to defeat Italian fascist troops like they had done at the battle of Adwa?

4. What were the sacrifices paid by Ethiopians, so as to defend the independence of their country from Italian fascism?

5. Discuss Emperor Haile Selassie's role in the patriotic resistance movement between 1936 and 1941.

UNIT SIX

THE SECOND WORLD WAR

Introduction

Two decades after the Treaty of Versailles, which was signed in 1919, the world once again moved in the direction of a more devastating war. The basic cause of the impending war was deeply rooted in the Treaty of Versailles itself. That is why some writers often refer to this treaty as "A peace treaty that ended peace". The victors of WWI such as Britain and France had made considerable gains out of the Treaty of Versailles and were satisfied by the settlement. On the other hand, the defeated powers, especially Germany, were dissatisfied and humiliated by the peace agreement that concluded the First World War. Those dissatisfied countries wasted no time to reverse the new arrangements included in the Treaty of Versailles and other peace treaties signed with the defeated powers. The most important post-war development was the emergence of nationalistic governments such as; Fascists in Italy, Nazis in Germany and the militarist government of Japan. In an effort to achieve the nationalistic aims, these governments started to pursue aggressive policies which ultimately resulted in the outbreak of the Second World War.

The Second World War was the most destructive war in the history of mankind. It caused enormous loss of human life and huge destruction to material property. Losses in human life may have been about 50 million. Hoping to safeguard global peace and avert future wars, a new international organization, the United Nations Organization (UNO) was established replacing the discredited League of Nations.

Objectives

Upon completion of this unit, you will be able to:

- * analyse historical developments leading to the Second World War;
- * identify the specific terms of the Treaty of Versailles that caused German resentment;
- * elaborate as how governments with expansionist and aggressive policies drove the whole world to another world war;
- * enumerate the consequences of the war.

Terms to Know

- Appeasement
- Holocaust
- Reparation
- "Blitzkrieg"

- Inflation
 - "Sitzkrieg"
 - Capitulation
 - Non-aggression pact
 - Self-determination
 - Concentration camps
 - Nazism
 - Under siege
 - Demilitarized zone
 - Puppet government
-
- Fascism
 - Reichstag

6.1. The World Moves to War

After the end of World War I, there was a general belief that it was the end all future wars. Many of the Allied statesmen also thought that the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations would ensure a lasting peace. Contrary to these expectations, however, the two decades which followed the end of World War I witnessed widespread conflicts. The post - war governments in almost all European countries had to face political, economic and social problems. Particularly Italy was hard hit by these crises.

In the years immediately after the war there was widespread popular unrest in Italy. The unrest was the result of popular uprisings. Workers in leading industries went on strike. In others, they shut down

production and took over factories after the example of the Russian Bolsheviks. Peasants also revolted against wealthy land owners. Meanwhile, the wealthy landowners and the town middle class feared a communist revolution. Italian nationalists and soldiers who served in the Italian army were also dissatisfied with the terms of the peace settlement.

Although Italy was one of the Allied powers and a victor nation, it faced various problems after the war. Among the problems were the accumulated war debts, economic depression and unemployment. These problems caused widespread political and social unrest. The post - war government of Italy was unable to control the situation. The prevailing dissatisfaction and chaos created a favourable condition for the rise of Fascists to power in Italy in 1922.

What do you understand by “fascism”?

The leader of Italian Fascists was Benito Mussolini (1883-1945) who had fought in the First World War as a corporal. Before the war Mussolini was a socialist. But, during the war, he abandoned socialism and became an ardent nationalist. In the war years, Mussolini developed new ideas about government which he called "fascism". The word "fascism" originates from the Latin term "fasces", which was a bundle of sticks bound together with an axe, that served as a symbol of power and unity in ancient Rome. Fascism was a political movement that propagated "the unity of all social groups under the control of a nation state". According to Mussolini, fascism was the dictatorship of the state over many cooperating classes. Fascism was extremely nationalistic. Fascists maintained that whatever the cost, the cause of the nation had to be promoted. According to fascists, national goals could be advanced by means of war and conquest.

Mussolini used all the discontents and fears of the people for his own political end. He promised to establish strong law and order, to end social unrest and protect private property. To nationalists, Mussolini promised to restore Italy's greatness. To capitalists and landlords, Mussolini's movement was a defence against communism. In addition, Mussolini won the support of some of the workers by promising job security and other benefits such as old age pensions and insurance. By doing so, Mussolini and his Fascist Party won popular support which encouraged him to take state power. Accordingly, in October 1922, the Fascists organized a big march to Rome. The government was divided on the action to be taken. Some urged King Victor Emmanuel III, the then King of Italy, to declare martial law. But the king rather appointed Mussolini as Prime Minister. At this time, the Fascists did not have a majority in the parliament. Therefore, Mussolini made arrangements for an election to be held in 1924. In this election Fascists won majority seats in the Italian parliament. Using this situation to his advantage

Mussolini then swept into power. He called himself "Il Duce" or "The Leader" and took into his hands the destinies of Italy, as dictator, in the following years.

Germany was another country where the consequences of the war gave rise to Fascism. Nazism was the German version of Fascism. When Germany lost WWI her Emperor, Wilhelm II, fled to Holland. The government which took power after Wilhelm's departure was weak. The weakness of the government was further worsened when groups of Communists known as the Spartacist League staged an armed rising in January 1919. The rising was crushed, but there remained the fear of another communist revolution in Germany which lasted to 1923.

What did the situation look like in Germany of the immediate post-war years?

The suppression of the communist insurrection was followed in 1919 by elections to a Constituent Assembly. The Assembly held its meetings in the town of Weimar and carried out the task of writing a new constitution for Germany. After six months in session, the work on the constitution was completed and a republican regime was set up. The republic was called the Weimar Republic, after the town where the Constituent Assembly held its meeting.

The Weimar Republic had to deal with a range of problems. One of the problems was related to severe economic set backs. According to the Versailles Treaty, Germany had to pay a huge sum of reparations to the Allied powers. The reparations were fixed at £6,600,000,000. In 1922 the German government announced that it was not able to pay the reparations. To enforce payment, France sent troops to occupy Germany's industrial Ruhr area, to collect reparations in the form coal and steel. Opposing French occupation, German workers went on strike. The German government tried to cover the expense by printing more and more paper money. The consequence was a serious inflation, a situation where the amount of money in circulation is very high with a very weak buying power. Although inflation was finally stopped and the economy recovered, it ruined German economy and weakened the Weimar Republic politically. There was a wide spread blamed the Republic for resentment to, the Treaty of Versailles and the inflation which followed the war.

During these troubled years several parties emerged in Germany. One of those parties was the Nazi Party. The full name of the party was the National Socialist German Workers' Party. The party grew in power especially after Adolf Hitler (1889 - 1945), a veteran of World War I, became its leader. He joined the party in Munich, a city in southern Germany where Hitler settled after serving in the German army during the First World War.

As soon as Hitler became the leader of the Nazis, he organized a private army known as the Stormtroopers (SA) or "Brown Shirts", named after the colour of their uniform. The members of the Brown Shirts were recruited mainly from young German war veterans and street hooligans. In November 1923 Hitler and his Brown Shirts staged a coup d'etat

(German: putsch) to take power in Munich. But the German police suppressed the coup. Upon the failure of the coup, Hitler was brought to trial and sentenced to serve a five years prison term.

Is it possible to argue that Mein Kampf was a blue print to Hitler's future actions? Why?

The time in prison was important in the political career of Hitler. This was because, during his time in prison, Hitler wrote an autobiography entitled Mein Kampf (My Struggle). The book described the ideology of Nazism and Hitler's future plan to make the Germans dominant in Europe. According to Hitler, the Germans were a "master race" who deserved to rule. He blamed the Jews and the Communists for Germany's defeat in the First World War. On the whole, all policies and practices the Nazis carried out after taking power in Germany were already stated in the Mein Kampf.

The years that followed Hitler's release from prison in December 1924 marked the period of economic recovery and political stability in Germany. Under such conditions, Hitler and the Nazis could not get the support of the general public. However, the period of economic recovery and political stability was short lived. In 1929 German economy collapsed because of the economic crisis that hit the whole world. The economic crisis was the result of the Great Depression which lasted from 1929 to 1933. The immediate cause of the depression was the Wall Street stock market crash in America in October 1929. The fundamental causes of the depression are still controversial. Periodic economic crisis had been common in the capitalist economy. But the economic crisis caused by the Great Depression of 1929 – 1933 was exceptionally severe. All industrialized and other nations of the world were hard hit by the Great Depression. It was very severe in the United States. In many countries workers lost their jobs. In the USA alone around 16 million Americans were unemployed in the early 1930s.

How did Hitler get the chance to become German Chancellor in 1933?

The Weimar Republic was one of the European states which was bitterly affected by the Great Depression and the economic crisis it resulted. The Great Depression stopped foreign loans, especially US loans. Workers lost their jobs. Many enterprises went bankrupt. The desperate situation brought Hitler and the Nazis once again to the political scene. Many Germans began to listen to and appreciate Nazi propaganda, and became Nazi supporters. But until 1932 the Nazis were a minority in the Reichstag, the German parliament. In the election of 1928, for instance, they won only 12 seats in the Reichstag. But in the election of 1932, they won 230 seats. Although the Nazis became the largest party in the Reichstag, they were still short of a majority. In 1933 there was political deadlock among the political parties in Germany. This was because none of the parties obtained a sufficient majority to form government. To solve the crisis, Paul Von Hindenburg, the President of the Weimar Republic, offered Hitler the office of Chancellor, that is, head of the government (Prime Minister).

After taking the office of Chancellor, Hitler arranged for a new election to be held in 1933. The aim of the election was to win a sweeping majority for the Nazis in the Reichstag. To achieve this aim,

communist influence among the workers had to be reduced. A week before the election, the Reichstag building caught fire and burned. Without any evidence, Hitler accused communists as being responsible for this criminal act. It is important to note that on one occasion Hitler wrote: "The great masses of people . . . will more easily fall victims to a big lie than to a small one." (Mein Kampf). Whoever was really responsible for the Reichstag fire, Hitler intended to reduce the support communists had among the workers. In this he was successful. Civil rights were suspended, and many communists were arrested. As a result, in the election the Nazis obtained sufficient seats in the Reichstag that gave Hitler, full powers to rule, in effect, as a dictator. Hitler took the title "Leader", Führer in German. Soon afterwards, Hitler started to take aggressive measures which ultimately led to the outbreak of the Second World War in 1939.

How did the peace settlements made at the end of WWI originate another world war?

The fundamental cause of the Second World War was deeply rooted in the peace settlements made at the end of World War I. As has been argued by many writers, the peace settlement sowed the seeds of a future war. Public opinion in Italy and Germany was strongly opposed to the peace treaties. The fascist regimes which came to power in both countries were determined to reverse the peace settlement and restore their lost glory through war and conquest. In Japan also militarist groups who took power in the early 1930s followed a similar policy of achieving greatness through territorial expansion, which targeted East and South East Asia and the Pacific. Thus, the aggressive policies of Italian fascists, German Nazis and Japanese militarists finally forced the world to face another destructive war in the twentieth century.

Japan took the lead in waging aggressive war on its neighbors. In September 1931, the Japanese army conquered Manchuria, the northern province of China, and set up a puppet government named Manchukuo for Manchuria. China appealed to the League of Nations. When the League condemned Japan as an aggressor and told it to withdraw from the Chinese territory. The Japanese announced their withdrawal from the League of Nations on 27 May, 1933. Further aggressive expansion of Japan against China finally led to the outbreak of open War between Japan and China in July 1937.

The Japanese boldness in 1931 encouraged Italy to make a similar move against Ethiopia. In December 1934 the Fascists unleashed the Walwal Incident which was followed by a full scale invasion of Ethiopia in October 1935. Emperor Haile Sellassie appealed to the League of Nations, upon which the League condemned Italy as an aggressor and imposed certain sanctions on it. But the League's action did not stop Mussolini from his military conquest in Ethiopia. He achieved a quick victory over Ethiopia by using poison gas which was against international law. An international agreement of 1925 had forbidden the use of poison gas. Italy had signed this agreement but Mussolini had no intention of keeping it. In fact large stocks of mustard gas had been sent to Eritrea prior to 1935 ready for use in the war against Ethiopia. In May 1936 the Italian army led by Marshal Badoglio occupied Addis Ababa. On the whole, the Failure of the League of Nations and the western powers to take effective action against militarist Japan and Fascist Italy for their criminal act in Manchuria and Ethiopia meant the end of collective security, and a return of the old principle of "might is right."

Then came the turn of Hitler, whose aggressive actions were responsible for the outbreak of the Second World War in Europe. Hitler took the following aggressive actions against the Treaty of Versailles as well as against international law.

- i) The introduction of national military service in 1935 violating the Treaty of Versailles which limited the German ground force to only 100,000 men and prohibited conscription.
- ii) The German armies occupied the demilitarized zone of the Rhineland in March 1936. It is to be recalled that the German army had been forbidden entry into this part of Germany by the Treaty of Versailles. Germany continued to rearm at a rapid pace.
- iii) In March 1938 German armies annexed Austria. For a long time Hitler had dreamed of an "Anschluss" that is, the annexation of Austria. As early as 1924, Hitler wrote in *Mein Kampf* that "German – Austria must return to the Great German mother country . . . one blood demands one Reich. [state]" This dream was realized when Austria was annexed by the German army in March 1938.
- iv) In 1938 and 1939 Czechoslovakia became a target for Hitler's policy of German expansion. The crisis over Czechoslovakia marked the last phase in the move towards the war, and therefore, it is important to treat this subject at length.

Czechoslovakia held a strategic position in Eastern Europe. In particular, the Sudetenland, an economically important and heavily fortified region in north western Czechoslovakia along the German border, was the target of Hitler's aggression. There were about 3 million Germans who lived in the Sudetenland. At the time, these Germans were on bad terms with the Czechoslovak government which provided Hitler a pretext to move against Czechoslovakia. Hitler in fact encouraged Sudeten German leaders to complain of Czech "oppression" and make demands. On 12, September 1938 Hitler demanded that the Czechoslovak government give the right of self – determination to the Germans of the Sudetenland. The Czechoslovak government not only refused to accept Hitler's demand but also declared martial law in the territory. In an effort to avert war, the British Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain, agreed to meet Hitler to discuss the problem. The French government also gave support to Chamberlain's effort. The issue was discussed at the Munich Conference in September 1938.

How was appeasement put into action at the Munich conference?

In what came to be known as the Munich Agreement, Germany was allowed to annex the Sudetenland. In return, Hitler promised to respect the sovereignty of the rest of Czechoslovakia. He also promised to settle future disputes by peaceful means. Britain and France should in part be blamed for Hitler's bold moves that finally ended with the outbreak of the Second World War. In dealing with Hitler, they followed the policy of "appeasement" or satisfying Hitler's demands. Above all, Chamberlain was the leading proponent of the policy of appeasement. He hoped to maintain peace and stabilize Europe by making concessions to Hitler. However, it did not take much time to prove that appeasement was ineffective in dealing with Hitler and Mussolini. It rather encouraged Hitler to continue with his plans of aggressive expansion. Moreover, the attitude of the western power at Munich confirmed his opinion that the west would not go to war with Germany in defence of an East European power.

Why did Britain and France refrain to react to Mussolini's invasion of Ethiopia?

When Hitler violated the Treaty of Versailles by introducing national military service and occupying the demilitarized Rhineland, Britain and France did nothing. After the Italian invasion of Ethiopia, Britain and France refrained from taking effective action. They feared to antagonize Mussolini and push him into alliance with Hitler. Despite their caution, however, the Fascist military bloc was formed. In 1936 Mussolini announced the formation of a Rome – Berlin Axis, which was the alignment of Italy and Germany. In the same year the two powers as well as Japan signed the Anti – Comintern Pact (an anti – communist alliance). Soviet Russia was willing to join the western powers against Germany and its allies. Britain and France refused to accept this policy because they feared that the formation of such a front would provoke war. In addition, the British and French governments and their bourgeois elite disliked the USSR as much as Nazi Germany. When Hitler invaded Austria, Britain and France refused to be involved in the crisis. Finally, in the Munich Agreement they attempted to satisfy Hitler at the expense of Czechoslovakia.

On his way home after the Munich Agreement, Chamberlain was confident that there would be no more trouble from the Nazis. He trusted that Hitler would keep his promises. However, far from keeping his promises, Hitler was encouraged to make further moves. On 15 March, 1939, only six months after the Munich Agreement, Hitler sent his armies into Czechoslovakia and occupied the western part of the country. In eastern Czechoslovakia a German puppet state called Slovakia was set up. In the same month, Hitler turned toward Eastern Europe where he annexed Memel from Lithuania. It was clear that Poland would be the next victim.

What were the major terms of agreement included in the Soviet- German Non-Aggression Pact of 1939?

Now it became clear to the British and French governments that the policy of appeasement had utterly failed, though Chamberlain himself still hoped he could get a firm agreement with Hitler. Therefore, they decided to increase their armaments and also pledged themselves to give military assistance to Poland, Greece, Rumania and Turkey, if these countries were invaded by Nazi Germany. Moreover, despite mutual distrust between the Soviets and the Western powers, the latter wanted to consolidate the anti-German alliance by including Soviet Russia. When they requested the Soviet Union to join them against the Nazis, the Soviet leader, Joseph Stalin, asked in effect a free hand for the USSR in Eastern Europe, especially in the Baltic republics and Poland. Chamberlain refused to accept Stalin's terms. This pushed Stalin to turn to Hitler. The consequence was the agreement known as the Nazi – Soviet Non – Aggression Pact which was signed on 23, August 1939. In the agreement the two sides pledged to remain neutral if one of them was at war with a third power. They also agreed to divide eastern Europe into their spheres of influence. In this respect, Poland was to be partitioned into west and east to be occupied by Germany and Soviet Russia respectively. In addition, Finland and the Baltic republics of Estonia, Latvia and (later) Lithuania were recognized as part of the Soviet sphere of influence.

Except its diplomatic value both Stalin and Hitler from the very beginning knew that the pact would have no lasting effect. Stalin calculated that the agreement would give him time to strengthen Soviet military power. Hitler also wanted the agreement because it would relieve him of the need to fight the Soviets while Germany fought a war elsewhere, without having to worry about an eastern front against the USSR. The British and French leaders realized that the Nazi – Soviet Pact destroyed the last opportunity of stopping Hitler without war. But Hitler still hoped that the west would not act against him.

6.2. Military Aspects of the War

i. The "Blitzkrieg", the "Sitzkrieg" and German Success on the Western Front.

Did the "blitzkrieg" result in the desired effect in Poland? How?

September 1, 1939 was a historic date as regards to the Second World War. On this day Hitler's army crossed the Polish-German frontier from different directions and invaded Poland. This event marked the beginning of the Second World War. Two days later Britain and France declared war on Germany. Whether this declaration of war rescued Poland is a matter to be seen in the subsequent paragraphs. In spite of its numerical superiority the Polish army could not stand the well armed German attackers. In their invasion of Poland the Germans employed a war strategy known as "blitzkrieg", which means a lightning-war. The key principle in this strategy was to win a quick and decisive victory through the coordinated attacks of the German air force and fast moving ground forces. The Germans made effective use of this strategy in their invasion of Poland where a massive aerial strike was followed by a swift advance of the German infantry and armoured divisions.

The "blitzkrieg" shattered whatever Polish resistance, and in less than a month time much of Poland was overrun by the German army. On the 30th of September German troops entered into the Polish capital. Warsaw. Thus, the Poles, with no direct assistance from their western allies which nominally declared war on Germany were defeated. Germany annexed Danzig and over 30,000 square miles of Polish territory.

In the mean time the Soviets advanced quickly into eastern Poland to get its share of the spoils. Russia took over 77,000 square miles of Eastern Poland. At about the same time Soviets also forced the Baltic states to accept the establishment of Soviet military bases inside their territory and later incorporated the Baltic states into the USSR (1939-40). Moreover, the Soviets fought a difficult but finally victorious war with Finland and annexed some Finnish territory. These moves gave the Soviets some measure of security against the Nazi invasion. But the USSR did not use the time gained by the Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact as well as it should have done, for which Stalin is now blamed.

For about seven months after the Polish surrender, there was no real fighting on the Western Front. This period has been termed the "Phony" war. It was also called the "Sitzkrieg" or Sitting War. The Phony war period came to an end on 29 April, 1940 when the German army invaded Denmark and Norway. Denmark surrendered after only a few hours but the Norwegian resistance took the Germans longer to overcome. They overcame the resistance only after the strength of the German navy was considerably reduced.

The next victims of German invasion on the Western Front were the Netherlands, Belgium and France. On 10 May 1940, the Netherlands was attacked. At the same time, the Germans attacked Belgium and France along the Meuse river and through the Ardennes hills, which Britain and France believed, wrongly, to be impossible terrain for tanks.

The French and British High Commands did not anticipate German war strategy. They expected the Germans to attack through the plains of Belgium as they had done in 1914, in World War I. Because of this, British and French forces moved into Belgium to defend what they thought to be the main German line of attack. But the Germans broke into France through the Ardennes. In only a few weeks the Germans, having broken through the French line and trapped the Allied army in Belgium, compelled this Allied force to retreat to Dunkirk, a port in northern France. This army, numbering more than 300,000 troops, was saved from falling into German hands by evacuating across the English Channel, but all the equipment was left behind.

Why did Mussolini declare war on Britain and France at the time he did?

The rapid success of the Germans on the Western Front prompted Mussolini to declare war on Britain and France on 10 June, 1940. Mussolini mistakenly calculated that the war was closer to its end, while it was just beginning, and wanted to be on the winning side. Four days later, on June 14, Paris surrendered to the Germans. Then the French signed an armistice with Germany, which came to effect on 22 June, 1940. According to the terms of the armistice, Germany occupied northern France, including the territory along the Atlantic coast to the Spanish border. In southern France a puppet government was set up under Marshal Henri Petain in the town of Vichy, hence the "Vichy government". (see the map on p. 131).

Map 1. European and Mediterranean Fronts

ii. The Battle of Britain

After the fall of France, Hitler gave orders to open attack on Britain. The offensive was to be launched from the air. What forced Hitler's decision in favour of an aerial strike was the fact that Germany had to win air supremacy before a full scale invasion of Britain. Therefore, Hitler aimed at weakening Britain's defence capacity by destroying the British Royal Air Force (RAF) and its

airfields. The British government was now led by Winston Churchill who had replaced Neville Chamberlain as Prime Minister of Britain in May 1940. In his first speech to the House of Commons, Churchill clearly stated his government's policy in favour of war against Nazi Germany as follows:

#You ask, what is our policy? I will say: It is to wage war, by sea, land, and air, with all our might and with all the strength that God can give us: to wage war against a monstrous tyranny, never surpassed in the dark, lamentable catalogue of human crime. That is our policy. You ask, What is our aim? I can answer in one word: Victory – victory at all costs, victory in spite of all terrors; victory, however hard and long the road may be; for without victory, there is no survival.\$

Fig 6.5 Winston Churchill, in the middle

This certainly was a clear message about the firm stand the British government had already adopted by the time Germany's air attack inaugurated the Battle of Britain.

The Battle of Britain had two phases. It started in early August when the "Luftwaffe" (the German Air Force) began bombing southern Britain. During the first phase, i.e., in August and September, the Luftwaffe launched its attack in daylight. The aim of this attack was to wipe out British airfields and

fighter planes. But the British RAF used the new detection instrument, "Radar" (then called RDF – Radio Direction Finding) to locate the attackers beforehand. Consequently, by counter-attacking, the RAF considerably reduced the German bomber and fighter planes in air battles. The decisive air actions of the first phase took place between 15 and 21 September, during which the Germans lost some 120 planes.

What was the tactical change the Germans introduced in the second phase of the Battle of Britain?

The second phase of the Battle of Britain started in early October, 1940. At this stage the Germans changed their tactic from attacking in daylight to night bombing. Through night bombing of London and British industrial centres, Hitler wanted to destroy British industrial production and to terrify the population which might induce the British government to ask for peace. Despite large scale destruction, however, the "Luftwaffe" was unable to paralyse production or break the morale of the British people. By the end of November, it became clear that Germany had lost the Battle of Britain. This was Hitler's first major defeat since the outbreak of World War II. Although Britain could defend itself from German invasion, it was not strong enough to send an army back into Europe. Hitler could therefore turn against the USSR in the east.

iii. German Invasion of the Soviet Union

After his army's failure in the Battle of Britain, Hitler decided on the invasion of the Soviet Union whose defeat he thought would be accomplished before winter. Of all things he did not want to share his hegemony over Europe with a communist dictator, Stalin. From his invasion Hitler hoped to get what he called the "Lebensraum" or living space which the vast Soviet territory could provide for German settlers. He also planned to take the wheat of the Ukraine and the oil fields of the Caucasus. With these aims, the Germans started their attack on 22 June, 1941. The Soviets responded with a so-called scorched earth policy, which called for destruction of everything that could be of use to the invaders, while fighting hard as they were pushed back to the interior of the country. The Germans advanced very fast and in November 1941 they had already

penetrated about 960 kms deep into the Soviet Union. By then Kiev, the capital city of the Ukraine, had fallen.

Leningrad, one of the major cities, was cut off from any land connection with the rest of the Soviet Union and put under siege. The Germans were at the outskirts of Moscow. Although the Soviets were hard pressed by the enemy, they fought with the utmost patriotism. They rallied to the cry "Behind us is Moscow – there is no room left for retreat!" Consequently, in December 1941 when the Russian winter set in, the Germans were prevented from taking Moscow and Leningrad. Hitler's "blitzkrieg" failed to bring the desired results in Russia.

Why was the "blitzkrieg" ineffective in the Russian campaign?

Fig 6.7 Soviet troops, in winter camouflage, attacking a German fortification

The Attack on Pearl Harbour

Since the conquest of Manchuria in 1931, the Japanese had been engaged in the task of achieving their ultimate goal of expansion in Asia and the Pacific. In 1937 they launched a full scale invasion over China which resulted in the establishment of a Japanese-dominated government in part of China in March, 1940. In the months that followed the Japanese government made it official that its plan was to establish a "New Order in Greater East Asia". To this end, the Japanese adopted the slogan "Asia for the Asians". They declared that the goal of the Japanese government was to establish a "Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere". In fact, the Japanese aim was to replace Western imperialism by Japanese imperialism and "Co-prosperity" for other Asian peoples was only a cover. As a step in fulfilling this goal, Japan invaded the Tonkin province in Indochina. In response, the United States extended a loan to China and stopped the export of scrap iron to Japan. This prompted Japan to sign a Tripartite Treaty with Germany and Italy widely known as the "Berlin -Rome-Tokyo Triangle". In the treaty the three powers pledged to assist one another in the event of attack on any one of them.

When and how did relations between Japan and the USA start to get sour?

In July 1941 Japan extended its control over the southern part of Indochina. This measure strained relations between Japan and the United States, and soon trade relations between the two countries was seriously affected. The USA put increasing economic pressure on Japan so as to force its withdrawal from Indochina and China. Imports of oil and other essential raw materials were denied to Japan by the USA, and later by Britain. Japan had only two choices: to abandon her conquests or seize oilfields and areas with raw materials in South East Asia. Japan obviously chose the latter. But to seize and hold the oil and raw materials which Japan needed in South East Asia, Japan would need to destroy US power in

the region. Therefore, Japan decided to smash US naval and air power in the Pacific and East Asia, if negotiations could not change US policy in favour of Japan.

When the negotiations failed to bring about the expected changes on 7 December 1941, Japanese bombers launched a surprise attack on the American naval base at Pearl Harbour, in Hawaii. In the attack of December, 1941, the Japanese sank 19 American ships and destroyed 188 planes. However, the US aircraft carriers, not present in Pearl Harbour at the time, were saved. The attack also killed more than 2,400 people and wounded another 1100 or more. On the following day the United States declared war on Japan. On 11 December, 1941 Germany and Italy, in keeping with their agreement in the Tripartite Treaty, declared war on the United States. Japan for a time made rapid advances in the Pacific and South East Asia. Hong Kong, the Philippines, Burma, Malaya were occupied.

iv. The World at War

The Pearl Harbour incident made the war fully a world war. The Japanese raid on Pearl Harbour and the consequent entry of the USA into the war upset the balance of power in the ongoing war. Until then, Japan's expansion had gone virtually unopposed. This attack had the immediate effect of solidifying the alliances on both sides. On 8 December America's declaration of war on Japan was accompanied by a British declaration of war. On 11 December Germany and Italy declared war on the USA. In August, 1942 the war was being fought in several theatres situated in eastern Europe, North Africa and the Mediterranean, Burma and China, and the Atlantic and the Pacific. In the meantime, Italian troops had already invaded Egypt and Greece.

Map 2. Asian and Pacific Fronts

In the winter of 1941-42 Soviet forces opened a counter-offensive and pushed the Germans back some distance from Moscow. But in the summer of 1942 the Germans opened a new offensive against the Soviet Union in the south. German troops mounted a major attack against Stalingrad, a major industrial centre on the Volga river. The city also served as one of the Soviets' lines of communication. This city was named after the Soviet leader, Joseph Stalin. The fall of the city to the Germans would have a severe psychological impact on the Soviets' national pride. Given this, Stalin and the Soviets were determined to hold the city. Hitler, on his part, was equally determined to take the city and kept on ordering German forces to continue with their assault. For weeks, fierce battles were fought for each building, or street. In November 1942, the Soviets launched a major counter-attack against the Germans fighting in and near the city. In the counter-attack the Soviets encircled the Germans fighting in Stalingrad. At the time, the Germans were already suffering from the Russian winter. On 1 February, 1943 the Germans were forced to surrender. This brought an end to the battle of Stalingrad in which a large part of the German army was destroyed. The Stalingrad battle was a decisive turning point in the course of World War II. In Europe on theatre of war the heaviest fighting was done by the Soviet armies, and the Soviet armies had the heaviest losses.

How did the Allies won the war in Africa?

Elsewhere, fierce battles were still raging. In North Africa, the German forces commanded by General Erwin Rommel had dominated the desert war since 1941. In 1942 they had nearly taken Egypt. In late October, 1942 the British and Commonwealth troops under General Bernard Montgomery launched a major attack against Rommel's troops. Allied forces landed in Algeria and Morocco in November 1942. Fierce battles continued in the desert and in Tunisia which came to an end with the victory of Allied troops. In May, 1943, the Axis forces in North Africa surrendered to the Allies. Then followed, in July 1943, the invasion of Italy. Victor Emmanuel III, King of Italy, deposed Mussolini and appointed Marshal Pietro Badoglio as Prime Minister of Italy.

Fig 6.8 Left to right, Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill plan Allied strategy at Tehran, Iran, in November, 1943

Although Marshal Badoglio promised Hitler that Italy would continue in the war on the Axis side, he signed a secret act of surrender to the Allies. Suspecting this, Hitler sent German forces into Italy which occupied Rome and rescued Mussolini who was put in control of northern Italy. Heavy fighting went on in Italy until the end of the war but on 4 June, 1944, Allied troops occupied Rome. Near the end of the war, Mussolini was captured by Italian communists and shot by them.

v. End of the War

The landing of US, British and Canadian forces at Normandy (North France) or, the invasion of Normandy, on 6 June, 1944 was a major breakthrough in the Allied reconquest of Europe; This invasion was named Operation Overlord. The commander of the Allied troops, the American General Dwight Eisenhower, organized around 150,000 troops, 5,300 ships and 12,000 planes for the invasion. In preparation for the attack, Allied forces and its war machines and supplies had assembled in southern England. The Germans knew that there would be an invasion. Nevertheless, they did not know when and where the invasion would take place. Because of this, they spread their armies all along the French coast facing the English Channel. The Allied troops launched the attack along a 96 kms stretch of the Normandy coast. Within a month and a half, they had liberated almost all of France. In the meantime, General Charles de Gaulle, the leader of Free France, triumphantly entered Paris on 25 August 1944.

When did the Japanese suffered a major setback in the Pacific war?

Meanwhile, on the Eastern Front, the Soviets made rapid advances. They liberated the Soviet cities and territories one after the other. In July 1944, they crossed into Polish territory. Between August and October 1944, the major part of Eastern and Central Europe was under Soviet control.

In the Pacific, US forces were in a life and death struggle against the Japanese. The battle of Midway Island in 1942, fought entirely by carrier borne aircraft, was a decisive defeat of the Japanese navy suffered. From then on the US forces were pushing the Japanese back in the

the Pacific and by 1944 were getting ready to invade mainland Japan.

At the end of 1944, the Allied troops, advancing from the west, invaded Western Germany. Hitler decided to mount a counter - attack against the Allies through the Ardennes in order to halt their advance. Accordingly, the Germans launched the counter-attack in mid-December 1944, but failed to check the Allies' advance. Indeed, this was the last desperate offensive the Germans made before they surrendered to the Allies. In the east the Soviet Red Army had already reached to the German frontier liberating east European countries on their way. On 16 April, Marshal Zhukov, commander of the Russian forces, launched what proved to be the final attack on Berlin. Adolf Hitler did not live to see Germany's surrender to the Allies. He committed suicide a week before the capitulation of Berlin on May 2, 1945, to the Soviet troops. One of Hitler's last measures was to make Admiral Karl Doenitz his successor. On May 7, 1945, Karl Doenitz authorized Germany's surrender to the Allies. On that same day, General Alfred Jodl surrendered the German forces in the west to General Eisenhower. The next day, the German forces in the east surrendered to Marshal Georgi Zhukov. Thus 8 May, 1945 became VE (Victory in Europe) which marked the end of the war in Europe.

Despite Germany's surrender, the Second World War was not yet over. The Allies had to fight the Japanese in Asia and the Pacific who continued fighting after VE day. The Japanese surrender was forced by the use of the newly invented atomic bomb. On 6 August, 1945, the first of the atomic bombs, was dropped on the Japanese city of Hiroshima. On August 9, the second bomb was dropped on another Japanese city, Nagasaki. The bombs caused immense human and material destruction.

On the days of the bombing, 80,000 people in Hiroshima and 40,000 people in Nagasaki lost their lives. Long after the bombing, victims continued to suffer and die from radiation sickness. As a result, the death toll rose to about 200,000.

Fig 6.11 View of Hiroshima after the first atom bomb was dropped

Fig 6.12 View of Nagasaki after the second atom bomb was dropped

According to the US President, Harry S. Truman (Roosevelt had died in April 1945), the atomic bombs were used to hasten Japanese surrender. However, Soviet historians argue that in terms of military strategy the use of the bombs was not required. Since Japan was the only Axis power still in the war, its surrender could have been forced without those bombs. Therefore, they concluded in using the bombs the US intended to demonstrate its power to the Soviets which would have an impact on post-war

international relation. Soviet and some non-Soviet historians have also argued that the USSR's declaration of war on Japan in August 1945 did more to make Japan surrender than the use of the atomic bombs. Apart from this, the US might have used the atomic bombs against Japan to take revenge for the Pearl Harbour catastrophe. In any case, on 15 August 1945 the Japanese Emperor, Hirohito, signed the unconditional surrender of Japan that put an official end to the Second World War.

6.3. Consequences of the War

Compared to World War I, the Second World War caused far more damage to material property, and even greater loss of human life. Several factors accounted for this. First of all, the Second World War was fought in several theatres (areas). Secondly, in addition to the deaths in the fighting, there were mass killings in concentration camps. Thirdly, air raids, starvation and disease made civilian casualties very high. Finally, the air raids caused serious destruction on material property.

It has been estimated that more than 70 million people fought in the war. It is impossible to give a conclusive figure about war deaths, but probably about 50 million might have died in action. The USSR lost over 20 million of its population and China probably several millions but the figure for China is uncertain.

Material destruction caused by the Second World War was far greater than in the First World War. Almost all ports in Germany, France and other countries were destroyed. Roads and railways were damaged by repeated bombings. Many bridges were destroyed together with a large number of locomotives and railway waggons. Many cities and towns and industrial centres such as the Ruhr were ruined. Warsaw had to be totally built anew. In general, material damages to property have been estimated at more than two thousand billion dollars (\$ 2,000,000,000,000).

What do we mean by the "Holocaust"?

Perhaps the most painful memory of the war was the "Holocaust". Literally, holocaust meant wholesale, complete destruction. But in World War II, it meant the mass murder of European Jews by the orders of Hitler and Nazi officials. As a result of Hitler's plan of eliminating Jews and other minorities, 12 million people were slaughtered. Of these, about 6 million were European Jews, while the rest were minorities like Gypsies, and Slavs. The mass killing was carried out in concentration camps, among which the most infamous were Auschwitz, Dachau, Buchenwald, Belsen and Nordhausen. In these camps the Jews and others worked and lived under horrible conditions. Many died of starvation and disease. Others were made victims of cruel experiments conducted by Nazi doctors. Jews, however, were usually marched into gas chambers where they were killed with poison gas. Such Nazi atrocities had been generally unknown at least in their full extent, until they were revealed towards the end of the war.

Fig 6.13 Bodies of Victims of the Nordhausen Concentration Camp

The Second World War had also far-reaching political consequences. It helped to accelerate the struggle for national liberation from colonialism in Asia and Africa, hence, the emergence of many new independent states in Asia and Africa after World War II. The war also led to the development of new international alignments. The USA and the USSR became the super powers of the post-1945 period. Since 1945 there has been a series of crises in almost all parts of the world. In such crises, the super powers always took opposite sides. On the whole, the great problems created by the Second World War took many years to solve and in fact, some of the problems have not yet been solved.

6.4. The United Nations Organization

The formation of the United Nations Organization (UNO), was directly related to the Second World War. The League of Nations was the World's first peace – keeping organization founded after the First World War. But the League evidently failed to avert war and maintain collective security. Because of this, it became clear that the League would not continue when the war ended, and another organization, would take its place. Winston Churchill, prime Minister of Britain raised the issue with the US President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, for the first time when they met in 1941. At that time Roosevelt was not ready to pledge the USA to join such an organization. When the issue was again raised at the Tehran (Iran) summit in 1943, the US attitude on international cooperation had changed. As a result the USA, together with the USSR and Britain gave support to the idea of a United Nations Organization at the Tehran meeting.

Accordingly, at the Moscow Conference of October, 1943, the Foreign Ministers of the three Allied powers agreed on:

“The necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principles of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large or small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.”

In 1944, the Allies met again at Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, and conducted a detailed discussion on the structure of the United Nations Organization. At this meeting the USA, the USSR, Britain and China reserved to themselves and to France permanent seats in the UN Security Council. This idea was further strengthened in 1945 at the Yalta Conference, where the Big Three – the USA, the USSR, and Britain – agreed that each permanent member of the Security Council should have the right to “veto” any decision made, that is, to reverse a decision. The UN took its final shape at a conference held at San Francisco, in April, 1945. At this meeting fifty Allied nations drafted the United Nations Charter. In accordance with the agreements made at Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta, the machinery of the UN was further developed. The Charter was signed in June, 1945 by 51 founding members.

The aims of the UN were contained in the first two articles of the Charter. The opening statement of the Charter declared that the chief aim of the UN was “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime, has brought untold sorrow to mankind.”

The UN was also aimed at promoting human rights, respect for international law, and “social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom.” In the new organization, the functions, particularly regarding the economic and social programs which were aimed at improving the well-being of the peoples of the world, were broadened.

The UN consisted of six agencies, set up to perform various tasks of the organization. They are the:

- | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. General Assembly, | 4. International Court of Justice, |
| 2. Security Council, | 5. Economic and Social Council, and |
| 3. Secretariat, | 6. Trusteeship Council |

The Structure of the United Nations

The General Assembly is made up of representatives of the UN member countries, all of whom, regardless of their size, have one vote. The General Assembly meets once; annually but in times of crisis additional meetings can be called. Among chief responsibilities of the Assembly are admission of new members, expulsion of members, the supervision of the budget, appointment of the UN Secretary-General and the maintenance of peace and security.

According to the Charter, the principal functions of the UN are assigned to the Security Council. This body is responsible for the maintenance of peace and security. It has the authority to investigate any dispute between nations and to recommend mechanisms for settlement to the General Assembly. The council also has the authority to take diplomatic or economic measures, known as sanctions, against an aggressor. In case the measures prove insufficient to avert aggression, the council can take military measures to maintain international order. According to the Charter, member states are required to provide armed forces when the Security Council calls for it.

Originally, the Security Council was made up of eleven members. Six of the members were elected by the General Assembly for two year terms, while five seats on the Security Council were held permanently by the Big Five – the USA, the USSR, Britain, France and China. The permanent members have the right of veto. This means that no decision can be accepted if one of the permanent members has voted against it. In 1965, the number of the elected members rose to ten, but the permanent members remained the same. The Security Council has a Military Staff Committee to advise and assist it. Members of the Committee come mainly from the Big Five.

Another body of the UN is the International Court of Justice. The seat of the Court is at the Hague in the Netherlands. The Court has fifteen judges jointly chosen by the General Assembly and Security Council. The Court is mainly concerned with legal issues. Its official languages are English and French.

The body which took over the functions of the League's Mandates Commission was the Trusteeship Council. This body was responsible for supervising the administration of trust territories, which were called mandates or mandated territories after World War I. The function of this council gradually came to an end in 1944 when the last trust territory the Pacific island of Palau achieved its independence.

The Economic and Social Council is a body set up to handle international economic, social, cultural, educational, health and related matters. Originally, this Council was made up of 18 members which increased to 27 in 1965. The body is assisted by various commissions which deal with specific issues such as trade, drugs, population, human rights and the status of women. The body also has under its jurisdiction several specialized agencies mainly concerned with various aspects of the welfare of the peoples of the world. Among such specialized agencies, the following are the most important.

1. International Labour Organization (ILO)
2. World Health Organization (WHO)
3. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
4. United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF)
5. Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO)
6. United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
7. International Monetary Fund (IMF)
8. World Bank

or even longer. The war had several consequences. Material destruction and loss of human life were by far greater than the case of the First World War. The terrible experience of the war induced the major powers to agree on the formation of the United Nations, an international organization meant for the maintenance of peace and security. Moreover, as we shall see in a separate unit, many of the crises and tension on world peace in the post- 1945 have been the outcome of the consequences of the Second World War.

Review Questions

Part I. Choose the correct answer

1. Which of the following fascists seized political power early?

a. German Nazis	c. The militarists of Japan
b. Italian fascists	d. General Franco of Spain
2. One of the following does not characterize the Nazi party.

a. Glorification of war	c. Extreme reaction
b. Racial Chauvinism	d. Peaceful co-existence
- 3.

At the Munich conference of Sept. 1938, Hitler promised

- a. to give the western tip of Czechoslovakia to Hungary.
 - b. to take the whole of Czechoslovakia peacefully.
 - c. to take the area inhabited by German minorities peacefully.
 - d. to notify the west when he attacks Czechoslovakia.
4. The first serious challenge to Hitler's "blitzkrieg" came when his forces invaded.

- a. France
- b. Czechoslovakia
- c. the Soviet Union
- d. Poland

5. The collaborationist government of France set up after its capitulation to Hitler, which took its name from the seat of its power was.

- a. Vichy
- b. Barbarosa
- c. the Third Republic
- d. Parisian

6. The government in power, in Germany, immediately before the Nazis seized political power was

- a. the Second Republic
- b. the Thousand years Reich
- c. the Weimar Republic
- d. the Bundstag

7. Where is the headquarter of the UNO situated?

- a. the Hague
- b. Rome
- c. New York
- d. London

8. The incident at Pearl Harbour, 7 Dec. 1941.

- a. upset the balance of power in WWII.
- b. brought a change in the alignment of forces.
- c. contributed to the establishment of unchallenged Japanese authority in Asia and the Pacific
- d. laid the foundation for the establishment of the UNO.

9. To "operation overlord" Normandy was

- a. its resort center
- b. the place where the actual operation started
- c. its ultimate goal in the course of the reconquest of Europe
- d. its commanding post

10. Which one of the following is an incorrect link?

- a. Churchill - Appeasement
- b. de Gaulle- Free France
- c. Mussolini - Il Duce
- d. Eisenhower-"operation overlord"

Part II. Attempt the following

1. Describe the major incidents of military aggression which provoked the outbreak of the Second World War.

2. How would you compare and contrast the policies of the two British Prime Ministers, Neville Chamberlain and Winston Churchill, against Hitler's aggressive policy?
3. How far were Hitler and Stalin committed to observing the Nazi–Soviet Non–Aggression Pact of 1939?
4. What objectives did Hitler intend to achieve in his invasion of the Soviet Union?
5. What is a scorched – earth policy? Which country used this policy and why?
6. What were the causes for the US entry into the Second World War?
7. Explain the following historical concepts or events or items:
 - a. Anschluss
 - b. Mein Kampf
 - c. Lebensraum
 - d. Munich Agreement
 - e. Blitzkrieg
 - f. Phony War
8. Identify and describe the decisive battles of the Second World War, the forces involved in the battles and why the battles could be considered as decisive.
9. Describe the consequences of the Second World War in terms of loss in human life and material destruction.
10. Outline the major steps and discussions that led to the formation of the United Nations Organization.
11. Identify the chief bodies of the UN and describe the functions of each of the bodies.
12. Identify the specialized agencies under the jurisdiction of the UN Economic and Social Council. Describe the functions of each of its specialized agencies.
13. As a result of the Second World War material damages to property have been estimated at more than two thousand billion dollars (\$ 2,000,000,000,000). At the present level of world population, how much do you think would each person get from the sum total of loss sustained as a result of material destruction? How far would this help improve the living standard of the peoples of third world countries?

UNIT SEVEN

MAJOR REGIONAL AND GLOBAL DEVELOPMENTS SINCE THE END OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR

Introduction

This unit deals with some of the major historical developments that took place in the world since the end of the Second World War to the 1980's. Attempt has been made to discuss selected developments with a decisive influence in shaping the future.

The world had hoped that the defeat of Fascism would bring in a period of peace and constructive development. A Third World War has not occurred, though new historical forces emerged in the world. Those forces brought about new and heightened tensions, which at times, led to bloody regional wars. Both constructive and destructive results came about as a result of the new developments in the world, which this unit explores.

More specifically, the unit is concerned with the division of the world into two major camps (the socialist and capitalist camps), the emergence of the two antagonistic super-powers (the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R) and the Cold War. The unit examines the Chinese socialist revolution and the Vietnam War. It also addresses the historical process that brought to an end colonialism with special emphasis on the national independence struggle of India and Indonesia. A brief review of the conflict between Arab and Jewish nationalism and the series of Arab-Israeli wars is included in this section.

Objectives

After studying this unit, students will be able to:

- * discuss the emergence of the two antagonistic super-powers, i.e. the U.S.A and the USSR, in the world;
- * explain the division of the world into capitalist and socialist camps;
- * analyze the main features of the cold war;
- * give a brief account of the Chinese socialist revolution;
- * discuss the independence of India and Indonesia from colonial rule;
- * explain the cause and consequences of the Vietnam War;
- * discuss the origins of the Arab-Israeli conflict;
- * appreciate the efforts and the forces that have kept the world in relative peace, in spite of some major regional conflicts;
- * locate on maps the areas where the above historical developments occurred.

7.1. The Emergence of the Antagonistic Super-Powers: the U.S.A. Versus the U.S.S.R

Terms to Know

- Antagonism
- Bloc/Camp
- Capitalism
- Communism
- Detente
- Ethnic Conflicts
- Isolationism
- Peace-time economy
- Radio active material
- Socialism
- Super – power
- Truman Doctrine
- War economy

World War II was mainly fought in Europe. It resulted in greater destruction in the continent. The economies of the leading European powers, i.e France, Britain, Germany, were seriously affected by this war. Thus, their attempts at economic recovery turned out to be a challenging task. Politically and militarily, they were exhausted and weakened, as a result of the war.

Unlike the above group of states, however, the U.S.A and the U.S.S.R came out of the Second World War much stronger than they had been before. As a result, they styled themselves as the super- powers of the post-World War II era.

Before the Second World War, the U.S.A had been following the policy of isolationism. That policy was based on the assumption that the U.S.A could live in peace, if it avoided involvement in the affairs of Europe and the world. But the two World Wars proved that this policy was wrong, as you have learned in Units Four and Six of this textbook. Therefore, after 1945, the U.S.A adopted a policy of active engagement in Europe as well as in other parts of the world.

Except for the island of Hawaii, the territories of the U.S.A had not been battle - grounds for World War II. Indeed, the U.S.A had served as supplier of war materials, food and manufactured goods for the Allied forces and states, during World War II. As a result, its agriculture and industry had expanded during the war. Consequently, it came out of the Second World War richer and more powerful than it had been in the pre-war period.

Between 1928 and 1945, the Gross National Product (G.N.P) of the U.S.A had grown from 91 billion dollars to 213 billion dollars. After the Second World War, the average income of an American citizen was two times than that of a Briton (British citizen) and seven times than that of a Russian. In 1950, more than a half of the world's total motor vehicles were found in the U.S.A. But this is not to deny the existence of poor quarters (slums) and very poor Americans in the U.S.A, owing to the uneven distribution of wealth. Nonetheless, the U.S.A was by far the richest country in the world, during the immediate post-war period.

In 1945, the U.S.A. had developed the atom bomb, the most destructive weapon that human kind had ever made. It was atom bombs that were dropped at the two Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, at the end of World War II. No other state had this weapon until the U.S.S.R built its own in 1949. Consequently, the USA became a super-power in every sense of the word.

The U.S.S.R had suffered greatly from World War II. It lost twenty million of its citizens, and many more millions were wounded. Its economy was also in ruins. Russia's war economy had to be changed into peace-time economy. Its industries, about 100,000 collective farms, 5 million homes and some 65 thousand kilometers of rail roads had to be restored and built. Reconstruction and re-settlement were a policy priority in the immediate post-war period. In 1945, the Gross National Product of the Soviet Union (Russia) amounted to a third of that of the U.S.A. But by 1953 the gap was considerably narrowed.

Since 1949, the U.S.S.R became the second country competing for the great power status the USA had already enjoyed. By 1949, two super-powers could be said to have existed in the world. Those were the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. No nation, other than the two, possessed the atomic bomb at the time, though later more states developed it.

Moreover, the U.S.A and the U.S.S.R. followed two different ideologies (political philosophies) that were opposed to one another. The U.S.A followed the road of capitalism and the U.S.S.R. that of communism. Each was the leader of a group of nations that followed a similar ideology. Each one tried to strengthen itself, and spread its ideology at the expense of the other.

Activity

7.2. Division of the World into East and West and the Cold War

Terms to Know

- Alliance
- Economic recovery
- People's democratic state
- Cold war
- Rivalry
- Policy of containment
- Détente
- Tension
- Propaganda war
- East-West division of the World
- "The iron curtain"

- Peaceful co-existence

At the end of the Second World War, nearly all the countries liberated from Nazi German and Fascist Italian rule in Eastern and Central Europe became socialist (communist) states. Those countries were Poland, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Albania and Eastern Germany. Each of them took the official label of "People's Democratic" state. Later, nations like China (Beijing), Cuba, North Korea, North Vietnam, etc. joined the socialist group of states. The socialist states of the world made up the Eastern bloc. They were led by the U.S.S.R upon which most of these states relied for support and protection.

However, later Yugoslavia, and China shook off dependence on the U.S.S.R. But, the rest of the socialist states remained under the guidance of the U.S.S.R.

The West was made up of the capitalist nations of the world. The major states in this camp were the U.S.A., the United Kingdom (Britain), France, the Federal Republic of Germany, (West Germany), Canada, Italy, etc. The champion of the capitalist world was the U.S.A. Thus, the world was divided into two camps (blocs), known as the East and the West, since the end of the Second World War. The East (the socialist camp) and the West (the capitalist camp) were rivals. There was a persistent struggle between the two to expand their ideology and sphere of influence in the immediate postwar period. It was this struggle, between the East and the West and the state of tension that came to be referred to as the Cold War.

As leader of the socialist bloc, the U.S.S.R had all the Central and Eastern European states behind it in the Cold War. The socialist states of Europe were all under the rule of communist dictators. European communist governments shut off their peoples from the rest of the world. That was why Winston Churchill of Britain commented in 1946 saying that an “iron curtain” was drawn between the European East and West.

In 1945, the U.S.S.R. announced to the world that it was prepared to face the West. Malenkov, a notable diplomat and a future Prime Minister of the U.S.S.R. speaking on Soviet foreign policy said:

There (are) cases in history when the fruits of victory slipped out of the victor’s hands. This must not happen to us . . . We must, in the first place, consolidate (build) and strengthen further (our) Soviet Socialist state . . . And we must remember that our friends will respect us only so long as we are strong . . . There is no respect for the weak ones, and the weak ones get beaten.

In the same manner, in what came to be known as the Truman Doctrine, the American President, Harry Truman, made it clear to the world that his country’s relations with the U.S.S.R. would be carried on the understanding that:

Unless Russia is faced with an iron fist and strong language, war is in the making. Only one language do they understand --- “How many divisions have you?” --- I’m tired of babying the Soviets.

In 1947 elaborating on the above U.S. policy of containment, Truman further added:

It would be the policy of the United States to support free peoples, who are resisting attempted subjugation (dictatorial rule) by armed minorities or by outside pressure.

The main features of the Cold War were the following.

- * A war of words (strong propaganda war).
- * Ideological struggle.
- * Weapons race (competition to build more and more destructive weapons).
- * Competition in espionage (spying).
- * Economic conflicts (rivalries).
- * Expansion in Europe and elsewhere by all means, short of armed fighting.
- * Building military alliances.
- * Building military bases in different parts of the world.

In 1947 President Truman announced his determination to “contain” or stop the spread of Soviet power. Thus began the policy of containment which explains the whole essence of US policy as regards to the Soviet Union. The Truman Doctrine was one among the series of plans and programmes through which the policy of containment had been put into action. The name Truman Doctrine was derived from

the famous speech of the president in front of the American congress in 1947. Through the Truman Doctrine, the U.S. gave financial aid to Greece and Turkey. As a result of this aid, the two governments successfully overcame communist attempts in their countries to take power. That was the U.S. policy of containment, which was extended to other parts of the world, too.

Another plan which was part of containment was known as the Marshall Plan. The Marshall Plan – so named after the US Secretary of State George C. Marshall – was the US program to rebuild Europe after the Second World War. In June 1947, George C. Marshall announced the U.S. plan to re-build Europe. The plan called upon the European nations to cooperate in drawing up a plan for economic recovery. According to the Marshall Plan, the USA would provide money and equipment required for implementation of the plan. On the basis of this aid, George C. Marshall invited all countries of Europe to take part in the program. Apparently, the invitation included the Soviet Union as well. But the Soviets not only refused to take part in the program, but also prevented the East, communist governments of Central and Eastern Europe from taking part in the program. Those countries which participated benefited a lot from the program. This was because, under the terms of the Marshall Plan, the USA supplied 9 billion dollars in four years between 1948 and 1952, to re-build Europe. The plan enabled Western Europe to regain and even to surpass pre-war production rates in a few years. The Soviets took the plan as a US measure to strengthen non-communist countries in Europe against the Soviet Union in particular and the communist camp in general. Consequently, the Cold War tensions were heightened.

As was stated above, the Cold War between the super powers manifested itself in various ways. One of its manifestations was the formation of hostile (opposing) military alliances. In forming a military alliance, it was the US-led West which took the lead. The formation of a military alliance among the countries of the West was precipitated by two crises. The crises occurred in Czechoslovakia and in the city of Berlin one after the other. In February 1948, Czechoslovakia was taken over by its communists and became a Soviet satellite. The Czechoslovak crisis was followed by another crisis known as the Berlin blockade (1948-49). This was Stalin's measure to force the western powers out of their occupied zones of Berlin. Just as Germany was divided into four zones of occupation, the city of Berlin was also divided into four sectors (the US, British, French and Russian). But the city was situated deep inside the Soviet Zone of Germany. When Cold War tensions heightened, Stalin cut off all land and water routes leading to the sectors of Berlin under the Western Allies. The people of West Berlin suffered, from shortage of every kind of supplies. The Western powers started to supply Berlin by air and in the end the Soviet blockade was lifted.

The above - mentioned two crises increased Western concern about military defense and quickened the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949. The founding members of NATO included Belgium, Britain, Canada, Denmark, Norway, France, Iceland, Italy, the Netherlands, Luxembourg and the United States. In 1952, Greece and Turkey also joined the alliance. In response to this measure, the Soviet Union and its East European satellites also signed a military alliance known as the Warsaw Pact in the Polish capital in 1955. The original founders of the Warsaw Pact were the U.S.S.R, Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic (East Germany), Poland, Rumania and Czechoslovakia. Members of each alliance system agreed that an attack on one of them would be considered as an attack on all.

The formation of antagonistic military alliances strengthened the arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union. The nuclear arms race seems to have already started after the first atomic bombs were used on Japanese cities. This was because Stalin right away ordered the development of these weapons in Russia at top speed. Nonetheless, until 1949 the United States was the only country that possessed the atomic bomb. As long as this situation continued, no country was likely to attack the United States. But the USA lost its status as the sole owner of the atomic bomb in 1949, when the Soviet Union exploded its first atomic bomb.

Farther than this, scientists and engineers in both Russia and the U.S.A. were working on new ways to deliver the destructive bombs. In place of planes, experts in both countries sought to build rocket-powered missiles, which could travel great distances at high speeds. Eventually, the Soviets won the contest. On October 4, 1957 they put an artificial satellite, Sputnik I, into orbit around the earth. In terms of military strategy, this was a great success, because rockets, which could lift a satellite, could deliver a bomb to any spot on the earth. On January 31, 1958 the United States also sent its first artificial satellite into orbit. This achievement made it clear that each country could send missiles over the other's territory from home bases. As a result, both the Soviets and the Americans feared the possible outbreak of a nuclear war, but still continued to improve and invent more and more destructive weapons.

The problem with nuclear bombs was not only their destructive power. There was also the problem of release of a deadly radioactive material. In addition, the cost of developing and building nuclear weapons and missiles was very expensive. The super powers had to spend huge sums of money on weapons and complex defence systems. Another danger with nuclear weapons was lack of guarantee to stop their proliferation, that is, spread to other countries, as in fact has happened.

Military bases were also built by the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R at different strategic sites all over the world to safeguard their respective spheres of influence from the reach of the other. In other parts of the world, ground, naval, and air force bases were also built with the same goals.

There was also strong rivalry in the economic field. For instance, the West European nations formed the European Economic Community (E.E.C) in 1957. The original founders of the E.E.C were France, Italy, the Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany), Belgium, Holland and Luxemburg. Later, other West European states, including Britain, joined the E.E.C. The E.E.C. has now developed into the European Union. The E.E.C. was built originally to enable its member-states to compete better in world economic activities and relations.

The European communist states had also built, earlier in 1949, their own economic organization called the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. It was also referred to as the Comecon. The Comecon was intended to strengthen economic ties among socialist states.

The growing fear caused by nuclear weapons brought statesmen in both camps to their senses to seek solutions for the relaxation of Cold War tensions. This resulted in the beginning of new policies such as peaceful co-existence and détente. Under Premier Nikita Khrushchev, before he was removed from power in 1966, the Soviets adopted a new policy toward the West. This policy was known as “peaceful co-existence”. To Nikita Khrushchev, peaceful co-existence meant that the Soviets would compete with the West, but would avoid war. Détente was the West’s equivalent for the Soviet term, peaceful co-existence. Clearly, there was a desire in both camps to relax the Cold War tensions. In spite of this, until the 1970s there was little progress in arms limitation talks.

The first positive move towards détente was the conclusion of the Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1968. The treaty aimed at preventing the expansion of nuclear weapons beyond the countries that already possessed them. By the end of 1971, all

permanent members in the UN Security Council were nuclear powers. Although the treaty did not prevent proliferation of nuclear weapons, it promoted renewed efforts to limit the armaments of the super powers. In November, 1969 a disarmament negotiation, known as Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) was opened.

With the beginning of SALT, there arose a growing hope that the further build-up of nuclear weapons, with their enormous cost, might be minimized. After a long delay, SALT was concluded in 1972. The move toward détente reached its peak in 1975, when negotiation on SALT was opened. But before the negotiation could get any further, new East-West Cold War tensions began. The tensions continued until the Cold War itself finally came to an end, as a result of the two successful summit meetings (1986-1987) between President Ronald Reagan of the USA and President Mikhail Gorbachev of the USSR. There soon followed, at the beginning of the 1990s, the fall of communism in the USSR as well as in East and Central Europe, and the break up of the Soviet Union into independent republics.

Activity

7.3. The Indian Independence Movement

Terms to Know

- Civil disobedience
- Colonialism
- Colony
- Conference
- Congress
- Commonwealth
- Independence
- League
- National independence movement
- Peaceful methods of struggle
- Political party
- Provisional government
- Religions antagonism
- Secular state

India was a British colony. The Indian National Congress was founded in 1885 to lead the struggle for national independence. The wealth of India had been used by Britain to enrich itself. In the period between the two World Wars, Indians waged a struggle for national independence. On the other hand, the British worked to sow differences between Muslims and Hindus. That was aimed at weakening the struggle of Indians for self - rule. Way back in 1906, the Muslim League had split away from the Indian National Congress, to stand for the rights of Indian Muslims. And the League became a rallying point of Muslims, while the Indian National Congress was identified with Hindus. In some cases, like in the Amritsar Massacre of 1919, the British used brute force against the Indian struggle.

During the inter-War period, non-violent forms of struggle were used against the British by the Indian National Congress. In the 1930's under the Leadership of Mahtma Gandhi, civil disobedience campaigns were carried out against British colonial rule. The British tried to make half-hearted reforms, while the Indian National Congress was demanding for more.

During the Second World War, the struggle for Indian national independence was temporarily weakened. Leaders of the Indian National Congress, such as Mahtma Gandhi and Jawahralal Nehru, were arrested. At the end of World War II, however, the struggle for independence was strengthened with much vigour and determination.

Focus

On May 14, 1945, the British called for the Simla Conference, in order to make reform and introduce self-rule considering the interests of the existing religious communities. Both the Indian National Congress, led by Gandhi, Nehru and V. Patel, and the Muslim League, under Mohammed Ali Jinnah, rejected the British proposal.

But in 1946, under a better arrangement Indians were allowed to establish a Provisional Government and a Legislative Assembly, though still under British colonial control. Nerhu was appointed head of the Provisional Government. At this time, the Muslim League was calling for a separate Muslim state which later became Pakistan. The last British Viceroy to India, Lord Louis Mountbatten, and the British Government agreed to give independence to two separate states in the Indian sub-continent namely Pakistan (Muslim) and India (predominantly Hindu) in 1947.

On January 26, 1947 India became an independent state, with Jawaharlal Nehru as its first Prime Minister. Pakistan, too, became independent with Mohammed Ali Jinnah as its first President. Pakistan was officially declared to be an Islamic state, while India was declared to be a secular state. Attacks on Hindus by Muslims in Pakistan, and similar attacks on Muslims by Hindus in India took place at the time

of independence. Those conflicts led to chaos, property destruction, beatings and killings of people, on both sides. People were forced to abandon their home areas. Large number of Muslims fled from India to Pakistan. Similarly, large number of Hindus left Pakistan for India as well. Those events were very sad. Mahtma Gandhi advised tolerance for both religious communities. But fanatics (extremists) did not listen to him. Indeed, one of them, a Hindu fanatic, murdered Gandhi in 1948.

In such a way the long story of the struggle for independence in the Indian sub-continent came to a close. As separate independent states, while India and Bangladesh have been good neighbors, relations between Pakistan and India have not been so good. Relations between Pakistan and India have characteristically been full of tension, accompanied by intermittent armed clashes. Both have become nuclear powers.

Activity

Give brief answers to the following questions

1. What was the role of Mahtma Gandhi in the independence struggle of India?
2. How did the British colony of India split into three independent states?
3. What made conflict and dispute to characterize the relations between India and Pakistan?

7.4. Indonesia: From Dutch Colony to an Independent Nation

Terms to Know

- Colonial state
- Coup d'etat
- Disarming
- Imperialism
- Military operations
- National liberation
- Non-aligned

Indonesia, in the Pacific region of the Spice Islands a colony of the Netherlands. During the inter-war period (1918-39), the Indonesian national struggle for independence grew strong. The colonial parliament called the Volksraad (People's Council) established by the Dutch meant little to freedom-seeking Indonesians. Rather, they began to organize themselves to struggle for independence. It was with this spirit that Sukarno formed the National Party (Indonesian Party) in 1931. But the Japanese occupation of Indonesia during the Second World War stopped the Indonesian struggle against the Dutch.

Why did British troops come to Indonesia in 1945?

Indonesians fought against Japanese occupation troops during the Second World War. In 1945, they had already liberated their country from the Japanese, before the arrival of British troops. British troops came to Indonesia, in order to disarm the Japanese troops. In the meantime, Indonesian's had formed an independent republic. But, soon enough the Dutch, once again came to Indonesia hoping to restore their rule. This gave rise to an anti-colonial war in Indonesia to drive out the Dutch. Military operations between the Dutch and the Indonesians ended in August 1949. A transitional government called the "Netherlands-Indonesian Union" was formed in 1949, to administer the country which was heading to independence. That Union government was dissolved, and Indonesia became an independent republic in May 1956.

The first president of the Republic of Indonesia became Sukarno. Indonesia is a land of Muslims. Sukarno's government became pro-U.S.S.R. It also stood against Western imperialism. Together with India, Yugoslavia and Egypt, Sukarno's Indonesia became a moving force in the Non-Aligned Movement.

Activity

Give short answers to the following questions.

1. Why did military operations (fighting) start between Indonesians and the Dutch, after the Second World War?
2. How did Indonesia achieve its national independence in 1956?
3. What were the contributions of Sukarno to the independence struggle of Indonesia?

7.5. Arab- Israeli Conflicts

Terms to Know

- Arabism
- Massacre
- Self-determination
- Buffer zone
- Mediation
- Settler
- Cease-fire
- Peace-keeping force
- Surprise attack
- Fedayeen
- Partition
- Terrorism
- Government -in- exile
- Pre-emptive strike
- Troop deployment
- Intifada
- Recognition of a state
- Zionism
- Mandate territory
- Refugee

According to the peace settlement after the First World War, the Ottoman territory called Palestine was made a mandate territory under British administration. At the time, Palestine had a Jewish minority, though the great majority were Arabs. The Jewish population in Palestine had grown as a result of massive immigration of Jews due to the efforts made by Zionism. Zionism was a movement that began in the nineteenth century, and then grew steadily mainly through the efforts of a European Jew named Theodore Herzl.

What was the underlined objective of Zionism?

The main objective of Zionism was to create a national state for Jews in Palestine. To achieve this objective, the organization promoted the settlement of Jews in Palestine. In 1917 through what was called the Balfour Declaration, Britain had promised to give Palestine to the Jews. But earlier, in 1915, the British had made the same kind of promise to the Arabs. When the number of Jewish settlers in Palestine grew considerably, in - between the two World Wars, conflict between Arabs and Jews in Palestine started. In the meantime, the British mandate government was unable to solve the problem of Arab-Jewish conflict. The basic cause for conflict was the rivalry between Arab and Jewish nationalism. The importance of the Middle East as a region of strategic value and source of oil has added fuel to the Arab-Jew conflict.

Following the end of the Second World War, relations between Arabs and Jews grew in scope and intensity. At the time, the Zionist movement had already won world-wide sympathy owing to Nazi persecution of Europe's Jews. Consequently, the movement continued to organize further immigration of Jews into Palestine. The British Government which was responsible for Palestine could not stop this immigration. Increased Jewish immigration and the Zionist goal of making Palestine a Jewish state heightened Arab hostility. Both the Jews and the Arabs started terrorist activities against each other. There were Jewish attacks on officials of the British mandate government and British soldiers. The British authorities were unable to maintain order in Palestine.

In 1947, the British government announced its plan to give up its mandate authority and pass the problem of Palestine to the United Nations. On the basis of a UN Commission report, the Security Council voted for the partition (division) of Palestine into Jewish and Arab states. But, Jerusalem was to be an international city under UN supervision. Zionists accepted the plan but the Arab world opposed it demanding the right to self-determination for Palestinian Arabs. The Arabs wanted an independent Arab state without partition. On May 14, 1948 Britain withdrew from Palestine. The Jews in Palestine immediately declared the establishment of an independent Jewish republic which they called Israel, with its capital at Tel Aviv. This event marked the beginning of bloody conflicts between the Arabs and the new state of Israel, which have continued to dominate the history of the Middle East for half a century without any solution.

Map 1. The Eastern Mediterranean Since 1967

Since then, Arab countries, which refused to recognize the new state fought four wars against Israel. There was no real peace during the intervals between the four Arab-Israeli Wars. And until 1977, no Arab state gave recognition to the state of Israel.

Why did Arab states refuse to recognize the state of Israel?

The first Arab- Israeli War broke out immediately after the establishment of the state of Israel. In the spring of 1948 five Arab states, namely Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Trans-Jordan and Iraq, attacked Israel. In the war that lasted until 1949, the determined Israeli army defeated the forces of the Arab states. From this war Israel acquired more land and became larger. The territorial gains of Israel included half of Jerusalem (the old quarter) and the northwestern coastal strip along the Mediterranean Sea. Trans-Jordan was the only Arab state to achieve any success in the war. Its army successfully held the hill country of central Palestine. After the war, Trans-Jordan took this territory and the state changed its

name to Jordan. The territory held by Jordan across the river Jordan was the West Bank of River Jordan. The cease-fire line at the end of the war ran through Jerusalem dividing the city into two halves. The UN mediated the cease-fire and the agreement which ended the war. But the Arabs refused to sign any final peace treaty preparing themselves for another war.

The First Arab- Israeli War forced around 750,000 Palestinian Arabs to leave the country that had been their homeland. They moved out of the territory of Palestine on which the Jewish state of Israel was created. Many of them moved to the nearby Arab countries. At first, some of the Palestinian refugees fought to regain their homeland as fedayeen or militants under their traditional leader the Mufti. Having failed to achieve their objective, Palestinians turned to Al Fatah, a guerilla group, and other terrorist organizations, such as the Black September. The various Palestinian Arab groups and agencies merged and formed the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) in 1964. The PLO formed a government-in-exile, and also carried on a guerrilla war against Israel. Through military and diplomatic means, the organization promoted the interests of the Palestinian Arabs. The PLO's famous and long year leader was Yasir Arafat.

Meanwhile, Israel's Arab neighbour states actively continued their struggle against the Zionist state. They used the Arab League which was founded in 1945 as a platform. The League made the liberation of Palestine an issue of priority. From 1954 on, Gamal Abdel Nasser, President of Egypt, became an active champion of the Arab cause. In 1956 Nasser first got the withdrawal of all British troops that had been stationed in Egypt. Then, he nationalized the Suez Canal Company, whose shares Britain and France owned. This action angered Britain and France. The actions of Egypt were also dangerous to Israel. And the Second Arab-Israeli War, also known as the Suez War, started when Israel attacked Egypt. Britain and France also joined the war on the side of Israel. Again the Israelis proved stronger, and conquered the Egyptian territory of Sinai. The war came to an end when American, Soviet Russian and UN pressure forced Britain and France to stop the war against Egypt. President Eisenhower of the USA was unhappy about the Suez war mainly because he believed that the war would likely lead to increased Soviet influence in the Middle East, as it actually did. Israel was also persuaded to surrender its conquered territories. A UN peace-keeping force separated Israel and Egypt.

An uneasy calm reigned until the outbreak of the Third Arab-Israeli War, also called the Six Days War, in 1967. It was started by Egypt (Nasser), Iraq, Jordan and Syria. In early May of that year, a large Egyptian force was deployed in Sinai. At the same time, Nasser closed the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli shipping. He also demanded that U Thant, the then UN Secretary-General, pull out the UN peace-keeping forces from the region. In addition, the Syrians started shelling Israeli settlements from the Golan Heights. Furthermore, minor clashes had taken place between the Israeli and Syrian forces along the border of the two countries. As tensions grew, Moshe Dayan, the Israeli Minister of Defence, decided to start a pre-emptive strike. The U.S.A. Britain and the Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany) assisted Israel, though they did not take direct part in the war. The U.S.S.R did the same for the Arabs. Between 5-10 June 1967, after the Israeli Air Force had destroyed Nasser's air force, Israeli troops reached the Suez Canal. The Israeli army defeated Jordanians on the West Bank and took the whole Palestinian territory occupied by Jordan. The Syrian forces also faced a crushing defeat in the Golan Heights. On June 10, 1967 Syria and Egypt accepted a cease-fire. As a result of its victory in this war, Israel not only reopened the Gulf of Aqaba, but also kept possession of the Golan Heights, the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and the Sinai peninsula. Later, these occupied territories were to be used as buffer zones by Israel.

In 1970, President Nasser of Egypt died, and he was succeeded by Anwar Sadat in 1972. Israeli athletes at the Munich (W. Germany) Olympic Games were massacred by PLO agents. After years of preparations, Egypt and Syria again opened war against Israel. In October, 1973 the Fourth Arab- Israeli War broke out. This war is also known as the Yom Kippur War, because the Arabs began the conflict with a surprise attack on Israel on Yom Kippur, a Jewish religious holiday. The Arabs got early successes which did not last long. Within three weeks, a cease-fire was arranged. By then the Israeli forces were advancing deep into both Egypt and Syria. In 1978, President Sadat signed the Camp David Agreement with Prime minister Mennachem Begin. In this agreement Sadat gave full recognition to the State of Israel. However, his attempt at securing peace with Israel resulted in his death at the hands of Arab extremists. Thus, after four bloody wars, Arab states failed to realize the objective of liberating Palestine. The Arab-Israeli conflicts continued and the Palestinian Arabs adopted a struggle called the intifada ("revot").

Activity

Give short answers to the following questions

1. What were the root causes of the Arab -Israeli conflict?
2. What were the reasons for the outbreak of the Second Arab-Israeli war?
3. Why did Western powers support the state of Israel in the conflict with the Arabs?
4. What were the achievements and failures of Arafat as P.L.O. leader?

7.6. The Vietnam War

Terms to Know

- Ambush
- Guerrilla war
- Referendum
- Cease-fire
- Marxist
- Terror
- Communist
- Mediation
- Vietnamization of the war
- Dirty war
- Occupation

Vietnam formed part of the French colony of Indochina in southeast Asia since the 1880's. During the Second World War, Indochina was occupied by the Japanese. The French were driven out. But the Vietnamese, under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh, started a peasant based resistance movement against the Japanese since 1941. In 1945 when the Japanese were defeated in World War II, Vietnam became independent. After Japanese surrender, Allied forces consisting of the British and the Chinese

Kuomintang forces came to Indochina to remove the Japanese. They ignored the declaration of the independence of Indochina (including Vietnam), and helped the return of the French to recolonize the region in 1946.

It was not easy for France to reestablish its authority, especially over the Vietnam part of Indochina. During the Japanese occupation, nationalist forces in eastern Vietnam had begun a resistance movement, as indicated above. The fighting force of the movement were called the Vietminh. It was a guerilla movement against the Japanese. The leader of the Vietminh was Ho Chi Minh. He was a Marxist as well as a nationalist. At the end of World War II, the Vietminh proclaimed an independent republic of Vietnam under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh.

Why did the French start the dirty war?

The French did not recognize the Vietminh's declaration of an independent republic. Instead, they insisted on the formation, in Indochina, of a federation of three self-governing states of Cambodia, Laos

and Vietnam under French colonial control. In this plan, the French intended to put Vietnam under the rule of Emperor Bao Dai. But the Vietminh rejected the offer and demanded a totally independent Republic of Vietnam.

As negotiations broke down, active fighting between the Vietminh, and the French began in 1946. The French aimed at recolonizing Vietnam and the war came to be known as "dirty war" by French citizens who opposed it. The "dirty war" lasted until 1954. The Vietminh gained support from the Soviet Union as well as from the Chinese Communists, after the latter came to power in China in 1949.

On the other hand, the French received substantial aid from the United States. By this support the United States hoped that the French would prevent a communist take-over in Vietnam. The Americans feared that communists would endanger US economic and political interests in the region.

The costly war continued on for seven years. In the end, France was defeated. More than 16,000 French troops were surrounded, many killed and the rest forced to surrender at the Battle of Dien Bien Phu in May 1954. In July, 1954 an international conference met at Geneva, Switzerland. The 1954 Geneva Conference was also attended by representatives from Britain, the USA, the USSR and Communist China. At the conference, France formally accepted the end of its rule over the whole of Indochina. Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam were to become independent states separate from one another. Among the agreements of the conference, one provided for a temporary division of Vietnam into North and South at the 17th parallel. The division created a communist state in North Vietnam under Ho Chi Minh in 1955. A pro-Western government under Ngo Dinh Diem was established in South Vietnam. It was also decided that the country would be reunited under a single government after national elections scheduled to be held within two years.

Fig 7.2 French commando forces ford a river in Indochina

Even before the Geneva Conference ended, there were signs that the division would lead to war between the two Vietnams. This became clear, especially when the leaders of South Vietnam together with the Americans refused to sign the Geneva Agreement. The USA refused to sign the Agreement, because it feared that a united Vietnam might fall under communist control. The fear was not groundless, because after the conference communist North Vietnam started to work for the reunification of the country as a communist state. To this end, the Vietminh planned to use communist guerilla forces, who started operation throughout South Vietnam.

Communist guerilla bands strived for the realization of a united, communist Vietnam by force of arms. In 1960 groups of South Vietnamese Communists, known as the Vietcongs, had set up a united guerilla movement. This marked the outbreak of a civil war between the Vietcongs, supported by North Vietnam, and the government of South Vietnam.

Why did the US intervene in the Vietnam War?

In 1961 the United States increased its financial and military aid to the South Vietnamese government. At the same time, North Vietnam and the Vietcongs obtained assistance from the Soviet Union. Beyond the financial and military assistance, the USA began direct participation in the conflict in 1962. Even for US troops fighting on the side of the South Vietnamese government, the communists proved too powerful. By 1964 around 40 per cent of South Vietnam had fallen under the control of the Vietcongs. The growing worry caused by this, together with attacks against US forces in Vietnam, led the American Congress to vote for US President Lyndon Johnson's request for "all necessary steps, including the use of armed forces" against Ho Chi Minh and North Vietnam. That led to escalation of the war. US forces in Vietnam were increased in number. The US also began aerial bombing in North Vietnam. In this military venture the USA was assisted by Australia, New Zealand and South Korea. In 1966 the fighting forces on both sides numbered several hundreds of thousands of troops. The USA feared that if communism won Vietnam, it would spread to other countries of South East Asia. Also, the US government did not want to accept defeat. The more effort the USA made, the harder it was to withdraw, though this was what the USA had to do in the end.

After 1966, the war continued for about a decade. The Vietnamese communists, which were assisted by the Soviet Union and China, were determined to fight to the last person. They successfully resisted every effort of the US forces at terrorizing them into submission. The US forces used modern weapons produced by post- World War II military technology. However, as Jack Watson, a specialist in contemporary world history, has remarked:

Massive bombing, anti-personnel weapons, napalm and other terror weapons, and the use of chemicals to defoliate trees the better to expose Vietcong guerillas could still not win the war for ... the Americans.

Fig 7.3 June 1972: the Horror of the War in Vietnam

"This photograph was taken at Trang Bang in South Vietnam, immediately after an ill- targeted napalm strike by a US Skyraider. The child in the centre had torn off burning clothing, and the children were joined in flight by South Vietnamese soldiers."

Why did the US fail to win the Vietnam War?

As the war dragged on, the US government began to face strong opposition at home. Reports on high numbers of Americans killed and wounded caused popular opposition against the war. Many Americans were also horrified by news of cruelties committed against Vietnamese civilians. A policy of Vietnamization of the war was introduced by President Nixon, from the end of 1969. That was due to heavy American losses and opposition from the American public. At first, American troops were reduced by half. Eventually, the USA was forced to withdraw totally from Vietnam. The evacuation process (total withdrawal) started particularly after a cease-fire mediated in February 1973 by Henry Kissinger, the US Secretary of State. The last US troops left Vietnam the same year. In 1974, the government of South Vietnam Collapsed and Vietnam was United as a Single Communist Country.

Activity

Give brief answers to the following questions?

1. What was the importance of the Battle of Dien Bien Phu?
2. What was the significance of the Vietnam War?
3. What was the role of Ho Chi Minh in the struggle for the national liberation of Vietnam?
4. Why did the U.S.S.R. and the Peoples' Democratic Republic of China support North Vietnam?

7.7. The Chinese Socialist Revolution

Terms to Know

- Commune
- Cultural revolution
- Revisionism
- Collectivization
- Inflation
- The Third World
- Co-operative
- Maoism

- Corruption
- Personality cult

Between 1644 and 1911, China was a feudal empire under the Manchu (Ching) Dynasty. After a period of civil war between Chinese war lords, the Kuomintang (Nationalists) and the Communist Party of China took power in alliance, in 1926. The Kuomintang was a bourgeois- nationalist party. The head of the Kuomintang (KMT) was Sun Yat-sen (1866-1925). Sun was a nationalist and anti-imperialist and was

respected by Chinese communists. The Chinese Communist Party (CPC) was founded in 1921. On Sun's death, the leadership of the KMT and its republican government was taken over by Chiang Kai-Shek.

Why did the KMT and the CPC split in 1927?

Unlike Sun, Chiang Kai-Shek was not in favour of the alliance with the CPC. Therefore, in 1927 he dissolved the alliance and started attacks on the communists. Consequently, the Chinese communists made their Long March to Yenan, for safety. The communists covered a journey of over 9,000 kms. And out of the original 100,000 persons that set out for the journey three-quarters perished before they reached their new base area in the north. It was during this period that Mao Zedong emerged as the leader of the CPC.

Why did Japan wage war on China?

In 1931 Japan attacked north- eastern China and took control of the Chinese province of Manchuria. And in 1937, Japan began a total war against China, which has come to be known as the Sino-Japanese War. The war became part of the Second World War in Asia. The KMT under Chiang Kai- Shek and the CPC under Mao formed an alliance to fight against Japanese invaders. But the alliance was a loose one.

During the Second World War, different parts of China were occupied by the forces of the KMT government, the CPC and Japan. Following the surrender of Japan in 1945, the Kuomintang and the Communist forces fought each other to control and take power over the whole of China. In the struggle, the Kuomintang had many advantages. First, the Kuomintang fighting forces outnumbered the Communist forces in a three to one ratio at the beginning. Second, Chiang Kai-Shek, leader of the Kuomintang government, had US assistance, though no American troops were sent to fight in China. Finally, the Allies, including the Soviet Union, recognized the Kuomintang government as the only legal authority in China. But, the communists depended exclusively on the popular support they had among the Chinese peasants who benefited from the Communist land reform policies.

In 1946 a civil war started, when the Kuomintang army started a massive attack against Communist strongholds in northern China. As a result, all the major cities in northern China fell under the Kuomintang forces. But the communists continued to dominate the rural areas. The early success of the Kuomintang forces did not last long. Several factors undermined Kuomintang power internally. There were bad economic conditions in the territories under Kuomintang control. The Kuomintang government suffered

from inflation, corruption and poor military strategy. All these hastened its defeat. In January 1949, the communists captured Beijing, the capital and declared the communist Republic of China. Chiang Kai-shek fled to Taiwan (Formosa) and formed a Nationalist Government at Taipei.

The new communist government had popular support in the Chinese mainland. It also began to obtain international recognition. The first of such international recognitions came from the Soviet Union and its satellites. In 1950 a treaty of friendship, alliance and mutual assistance was signed between Communist China and the Soviet Union. Following that, several other economic agreements were concluded between the two countries. On the basis of these agreements, the Chinese government obtained a great deal

of aid from the Soviets to build the country's industry.

Between 1953 and 1957, China carried out its First Five-Year Plan. The period of its operation was regarded as a "transition to socialism". The plan emphasized on heavy industry and collectivization of agriculture in accordance with socialist principles. During the plan period, the government nationalized banking enterprises, industry and commerce. Thus private ownership of enterprises was abolished.

What was the Great Leap Forward?

In 1958 a more ambitious Second Five-Year Plan was introduced. Mao introduced the plan known as the "Great Leap Forward". It was intended to take China to the second stage of communism. During the Second Five-Year Plan, large farm areas were organized into rural cooperatives called communes. Members of each commune were organized into production brigades. They took responsibilities ranging from farming to weaving. Despite Communist efforts, the commune system failed to meet its immediate goals. As early as 1959, it became clear that Mao's "Great Leap Forward" to the second stage of communism had failed. The main factors for the failure were food shortage, mismanagement and peasant resistance to the communes. In fact, the Great Leap Forward was responsible for a terrible famine during 1958-62, which killed people by hundreds of thousands. The peasant communes proved failures. Although there was disaster in agriculture, China made significant progress in industrialization.

The Communist government was able to improve the life of the Chinese people in some ways, too. Public sanitation and health were greatly improved. Illiteracy was greatly reduced. Women obtained full equality with men. Opium smoking was eradicated.

Explain the main features of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

Along with the successes registered, the Chinese government faced many serious problems. There was power struggle within the Communist Party and opposition from the rural areas. Such opposition was stamped out by the communist state. The so-called enemies of the people or political opponents were jailed or killed. During the first seven years of communist rule, about a million people were

executed. The West regarded China as aggressive, especially in Korea where the Chinese government claimed that it was upholding China's legitimate rights and security. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution of the 1960's was another of Mao's disastrous policies. It started in 1966. It led to economic and political disruption on a big scale before being called off. While it kept hold of monopoly of power, the Chinese Communist Party, has since avoided wild adventurous policies. It has also made cautious experiments in market economies, especially in the countryside.

The foreign policy of the Communist government was active and vigorous. In 1950 China intervened in the Korean War. In the same year, Chinese forces occupied Tibet. Tibet is a mountainous land between India and western China. It had once been part of the Chinese Empire, and China claimed it to be part of China. In 1959 the revolt of the Tibetan nationalists was harshly crushed. Chinese policy and action in Tibet soured its relations with India. Soon afterwards, there was a border dispute between India and China, which led to fighting in 1962.

What was the Mao personality cult?

China's friendly relations with the Soviet Union did not last long. Beginning from the late 1950s relations between the two countries were closely related to the Soviet Union's policy of de-Stalinization. When Khrushchev denounced Stalin's personality cult in 1955, Mao took this as an attack on himself and his leadership in China. In criticizing the USSR after Stalin, Mao also believed that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had turned away from socialism. He labelled what Khrushchev and the U.S.S.R were doing as revisionism.

By revisionism, Mao meant that the Soviet Union was going back to capitalism. He claimed that his own ideas, which were to be labelled as Maoism were the most modern and correct forms of Marxism-Leninism. A development of a Mao personality cult was underway.

Fig 7.6. A Cartoon illustrating the Sino- Soviet Conflict. Khrushchev and Mao are shown bumping heads.

The conflict grew worse as Mao became convinced that the Chinese Communists, not the Soviets, provided the best example of a Marxist-Leninist system in practice. Mao criticized Khrushchev as revisionist and of having gone against Marxist-Leninist ideals. He regarded China as the real model for world communism.

Mao continued to challenge the leadership the Soviets assumed over the world communist movement. This antagonized the Soviets who began to withdraw their support from China. They did not back Chinese actions in Tibet or India. During the early 1960s, both sides began a war of words. The Soviets cancelled all economic and technical programs in China and called back their advisors and specialists. In 1966, the attack against the U.S.S.R became part of the campaign of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. In March 1969, Chinese and Soviet forces clashed over a disputed territory along their common border. Sino-Soviet relations reached a low point. However, the Chinese, already economically and technically self-sufficient, no longer needed Soviet assistance. By then China had become one of the great powers of the World, especially after the Chinese tested their first atomic bomb in 1964. Moreover, China has improved its relations with the USA.

Activity

Give short answers to the following questions

1. What made the Sino-Soviet relations to sour?
2. What was the Chinese Cultural Revolution all about?

Summary

The end of the Second World War saw different significant developments. The post-World War II period saw the success of national liberation movements against colonialism, Cases in point were the independence of India and Indonesia in 1947 and in 1965 respectively.

With the end of World War II emerged the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R as two antagonistic super-powers. Both turned out to be nuclear powers, leading two opposite camps. The U.S.A was the champion of the capitalist world, whereas the U.S.S.R was that of the socialist world. A Cold War developed between the two, until the victory of capitalism over socialism, and the latter's collapse in 1989.

The post-World War II period also saw bitter conflicts and in certain cases dramatic developments. The Arab-Israeli Wars were sad developments. The Vietnam War, with all the casualties and destruction it caused, ended in the victory of communists. The success of the Chinese socialist revolution was also a

blow to the capitalist world. However, China became instrumental in dividing the socialist world. As a result, it also weakened the socialist camp of nations.

Review Questions

Part I. Fill in the blanks with correct responses

1. The Mao personality cult was aimed at _____ .
2. All of the Arab- Israeli Wars ended in the victory of _____ .
3. The city of Saigon is at present known as _____ .
4. _____ lost the Vietnam War.
5. The Cold War was _____ .
6. _____ helped the economic recovery of Western Europe, at the end of the Second World War.

Part II. Say “True” if the statement is correct and “ False” if the statement is incorrect.

- _____ 1. In the post-World War II period, the U.S.S.R was as rich as the U.S.A.
- _____ 2. The Cold War was limited only to Western Europe.
- _____ 3. On independence, British India was divided into India, Pakistan and Bangladesh.
- _____ 4. In order to gain its independence in 1956, Indonesia had to fight against the Dutch.
- _____ 5. In 1948, the whole of Palestine became the independent state of Israel.
- _____ 6. One of the factors for the American failure in the Vietnam War was the opposition from the American Public.
- _____ 7. The Long March of the Chinese Communists saved the communist party of China from destruction.

Part III. Choose the best possible answer from the alternatives given for each question

- _____ 1. During the Yom Kippur War, Israelis defeated
 - a. Yemen
 - b. Egypt
 - c. Pakistan
 - d. India

- _____ 2. The first Arab state that gave official diplomatic recognition to Israel was
- a. Egypt
 - b. Jordan
 - c. Saudi Arabia
 - d. Sudan
- _____ 3. The first president of independent Indonesia was
- a. Suhartu
 - b. Tito
 - c. Nehru
 - d. None
- _____ 4. One of the great supporters of the principles of non-violent struggle in the world was
- a. Fidel Castro
 - b. Mahtma Gandhi
 - c. Mao Zedong
 - d. George Marshall
- _____ 5. Which of the following was not a manifestation of the Cold War?
- a. Propaganda war.
 - b. Absence of economic competition
 - c. Arms race
 - d. Formation of military alliances

Part IV. Match the items in column N with those in S.

N

S

- _____ 1. Truman Doctrine
- A. Communes
- _____ 2. Khrushchev
- B. Friend of Hitler
- _____ 3. Chiang Kai-shek
- C. US right to be world policeman
- _____ 4. Napalm bombs
- D. Anti-Stalin
- _____ 5. Great Leap Forward!
- E. Cuban communism
- _____ 6. Revisionism
- F. Nationalization of the Suez Canal
- _____ 7. Suez War
- G. Mao personality cult
- H. Vietnam

I. World War II

J. Kuomintang Party

K. First Arab- Israeli War

L. Supporter of Stalin

M. Going back to capitalism

Part V. Give short answers to the following questions

1. What were the causes for the Cold War?
2. Why did the Kuomintang lose to the Chinese communists?
3. Explain how British India became independent?
4. Why did the Arab - Israeli conflicts start?
5. Why were the U.S.A and the U.S.S.R called antagonistic super-powers?

UNIT EIGHT

ETHIOPIA FROM AUTOCRACY TO REVOLUTION (1941- 1991)

Introduction

This unit covers the contemporary history of Ethiopia from 1941 to 1991. It explains events that help to understand better present conditions in Ethiopia.

The restoration of the monarchy on independence from Italian Fascist occupation, and the building of an autocratic (absolutist) state by Emperor Haile Sellasie are dealt with, in the first two parts of the unit. Socio-economic and political developments under Haile Selaie's autocracy are discussed. So are the foreign relations of the country.

The last two parts of the unit are concerned with the history of protests, revolts and oppositions to Haile Sellasie's autocratic state. They also deal with the Ethiopian popular revolution that overthrew imperial autocracy, and its replacement by the socialist military dictatorship of the Derg. The nature of the military dictatorship as well as its downfall, and the transition to a federal system of government (the Transitional Government of Ethiopia) are also treated.

Objectives

On successful completion of this unit, students will be able to:

- * discuss the restoration of the monarchy;
- * analyze the features, and the strengthening of Haile Selassie's autocratic state;
- * discuss socio-economic conditions under Haile Selassie's absolutist state;
- * describe the plots, rebellions, revolts and oppositions to Haile Selassie's autocratic state;
- * analyze Ethiopia's foreign relations;
- * discuss the popular Ethiopian revolution and its consequences;
- * discuss the nature of the socialist military dictatorship and outline major developments under it;
- * analyze the destruction of the socialist military dictatorship and the triumph of opposition forces; and
- * describe the transition to the Transitional Government of Ethiopia.

8.1. Restoration of the Monarchy

Terms to Know

- Autocracy
- Foreign aid
- Occupied Enemy Territory
- Collaborators
- Foreign relations
- Restoration
- Concession
- Military base
- Toleration

Haile Selassie's Come Back and British Domination

Haile Selassie re-entered Addis Ababa on May 5, 1941, following the defeat of Italian forces by patriots and British forces, as explained in Unit Five. His imperial power was restored; and he took control of the government of Ethiopia. Patriots, the Orthodox Church and noblemen accepted the restoration of the monarchy. Collaborators of Italian occupation were also pardoned and accommodated in Haile Selassie's new government.

To what extent was the authority of the emperor limited by the British?

However, Haile Selassie's power was limited by the British Military Administration in Ethiopia. The British regarded the whole of Italian East Africa, including Ethiopia, which had come under their control, as Occupied Enemy Territory [OETA]. In the case of Ethiopia, the British practically shared governmental powers with Haile Selassie. The British Occupied Enemy Territory Administration kept for itself powers in the areas of finance, the army and foreign affairs. Overlapping of powers also created problems for Haile Selassie.

Although this arrangement in a way helped Haile Selassie to bring peace and normalization in the countryside, Haile Selassie needed to regulate his relations with the British. He also wanted to regain the complete and independent powers of the monarchy. For that purpose, he negotiated with the British and signed two significant agreements.

On January 31, 1942 the first Anglo-Ethiopian Agreement was signed. This agreement recognized Ethiopia as a sovereign state. However, it allowed the British to have final authority over Ethiopia's foreign relations, administration, finance and the military. The British reasoned that the Second World War was still being fought and Djibouti was under a pro-Nazi, Vichy government, and there might be a danger from that direction. The Emperor had no other choice but to accept what the British asked for. This passive acceptance provided an excuse for the British officials to have extraordinary rights particularly in the Ogaden, and over certain strategic areas, such as the French Somaliland border areas and the Addis-Ababa-Djibouti railway.

What was the idea of Greater Somalia all about?

The British combined the Ogaden with former Italian Somaliland and began to administer the whole area taking Mogadishu as a centre. In 1940 they had proposed to combine the five Somali-inhabited territories of Northern district of Kenya, Italian Somali land, British Somali land, Djibouti and the Ogaden to form a single state called Somalia. Above all, they developed a plan to create what they called "Greater Somalia". Their secret plot in the Reserved Area, along the southeastern borders, forced the Emperor to open another round of negotiations. The Second Anglo-Ethiopian Agreement was signed on December 1944. By this agreement the British recognized the Ogaden and the Reserved Area as an integral parts of Ethiopia. They requested only to remain in the regions for two more years until the end of World War II. They also made some concessions to the Emperor: the right to recruit non-British foreign personnel and to use the Djibouti railway line as an outlet. They also agreed to train an Ethiopian military force, to replace their army, which had been dominant in the country since 1941.

In 1948 the UN placed Italian Somaliland under Italian Trusteeship. With this the British desire to realize the idea of Greater Somalia failed. The British agreed to the return of the Ogaden to Ethiopia. But they kept the Haud grazing land and also the corridor known as the "Reserved Area", stretching from the Haud to the border of French Somaliland, as part of British Somaliland. The return of Ogaden was a diplomatic victory for the Emperor.

After another round of diplomatic talks, the British gave up and restored the Haud and the Reserved Area to the Ethiopian government in 1955. Political groups in British Somaliland and in the Italian Trust territory expressed their protest against the British agreement with Ethiopia over the Haud. Some

members of those groups came into the Ogaden and agitated the people to rebel. The Ethiopian government responded by using force which helped it to regain control over the region.

Period of American Influence

After World War II American influence became powerful in the Middle East. At this time it was Ethiopia which took the initiative to get closer to the Americans. The Emperor, who could no longer tolerate British heavy-hand over Ethiopia, wanted alliance with the USA. Official contacts between the two states began in 1943. Ethiopia formally requested the U.S.A for military aid as well as other experts and legal advisors. In 1945, the Emperor met President Roosevelt in Egypt and asked for support in the struggle to regain the Ogaden and Eritrea. The understanding reached there became the basis for future Ethiopian-American friendship and cooperation.

Why did the decide to USA become an ally of Haile Selassie's Ethiopia?

The Americans had felt the strategic importance of the Red Sea and in particular the Radio Marina in Eritrea. They had already taken control of Radio Marina in 1942. After 1953 Radio Marine (Qagnew station) became a large self-contained base, with more than 300 U.S. military personnel, and became an important link in the U.S global communications network.

In 1948, Britain decided to bring an end to her administration in Eritrea. American replaced Britain as the dominant power in Ethiopia since 1953. The threat from the communist bloc made Eritrea an increasingly valuable asset to retain. Thus the Americans preferred Eritrea to be a part of Ethiopia and supported Ethiopia's claim over that territory.

Ethiopia's stand in the Korean War convinced the Americans more. During the Korean War (1950-53) the Emperor showed willingness to provide troops to fight under the U.N., which deployed chiefly American forces. North Korea's goal was to unite South Korea with the North under communism. The UN gave military support to South Korea. Ethiopia's participation in the War was an indication that it identified its interest with the western world. The Americans took Ethiopia as a potential ally, which might play an important role in the politics of the Middle East. Once the federation of Eritrea with Ethiopia was endorsed, the Ethiopian government persuaded the USA to give it military support. In October 1952 negotiations were held to regularize the status of the U.S. communications base. By then the base was named the "Qagnew Station" to commemorate the Ethiopian battalion that fought in Korea and returned on 22 May 1952. The two states signed an agreement in 1953 governing the Qagnew Station and other facilities in Eritrea which remained in force until 1978.

Two additional agreements strengthened the Ethio- American partnership. The "Point Four Agreement" signed in 1952 laid the foundation for American assistance in the field of education and public health. Point Four, as the organization came to be known, was involved in agricultural, public health, education, tourist and public administration training and awarding of scholarships. In 1953, another treaty was signed for US military assistance. A unit known as Military Assistance and Advisory

Group (MAAG) was assigned to all branches of military units and training institutions of the Ethiopian armed forces.

The U.S.A gave to Ethiopia military aid which increased after 1960, particularly when Somalia became independent and entered into conflict with Ethiopia. By 1970, 60 per cent of the USA's military aid to Africa went to Ethiopia. By then American support to Ethiopia maintained by far the largest army in sub-Saharan Africa. The USA and the USSR were playing the Cold War game in the Horn of Africa, since Somalia was getting similar military aid from the U.S.S.R.

American military assistance enabled Ethiopian troops to play the role of international peace-keeper under the UN in Africa. In 1960, during the Congo Crisis Ethiopian troops served as a UN peace-keeping force.

American assistance was also given in the field of civil aviation. In 1945 the American Trans-continental and Western Air Lines (TWA) helped to set up the Ethiopian Air Lines (EAL), Providing it managerial and supervisory personnel.

The other major area of American support was in the field of road repair and construction. Roads built by the Italians had been badly damaged in the course of the war of liberation and repair was a burden on the Ethiopian government. In January 1957, the Imperial Highway Authority was established with the help of the Americans. Loans for repair and road construction were obtained from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), mostly funded by the U.S.A. American influence was also great in the sphere of education. With the exception of a few elite schools run by the British and the French, education was conducted along American lines. In the national University, the enrolment and evaluation system were modelled on standard American colleges.

American Peace Corps volunteer teachers, who came in the 1960s, accepted teaching assignments in the high schools, even in remote towns. They contributed a lot in advancing education in Ethiopia.

Later, however, anti-Americanism grew strong among the left-wing University students in the late 1960's and early 1970s. These students viewed the USA as an imperialist state supporting a regime which was reactionary and an obstacle to progress. Furthermore, the value of Ethiopia for the USA diminished in the 1970's. That was because the U.S.A was able to get a new ally in the Red Sea region. The new ally was Egypt under president Anwar Sadat. Previously Egypt, under President Gamal Abdl Nasser, had been an ally of the U.S.S.R. But that changed after 1973. As a result, when Haile Sellassie's government crumbled, the U.S.A did not come to its help.

Ethiopia was scarcely capitalist even on the eve of the 1974 Revolution. There was only a very small commercial bourgeoisie, and hardly an industrial bourgeoisie. Therefore, like other Third World countries, Ethiopia found itself in a position of dependence on external capitalist countries. Haile Sellassie built his absolutism through external support, particularly from the U.S.A.

Activity

Answer the following questions briefly.

1. Explain the following

- i) Occupied Enemy Territory
- ii) MAAG
- iii) Peace Corps
- iv) Qagnew station

2. Why was the British Occupied Enemy Territory Administration against returning the Ogaden, Haud and Eritrea to Ethiopia?

3. What was the basis of the friendship of the USA and Ethiopia, between 1952 and 1974?

8.2. Consolidation of Autocratic Power

Terms to Know

- Absolutist state
- Feudalism
- Proposal
- Aristocracy
- Federation
- Proclamation
- Autocracy
- Figurehead
- Rebellion
- Bourgeoisie
- Land reform
- Senate
- Centralization
- Land tenure
- Slogan
- Chamber of Deputies
- "Land to the tiller"
- Tenancy
- Conservative
- Manipulation
- Universal adult suffrage
- Conspiracy
- Neeh Lebash

Building Autocratic Control in Central Administration

Regarding centralization, the different decrees passed 1942 and 1943 became the pillars of Haile Sellassie's power. Those were decrees that concentrated more political, administrative and economic powers in the hands of the central government at Addis Ababa at the expense of the provincial (regional) lords and administrations. From the outset, the Emperor began to promote some young men of humble origins to positions of considerable authority to fulfil his policy of centralization. A part of this young group had got modern education; and they could put into effect his modernization plans. Through these men he managed to have control over government bodies. As they had no traditional power base, like the hereditary nobles, they could be expected to remain loyal to the emperor. Loyalty to the person of the Emperor was the chief criterion for recruitment and promotion of all individuals, of whatever origin, to higher posts.

To ensure the loyalty of his most important state officials, the Emperor followed the tradition of marriage alliances. Marriage into the royal family brought rapid promotions to several educated Ethiopians and men of noble background. Another road to promotion was being in the service of the royal palace. The sons of loyal persons were more preferred to the nobility of birth. Similarly, exiles who were loyal to the Emperor were more preferred to patriots who had genuinely fought for their country. Such connections to the Emperor and the royal family made officials be totally subservient to the will of the Emperor, and blindly obey him.

Most of the high ranking officials and the ministers of government frequently visited the Emperor at his palace to report on all matters that required his directives and decisions. The order of the Emperor was made effective through the Ministry of Pen. The Minister had the traditional title of Tsehafe Tezaz (literally, scribe). The most prominent political figure who held this post from 1941 to 1955 was Tsehafe Tezaz Wolde Giorgis Wolde Yohannes. Wolde Girogis was powerful and smart. He used his powers, at times, for political intrigues against the other ministers. Opposition to the Tsehafe Tezaz was organized by Mokonen Habtewold, the Minister of Finance, who finally had him sacked from the post in 1955.

How did Haile Selassie build his absolutist state, despite the influence of the feudal lords of the regions?

The Prime Minister, Makonen Endalkatchew, remained a nominal figurehead from 1943 to 1957. He was later appointed President of the Senate. Although Aklilu Habtewold had become Minister of Pen in 1958, it was actually in 1961 that he assumed real power as Prime Minister and Tsehafe Tezaz. He did not have as much power as Wolde Giorgis. This helped the Emperor to exercise his autocratic power without any limit.

Haile Sellassie was well aware of the sources of danger. Therefore, he assigned the aristocrats to posts away from the centre. Such prominent figures as Asrate Kassa, the son of the renowned Patriot Ras Kassa, was made governor of Eritrea with the intent of removing him from the center of power. Endalkatchew Makonen and Michael Imiru were assigned to ambassadorial posts. The only exceptions were Abiy Abebe and Yilma Deresa. Abiy was appointed Minister of War, and Yilma Minister of Finance. The rest of the leading figures such as Ras Kassa Haylu, Ras Seyoum Mangasha, Ras Mesfin Seleshi and Ras Imiru Haile Sellassie were made members of the Crown Council at various times. This gave them some opportunity for political influence. This was the method Haile Selassie used to maintain his autocratic position, by playing off the nobility of birth against the nobility of service.

Haile Sellassie had also full control over the fiscal (financial) system which remained the pillar of his power. In the post-war years, the Ministry of Finance emerged as the most influential agency of the government. The Emperor had control over all allocations of state revenues until the early 1960s. The Emperor used budget in the manner of a benevolent father, and at times ordered expenditures for non-governmental purposes.

Provincial Administration

In principle, provincial administration was left to the traditional ruling powers. But in practice, the recruitment remained under the strict control of the Emperor. To overcome regional tendencies, generally the nobility were deprived of their traditional political rights. But for two provinces (Tigray and Eritrea under two noblemen), the rest of the provinces were generally governed by members of the royal family, loyal officials of no aristocratic background or close friends of the royal family.

The country was divided into 12 administrative provinces. Later, the provinces were made 13 by splitting Hararghe into two and creating Bale, as a separate province. Finally with the federation of Eritrea with Ethiopia, the total number of the provinces became 14, which were divided into sub-

provinces (Awrajas) and districts (Woredas). According to the 1964 count, there were 99 awrajas (sub-provinces), 444 districts and 1,328 sub-districts, over which a uniform administrative structure was forced from the central government.

Governor-generals of the provinces as a rule were persons with traditional education, with no modern qualifications. What was expected from them was loyalty and the maintenance of "peace and security" (Tsetita). They had supreme power over all civil servants, according to imperial directives.

The 1955 Revised Constitution

The 1931 Constitution was revised in 1955 mainly to create a false positive image for the state. It was revised also to have similarity to that of Eritrea, which had a more progressive constitution and was federated with Ethiopia in 1952. In reality, however, the 1955 Constitution still stressed the special rights of the Crown. About a quarter of its articles were concerned with the issue of imperial succession and the power of the Emperor at large. It was largely a legal charter for the consolidation of absolutism. One of its provisions (articles) states that "By virtue of His Imperial Blood, as well as by the anointing which he has received, the person of the Emperor is Sacred. His dignity is inviolable and His power indisputable".

Why was the Revised Constitution undemocratic?

In the 1955 Revised Constitution, provisions on human rights, such as freedom of speech and of the press were included, but were made ineffective by phrases such as "in accordance with the law." or "within the limits of the law". If there was anything progressive in it, it was the introduction of the representative principle for the Chamber of Deputies. Its members were made elective on the basis of universal adult suffrage. Hence the Lower House of the Parliament was to be filled by elected representatives of the people, beginning from 1957. The Senate remained an appointed chamber. The Emperor kept the power and the right to postpone, extend and suspend sessions and to dissolve the Parliament. The President of the Senate was appointed by the Emperor while the President of the Chamber of Deputies was elected by the members. Proposals of either Houses of the Parliament (the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies) were forwarded to the Emperor through the Prime Minister for approval to become a law. The Parliament had no right of selecting the Prime Minister and the Council of Ministers, who remained accountable to the Emperor and chosen by him.

Most of the elected members of the Lower House (Chamber) were in fact themselves conservatives. There was a property qualification for being a candidate, and a number of the Deputies were in fact landlords. Political parties were not allowed.

Like the feeble role assigned to the Parliament, the post of the Prime Minister meant little until the failed coup d'etat of 1960. The coup was a shock to the Emperor. Haile Selassie was forced to examine political conditions in the country. Committees were formed to study and recommend reforms. The Committee of Constitutional Revision recommended that the function and position of the Head of State be separated from the function and position of the Head of Government. It also recommended that

executive authority be transferred from the Emperor to the Prime Minister and the Council of Ministers. In 1960 the Emperor announced that he had made a significant change in the position of the Prime Minister and the Council of Ministers, and that the ministers would be responsible to the Prime Minister. Thereafter the Prime Minister and the Ministers would be collectively responsible to the Emperor and Parliament. But, all this was not practically implemented and the power of the Emperor remained intact up to the outbreak of the 1974 Revolution.

Modern Military Forces and the Security

From the outset, Tafari Makonen (the future Emperor Haile Sellassie I) had the desire of establishing a standing army as you have studied in Unit Three.

After liberation, the Holeta Military School resumed its functions and trained officers for the Imperial Army with British teaching staff after 1942. Training for the Imperial Bodyguard was started in Addis Ababa, staffed by a Swedish mission. The Holeta Military School recruited students with elementary education, and later non-commissioned officers with long years of service. They were given short-term courses which enabled them to graduate as commissioned lieutenants.

A higher institution, the Haile Sellassie Military Academy, was opened at Harar in 1957 with a staff of Indian instructors. Promising students from secondary schools and freshmen of the University College were recruited to join in the Academy. The graduates from this academy became the first modern trained officers appointed to leadership in the military units, including in the Imperial Bodyguard. More than any other military unit, the Emperor trusted the Bodyguard unit, for personal security and control. Officers from the Bodyguard unit were the most privileged. The commanders of this unit acted as the Emperor's chief advisors in all matters of military affairs. The Bodyguard functioned as an instrument of control against opposition in other military units.

The Imperial Air Force was set up in 1947. The Norwegians helped the formation of the Imperial Navy after the federation of Eritrea with Ethiopia.

In 1942, the modern Ethiopian Police Force was at first organized largely along British lines. Later, the Germans and Israelis assisted it. Under it was the Department of Public Security, which was responsible to the Ministry of the Interior. Its main task was to suppress any political opposition. In the 1950s, the Americans became responsible for the training of the Ethiopian armed forces. The Americans financed and equipped four divisions. By then the Ethiopian army evolved to become, the biggest military force in sub-Saharan Africa. Although primarily set up for external defence, in extreme cases it was used against internal opposition as well.

Another unit thinly spread out in the countryside was the Netch Lebash which was organized after liberation. They were loyal volunteers and had no regular salary for their services. The Territorial Army, an auxiliary military force, was established in 1959 to replace the Netch Lebash, under the Ministry of the Interior. It was used by provincial governors. The duty of the Territorial Army was the maintenance of peace, in collaboration with the regular Police Force. It was also used to control any political opposition by peasants.

Major Weaknesses of the Autocratic State

From the above pages of the examination of the various features of Haile Selassies's autocratic state, the major weaknesses of the state could be identified. Among the major weaknesses of the autocratic state were found the following.

- Absence of democratic rights.
- Lack of enough modernization in all sectors.
- Backward socio-economic conditions.
- Dependence on foreign assistance.
- Absence of agrarian, including land tenure, reforms.
- Failure to address properly the question of the nationalities.
- Failure to make political reforms, including democratization.

Socio-economic Conditions, Land Tenure and Agriculture

In the 1960s, more than 90 percent of the population still lived in the countryside engaged in agricultural work. Agriculture still accounted for about 60 percent of the gross domestic product (GDP). Though the Italian occupation helped urbanization at a relatively rapid pace, there was no corresponding transformation in the agrarian system. The peasants continued with subsistence agriculture, using traditional farming techniques. Peasants continued to work on the land raising a variety of cereals for subsistence. They also used their little produce to pay taxes to the state and other tributes. The landed upper classes continued to take away their surplus, investing little. Usually, they did not care about any technical innovations, and were against social reforms.

Most of the rural population lived a wretched life in conditions where health and education facilities were scarce. Both kinds of facilities were concentrated in the cities and towns, far from the reach of the peasants. Ethiopia was one of the least developed countries in the World. The state and the land lords impoverished the peasantry through taxation, rent and other customary dues. This exploitative social and economic relationship continued up to the outbreak of the 1974 revolution.

After liberation from Italian rule the government had passed a series of proclamations. In 1941a decree that regularized provincial administration was issued. This decree stated that all government employees were to be paid salaries from the state. It also abolished the traditional rights of state officials to collect dues in lieu of salaries. In 1942 another proclamation was issued which established a uniform rate of taxation to be paid in official currency. To this effect, land was classified into three

categories: cultivated, semi-cultivated and uncultivated. And a land tax had to be paid on receipts to the taxpayers.

Under Haile Selassie's government, why was the spread of tenancy more in southern Ethiopia than in the northern part?

A proclamation issued in 1944 raised the amount of land tax and required payments to be made in money instead of the former *asrat*, which had been paid in kind. The 1944 proclamation theoretically abolished fees and labour services put on peasants. In fact, they continued to be collected. Moreover, in 1947 and 1959 an education tax and a health tax respectively were introduced. These acts were imposed on land. The acts added to the state revenue but increased the burdens on the tiller. It is worth noting that not much return in education and health services flowed back to the countryside from these two additional taxes.

Besides this, the post-liberation period witnessed the remarkable acceleration of land privatization in central and southern Ethiopia. This process came to happen in three ways. In the first place, the northern settlers (non-local government officials and descendants of the *neftegna* who acquired tributary rights over southern peasants turned the land into private property. Secondly, the *Madarya* (literally, temporary grant) holders who had been granted land in lieu of salary, particularly after liberation, got the right to convert it into private holding. The third and most common way of acquiring private land was the government's extensive grants of <government land> to patriot soldiers and civil servants. Those were allowed to convert it into private holdings. Most of the so-called state land was actually being cultivated by indigenous farmers. As land without cultivators was of no value, the recipient of the grants preferred land with *gabbars* (tenants). Thus, the grant of such lands turned the cultivators into tenants of the land recipient.

Hence, the greater part of the agricultural sector in some areas came under the control of a few rich landowners. Privatization then resulted in the spread of tenancy, particularly in the southern provinces.

Another problem related to tenancy was the absence of legal forms of contract between the landlords and the tenants. Tenancy agreement was verbal. The verbal contract was on the basis of sharecropping arrangements that could be one fourth (*erbo*) or one third (*siso*) or one half (*equal arash*). Besides, the tenant had no guarantee for his position for the duration of his tenancy and amount to be paid, which varied according to the crop yield. Thus, he was reluctant to add inputs, as the surplus usually went to the landowner.

The failed military coup d'état of 1960 demonstrated, among other things, the quick need for agrarian reform. As a result of the shock created by that event, and the continuing pressure, from outside, the government initiated a policy that could reduce the plight of the peasants and promote agricultural development. To this effect, a series of laws was introduced in the Parliament, between 1961 and 1971. In 1961 a committee of land reform was established. In 1965 a Land Reform and Development Authority was established, which became the Ministry of Land Reform and Administration in 1966. A tenancy bill was presented to Parliament and rejected. This prompted University students to

stage a demonstration in front of Parliament, under the slogan "Land to the Tiller." This was the beginning phase of the student movement.

Trade and Industry

In the 1960s, there was low circulation of goods in Ethiopia and a low volume of export commodities. Regarding export commodities, coffee accounted for up to 65 percent of foreign earnings followed by hides and skins. Pulses and oil seeds were exported on a very small scale. The bulk of the coffee export went to the United States, which received 70 percent of the total. Italy and Japan provided most of Ethiopia's imports, the USA being the third.

Before the Italian occupation, the Arada was the market centre of Addis Ababa. It had been a popular place frequented by foreign traders. They had been engaged in selling consumer items and import and export business. With the coming of the Italians, its popularity weakened, and it was replaced by the Mercato. The Italians deliberately removed the foreign traders; and this opened the way for the emergence of national traders. The Mercato became the centre of the national traders. However, this did not bring in the emergence of a large national bourgeoisie. Only a handful of Ethiopian traders were involved in the export and import trade after the liberation.

How much was the contribution of industry to the economy of Ethiopia, between 1941 and 1974?

After liberation, the state assumed a larger role in business. The government established big firms to carry out the business of export and import. In 1952, the General Ethiopian Transport Company popularly known as Anbasa was established. It was a share company with a capital of Eth \$96000,000, of which the government and the Emperor (through Makonnen) owned a third. Italian drivers and mechanics were employed to put abandoned trucks into operation. As a result, 20 buses came to provide both inter-urban and intra-urban services.

Regarding industry, the government policy was to establish import substitution factories. Despite the government's policy, which offered security to foreign investors, capitalist manufacturing production was very small. It focused only on light industries producing basic consumables such as processed food, textiles, beverages, leather and wood products and employed obsolete technology. Most of the enterprises were based on abandoned Italian firms.

But the most important enterprise was the manufacturing industry established by the Dutch Company (HVA). In 1954 it set up two major centers of sugar production, the first at Wanji and the second at Matahara, both along the Awash river. The Wanji plant was established on what the Italians had already started. In 1958 the Dutch company was renamed HVA Ethiopia, but Ethiopia's share in the capital was barely 20 percent. As a result, the profit mainly enriched the Dutch company rather than the Ethiopian government.

Industry contributed little to government revenue. The main sources of government revenues were land tax, customs duties and the Adola gold mine. By 1944 it was estimated that the total revenue was about £2,843,600. The Adola gold mining constituted nearly a fifth of the total revenue.

In general, the post-1941 Ethiopian economy was showing relative progress, but at a very slow pace. Socio-economic conditions had backwardness and under-development as their main features. The per capita income was among the lowest in the world. More than 90% of the population was illiterate. Subsistence agriculture was the dominant feature of the economy. The industrial sector was dominated by foreign capital. The gap between revenue and expenditure forced the government to turn to foreign loans, which were mostly obtained from the USA.

Education

Historically, secular modern education was a recent introduction of the early 20th century. After the liberation, from Italian occupation, the Emperor started again his policy of expanding schools. A Ministry of Education and Fine Arts was created in 1941. The first budget for education was adopted for the year 1943/44. The post-liberation era saw the opening of secondary schools and institutions for higher education.

The Haile Sellassie I Secondary School was founded in 1943, to be followed by the Wingate Secondary School in 1946, both in Addis Ababa. The latter was sponsored by the British. By 1950, more than 500 primary schools and four secondary schools had come into existence, with about 56,000 student enrolment. Correspondingly, the budget for education rose from less than Eth \$1 million in 1943/44 to about Eth \$ 10 million in 1950. With time, the number of schools increased.

What were some of the weaknesses of the educational sector, under the government of Haile Sellassie?

There were great difference between urban and rural areas in education. Educational facilities were concentrated in towns and administrative centers, while rural areas were sparsely covered. High concentrations were in the provinces of Shoa and Eritrea, especially in Addis Ababa and Asmara. There was difference of the sex ratio in the student population, with far more boys than girls attending school.

Another problem was the shortage of teaching personnel. In 1968 four teacher training institutes had a combined student body of only 1, 722 students. Altogether there were about 10,000 Ethiopian teachers at all levels in 1968. The shortage in teachers was met through recruitment of foreign teachers at secondary school level. Mostly Indians, and American Peace Corps volunteers filled the gap in the 1960s. Later, Ethiopian university students were made give a one year national service before graduation.

Higher education was introduced in 1950. In that year the University College of Addis Ababa was founded. In 1961, the university College of Addis Ababa together with other colleges became the Haile Sellassie I University. In 1967, a new university was organized in Asmara by Catholic nuns, who had been operating in the Catholic secondary school there. In 1972, this institution was taken over by the state.

Another crucial factor in the expansion of the educational system in Ethiopia was the financial problem. State investment in this sector of social development had not provided the needed amount for rapid growth.

Ethio-Eritrean Federation and Union

Eritrea became an Italian colony in 1890. In 1941, with the expulsion of the Fascist army, it was taken over by the British administration as an Occupied Enemy Territory. By the time the Emperor was raising the Ethiopian flag in Addis Ababa on May 5, 1941, the people in Asmara were holding a demonstration calling for the reunification of Eritrea with Ethiopia. On the same day, the leaders of the demonstration announced the formation of the Unionist Party, an organization that was to play an important role in the future of Eritrea.

With the coming of the British, Eritrea made some advance towards political development. The British allowed the right of free speech and press, and the right to form political parties. Political parties grew in number within a short period. Nevertheless, these political parties were founded on ethnic and religious basis. The British deliberately encouraged differences among these parties. That was because they had the plan of separating the western lowland region to add it to their colony, the Sudan. Regarding the highland territory of the Tsegreña-speaking groups, they planned to join it with Tigray to form a separate Tigray State. To this effect, the British proposed in 1943 to the Eritrean highland elites the formation of a united Tigray. Those that accepted the proposal formed a separatist group that later evolved into what came to be known as the Liberal Progressive Party led by Ras Tessema Asmerom. Besides, the British encouraged the Muslims to establish their own political organization. In 1946, the Muslim League was formed. It demanded independence for Muslim-inhabited lowland Eritrea or union with the Sudan. Between January and February 1947, the Unionist Party, the Liberal Progressive Party and the Muslim League were duly registered. A pro-Italian party was also formed later, towards the end of the year. This party wanted the return of Italian colonial rule under the cover of UN Trusteeship. It was dominated by Italians and half-castes, who were well established in Eritrea. However, it had few followers and could not play any meaningful role at the coming of the Commission of Enquiry.

In 1947, the Four Powers Commission of Enquiry, representing the USA, USSR, Britain and France, was sent to Eritrea to determine the future of Eritrean people. The arrival of the Commission signaled the climax of political agitation, in which the Unionist Party and the Muslim League came out as the major rivals. In 1948, an assessment of people's opinion was held in Asmara, on the future of Eritrea. Close to 50 per cent stood for independence, while others voted for unity with Ethiopia, and a few chose union with the Sudan. As a result, the Commission could not decide and referred the matter to the UN General Assembly in 1948.

How did the federation of Eritrea with Ethiopia come about?

In 1950, the UN appointed a Commission of five men from Burma, Guatemala, Norway, Pakistan and South Africa to decide the fate of Eritrea. But the Commission did not come to unanimity over the issue. Two members, from Guatemala and Pakistan, opted for independence. South Africa and Burma recommended federation with Ethiopia. Norway favoured union with Ethiopia. The UN General Assembly supported the majority opinion, and the USA and Britain followed. As a result, the General Assembly voted to that effect in 1950. Accordingly, Eritrea was federated with Ethiopia in 1952.

An Eritrean constitution was written by the UN, which among other things prohibited (according to Article 91) the Eritrean Parliament from passing legislation that violated the Federal Act. Political parties were organized and competed for the seats in the Legislature. In the first election of 1952, the pro-Ethiopian Unionist Party emerged as the largest party. It got 32 out of the 68 seats in the Parliament. The founder of the party, Tedla Bahru, became the chief Executive of Eritrea.

At the outset of the federal arrangement, the Emperor and his representatives were against Eritrea's separate identity under the federal system. They accepted the arrangement only out of necessity. The Emperor did not want to accept the special status given to Eritrea. He feared that the relatively higher degree of democracy and civil liberty exercised by the Eritreans might incite the rest of the Ethiopian people that were under his autocratic rule. However, Prime Minister Akililu Habtewold was able to see in time the danger of the dissolution of the Eritrean Federation, and opposed to it in the early 1960s. But the Emperor was determined to follow his own interests and transplanted his autocratic rule in Eritrea. This antagonized all the Eritrean parties including the Unionist Party that had struggled for the union of Eritrea with Ethiopia. In 1955 Tedla Bahru, the Chief Executive of the Eritrean Assembly, resigned under pressure from the Emperor, and was replaced by Asrate Kassa, a Shoan notable. Following that, the Emperor made Amharic the official language in place of Arabic and Tigrigna. He also terminated the use of an Eritrean flag and hoisted the Ethiopian flag instead. In addition, he forbade all sorts of political activities. He appointed more loyal Christians to responsible positions.

In November 1962, the Eritrean Assembly voted itself out of existence by ending the federal arrangement and decided to unite with the rest of Ethiopia. Eritrea lost its federal status and became one of the provinces of Ethiopia. The extinction of the federation consolidated internal and external opposition. Four years earlier, in 1958, Eritreans in exile had already founded the Eritrean Liberation Movement (ELM) in Cairo. The ELM was a movement which sought to achieve its objective by political and diplomatic means, including intervention from the UN. This organization was soon neutralized, and the Eritrean Liberation Front (ELF) came into existence in 1961 established by Eritrean exiles in the Middle East. The ELF started to receive Iraqi and Syrian support. It started to launch armed attacks in September of that year, under the leadership of a former rebel, Idris Awate, in the western lowlands.

But the ELF's sectarian conception of the struggle soon resulted in division within itself. As a result, three major groups emerged. These three groups began the process of merger in 1972 to form the Eritrean Liberation Front and Popular Liberation Force (ELF-PLF). In 1973 the Eritrean People's Liberation Front (EPLF) was formed.

The last years of Haile Selassie's reign witnessed two organizations competing for recognition as leader of the Eritrean separatist movements: ELF and EPLF, or in their popular Arabic designation Jabha (Front) and Sha'abiya (Popular). The two groups carried out a relentless struggle for supremacy in the period from 1972-1974, in which the EPLF triumphed. By 1974, the EPLF had over 10,000 members in the field fighting against the Ethiopian army.

Until the outbreak of the 1974 Revolution, the movement in Eritrea remained only a local issue without gaining wider international recognition. It was only a few Arab states which were sympathetic to the movement and provided material support. They regarded Eritrea as an "Arab" land and hated the regime of Haile Selassie because of its close ties with Israel.

After the 1967 Arab–Israeli War, most states of the Middle East and the Persian Gulf adopted a strong anti-Zionist policy. This was a great opportunity to the Eritrean cause. Arab support to the Eritrean movement became significant.

In Ethiopia, even the Ethiopian leftists in the student movement, which had a firm stand on Ethiopian unity, in principle adopted the position of recognizing the right of Eritreans to self-determination.

Early Oppositions against Haile Selassie's Government

In 1936, some prominent men among the aristocrats boldly opposed the Emperor's decision to go into exile to appeal to the League of Nations. When in 1941, he was restored to his throne with the backing of the British government, many resented his restoration to power. On top of that, the Emperor favored the exiles and even some collaborators, ('bandas',) ignoring and marginalizing the genuine patriots.

Why did several patriotic leaders oppose the return of Haile Selassie to power in 1941?

Blatta Takala Walda Hawaryat was one of the most renowned patriots of the occupation period, who organized the patriots to fight against the Fascists. He tried all means to prevent the Emperor from returning to the throne in 1941. When the Emperor was restored to power he started to plot against him. His first plot started soon after liberation in 1941. His plot was uncovered but he was put in prison and freed in 1945. He was again involved in another plot the following year. This time his detention lasted until 1954. On his release, Takala was given a high government post, becoming successively Vice Minister of the Interior and Afa Negus. In November, 1969, however, he organized a group of armed men to assassinate the Emperor. The plot was discovered, and he was killed in a shoot - out with the police.

Belay Zeleke was another famous patriotic leader in the struggle against the fascists from his home base, in eastern Gojjam. His courage made him a legendary hero throughout Gojjam and Ethiopia at large. His popularity was not very much appreciated by the Emperor. The Emperor was very suspicious of him and wanted to remove him from his home base. To this effect, the Emperor gave Belay the choice of either to be Governor- General of one of the provinces in the south of the country with the title of Ras or governor of Bichena Awraja. Belay rejected the former and accepted the latter. The Emperor granted other Gojjame patriots high titles and positions. But Belay was rewarded with only the title of Dejazmatch and made governor of Bichena district. Belay, a man with a great ambition, did not like what he got. More than that, the loss of Mota and part of Debre Marqos districts which had been under his control, angered him as a disgrace to his reputation. Out of anger, Belay made the ill-fated decision to stand up against the government by turning to banditry. He expressed his grievance by disobeying orders coming from both the Governor-General and the central government. In February, 1944 a combined force from the rest of Gojjam and Addis Ababa invaded his district. After three months of

fighting, he surrendered and was brought to Addis Ababa. There, he was kept in prison. A few months later, he broke out of prison, but was captured on his way to Gojjam. He was brought back to Addis Ababa, and was later made to stand trial and was publicly hanged.

Bitwaded Negash Bezabih was the grandson of King Tekle Haimanot of Gojjam. Like several others, he was a renowned patriot in Gojjam during the Italian occupation. He had reached the rank of Vice-Minister and had been appointed President of the Senate before his conspiracy. In 1951 he led a plot against the Emperor. The plot, reportedly, was to assassinate the emperor and proclaim a republic. In his attempt he got the support of some former patriots and army members. The plot was, however, discovered. The plotters were caught while carrying on a secret meeting. They were tried and sentenced to various terms of imprisonment. The plot, like the others before it, was carried out on an individual basis, uncoordinated, and destined to failure.

The Weyane Rebellion of 1942-43

After 1941, the newly restored regime made a quick move towards Tigray, in particular to reassert its authority by imposing taxation. Here the challenge came from traditional lords. Moreover, British influence was very high, because the British wanted to administer Eritrea and Tigray as the Italians had united them in 1936-1941. To prevent the British plan, Haile Selassie appointed his own officials in the province. The officials, however, were corrupt. They used unnecessary force and fraud in the process of tax collection. Furthermore the peasants were forced to provide provisions to tax assessors and their followers. Sometimes, the government stationed contingents of militia in districts, until all taxes were collected. The cultivators had to support the militia in districts until all taxes were collected. A case in point was the militia stationed between Korem and Quiha, who were poorly paid and as a result turned to looting, and raping of peasants, as well as creating destruction.

What were the causes for the Weyane Rebellion?

Another cause of the rebellion was the age-old conflict between the Raya and Azebo ethnic groups and the government. The Raya and Azebo ethnic groups on the eastern edge of the Tigray plateau did not want to lose their traditional local powers to the government. The Wajirat, who were Christians, had elected elders with administrative power. In general, as long as they had been willing to pay tribute, they had been left to exercise their traditional rights in former times. The conflict cropped up when the state started to appoint its own administrators in the region. In addition, some of the nobility joined the revolt to regain traditional privileges. The Weyane rebellion achieved some remarkable success under an able leader, Blatta Haile Mariam Radda, and spread over a wide area between 1942 and 1943.

The government assigned the former patriot leader Ras Abebe Aregay to command its forces against the rebellion. The government also appealed successfully to the British for air attacks on the rebels. Finally, artillery and bombing from the air crushed the rebellion by the end of 1943.

Activity

8.3. Challenge to the Regime

Terms to Know

- Boycott
- Coup d'état
- Commission
- Famine
- Liberation front
- Martial law
- Militia
- Peasant rebellion
- Radicalism
- Reactionary
- Self-determination
- Student association
- Sovereignty
- State of emergency
- Terra irredenta

The imperial absolutist state faced serious challenges that came one after the other. It was able to survive most of them. But the popular revolution of 1974, finally, destroyed the imperial regime. In this sub-section of the Unit are examined the major challenges it survived and the problems which it did not.

The Failed Coup d'état of 1960

The 1960 attempted coup d'état was the first of its kind. It was organized by educated officials to overthrow Haile Selassie's government. Its leader was General Mengistu Neway, the Commander of the Imperial Bodyguard. The master-mind behind the coup was his younger brother Germame Neway. Germame had returned to Ethiopia by imperial order in 1954, after graduating with an M.A degree in Social Sciences in the USA. He worked for the government under various capacities. Realizing that any peaceful way of change and reform was impossible, Germame and his brother Mengistu turned to a coup d'état, with the help of officers in the Imperial Bodyguard.

When the coup started, the rebels made their intention public by stating the backwardness of the country in contrast to the newly independent African states. The latter were showing rapid progress in the path of development. Thus, without directly attacking the Emperor, they pointed out the ineffectiveness of his regime to bring about real progress.

Securing the support of the Chief of the Addis Ababa Police Force the rebels launched tactical surprise. They seized public buildings and took as hostages some members of the imperial family and leading figures in the government. The reign of Haile Selassie was declared to have ended. Asfawosen was made the mouth-piece of the rebels; he was to be the constitutional monarch of the country, paid

and salaried. On December 14, 1960 a new government was declared. The Head of Government was to be the liberal aristocrat Ras Imiru Haile Selassie (a close relative of the Emperor).

The rebels failed to put other leading officials, nobles and army generals under control. They also failed to get the support of other military units for the coup. Consequently, they faced alone the joint reaction of the Army and the Air force. The Emperor was in South America when the coup was staged, but he came back home quickly to save his endangered throne.

The Imperial Bodyguard along with the Police Force (under its leader Brigadier-General Tsige Dibu) could not resist the might of the Army and Air Force. The loyalists won victory after a battle that lasted only two days. Losing hope, the Neway brothers shot the hostages, 18 in number, held in the Ganate Le'ul Palace (now Main campus of Addis Ababa University). Thereafter, they fled to the outskirts of Addis Ababa. As they made their exit, the Emperor made his victorious entry into the capital. The rebel leaders were unable to escape. Germame was killed on the way to Mount Zequala. At the same place and time Mengistu was badly wounded and captured. Mengistu was later brought to trial and hanged.

The coup was easily crushed. Only the University students supported its cause by staging a demonstration. In spite of its failure, the rebellion made a powerful impression on educated people, and showed that it was possible to remove the monarchy. "The torch of change had been kindled by the rebellion". University students became the torch-bearers of this change in the years ahead, and kept on their struggle against the imperial regime.

Peasant Rebellions

The Bale Rebellion

The Bale peasant rebellion had deep-rooted social and political causes. Grievances stemming from maladministration, land alienation, heavy taxation, ethnic discords between settlers and native farmers, and religious bias were some of the major problems in the region.

The bureaucrats began to expropriate peasant lands turning them into tenants under different pretexts. Between 1942-1970 the government granted more than 4,828,560 hectares of land to dignitaries, and military and civil servants in many provinces in the south. Perhaps as much as 30 per cent of imperial land grants in southern Ethiopia were located in Bale province. This led to serious land shortage in the province.

However, it was the 1963 land re-measurement policy in the region that sparked the rebellion. As a result, landowners were able to possess land more than double their lawful possessions. When they were compelled to pay tax arrears on the extra lands, the landlords put the burden of extra tax on the peasant cultivators.

Discontent was also rife among pastoralists of the province. The pastoralists avoided paying taxes by crossing the international boundaries, only to return as soon as the tax collectors had disappeared from the scene. Moreover, the Somali nationalist agitations of the Republic of Somalia of the early 1960s presented a challenge to the government. Then, the Ethiopian government began to tighten its control over the border lines in regulating the movement of pastoralists particularly in the Delo and Wabe areas.

In addition to the regular tax paid on their livestock, pastoralists were required to pay for pasturing their animals on what were regarded as state lands. The police and militia that were sent to collect taxes usually looted and raped, and committed all sorts of injustices. These, generally worsened the difficult traditional relations, between the Christian officials and the Muslim pastoralists. On the eve of the rebellion, the new Governor, Fitawrari Worku Enquselassie, continued antagonizing the Muslim local population. He took the side of the Christian settlers.

Islam was the ideology that brought the Oromo and the Somali of the province together. Externally the Somali Republic's expansionist policy that considered Bale as part of its terra irredenta (unredeemed territory, i.e. territory claimed for Somalia) provided all sorts of encouragement to them. It called upon the already dissatisfied Muslims to stand firmly against the Haile Selassie regime.

Rebellion started in the village of Afker, in the district of El-kere, under the leadership of Kahin Abdi. With his group, he began to strike on government installations. In September 1963, the group burnt government posts in Afker. Similar groups simultaneously did the same thing in Wabe and Delo. In Wabe it was carried out by Haji Ishaha Mohammed Dadi in Delo by Balambaras Waqo Lugo. Both Hajji Ishah and Waqo Lugo had some training and received encouragement in Mogadishu.

In 1964, in an inter-clan conflict, the Borana and Guji Oromo drove out the Ethiopian Somalis and Rayitu Oromo from Sidamo, and forced them to flee across the Genale river into Bale. Frustrated by lack of response from the government, the leaders of these dislocated clans went to Mogadishu. Among those chiefs were Grazmatch Cherri Gutu and his brother Waqo Gutu, additional future leaders of the rebellion.

These and other groups who got military training and weapons in Mogadishu returned to the areas of Bale in 1965. Then under the leadership of Waqo Gutu, and with Waqo Lugo as his lieutenant, they started organized resistance against Haile Selassie's regime. The first rebel action took place on 8 February 1965, when a small force under Aliye Chirri overran the town of Oberso, destroying the only Orthodox Church there and burning state documents. The Christian settlers fled to Mena and Negele-Borana. Three days later, Waqo Gutu with about 250 rebels attacked the town of Bidre. The town fell into the hands of the rebels on February 18, after an engagement with the police force from Negele.

Then, the governor of Bale, promptly, asked the Emperor to station a large military force in the province to maintain law and order. In March 1965, in another engagement, two district administrators, along with many police and territorial soldiers, were killed by the rebels.

Map 1. Bale

In December 1966, the government put Negele- Borana and all the districts of Bale (except Fasil district) under martial law. Two army brigades consisting of 4,500 men and volunteers were put under the command of Fitawrari Worqu for the prosecution of the campaign. The objective was primarily to cut off the main rebel supply routes from Somalia and to seize their rear base. As a result, in less than three months the resistance in Negele-Borana (Sidamo) was extinguished in early 1967. But the resistance in Bale continued for another three years.

According to official sources, the state lost a very low number of its men, not more than 54 as opposed to 871 for the rebels. The army created great suffering to the peasants, when it destroyed villages, animals and crops. After the war, however, the state treated the people fairly. There was no revenge, and none of the rebel leaders was deported or punished. The government cancelled all arrears in land taxes up to 1967. Furthermore, the state elevated some of the local gentry to higher administrative posts, which eventually helped to strengthen its political power in the region. Finally,

Waqo Gutu was given the title of Grazmach and hectares of land. He became a wealthy man owning much livestock and plenty of land in his village of Meda Walabu near Mena town.

The Gojjam Rebellion

The corrupt rule of Dejazmatch Tsehaye Enquosilassie, who had been Governor-General of the province since 1960, had been the main source of political dissatisfaction in Gojjam. His policy of appointing officials from outside the region created resentment among the local gentry. Furthermore, his policy of impoverishing the Gojjame nobles by starting the collection of overdue arrears and accusing those who did not pay made him the enemy of the nobility and the peasantry alike.

The conditions in Gojjam moved from bad to worse when the governor issued a decree that required all citizens to have their guns registered upon payment. According to this decree, all gun-holders were to obey the decree and get their weapons registered within three months or otherwise forfeit their property. The hasty manner of its enforcement soon became a source of public outcry. It was clear to the people that the real intention of the governor was to disarm the population and to bring them to total submission. Hence, this repressive policy soon became a liability to the state. It made the masses stand against the state.

The 1967 Income Tax Proclamation ignited the rebellion. Damot and Mota districts were at the forefront of the rebellion. They refused to elect or admit tax assessors, and prevented the adjacent districts from obeying government directives. At first, the protest took the form of petition, and appeals through delegations. Only when these failed did they turn to violent tactics. On 7 February 1968, rebellious peasants from the two districts met at the Azwari river and took a solemn oath of unity and action, electing their leaders. They agreed to expel all state officials, boycott government courts and to destroy the property of traitors (i.e. those who did not obey their decision).

By the end of February 1968 nearly all state officials had withdrawn from the area and for nearly two months the rebels were in full control of the districts. Resistance expanded into the adjacent districts of Bichena, Debre Marqos and Bahr Dar.

By the middle of March 1968, about 60% of eastern Gojjam had openly gone against the state. It is remarkable that little violence was used so far. As a result, the government was reluctant to commit itself to forceful means, thinking that the resistance would be gradually solved peacefully.

The mood changed, however, following a small incident in Debre Marqos district in the village of Awobel. On 9 March, 1968, the villagers were enjoying a feast in their village church. At the time, the deputy administrator arrived with his followers and guards and began to measure a plot of land. All cried out against what the administrator was doing. They managed to stop the measurement, forcing the assessors to leave the village.

A unit of militia under the command of Demiss Alamirew, the Governor of the district, was sent to Awobel. Then, the militia looted property and apprehended seventy men. Fifty-six of them were later sentenced to prison. On 6 April, 1968 more than three thousand rebels from Bichena, Damot, Debre Marqos, and Mota moved towards Mengisto to set the prisoners free and to punish Demiss Alamerew. About seven kilometers short of their goal, the rebels met a combined force of the Territorial Army and the Police. After two days of continuous fighting, government forces ran out of ammunition, and only the timely arrival of regular troops saved them. This was the first direct involvement of the army in the conflict.

It was after this incident that the central government sent commission after commission to look into the problem. On April 17, presented their problems to the Emperor both orally and in writing in Addis Ababa. They informed him of their miseries under bad governors and militia. They asked for better governance, better educational, health and transport facilities and demanded the stopping of tax assessment. The Emperor, however, was not pleased with such boldness and rejected their pleas. He warned them to give up their “unlawful activities”. Deeply disappointed and empty handed, they returned home.

On 1 June, 1968 a commission, made up of representatives from the Ministry of the Interior and Finance came to Gojjam. The commission spent eleven days moving around the districts of Bichena, Debra Marqos, Damot and Mota. Based in Addis Ababa, the commission recommended military means to end the problem.

Suddenly, violence started between June 18 and 20. Several clashes occurred, in which both the government and peasant sides suffered heavy casualties. The central government quickly sent 900 troops. Mota and Bichena were put under military administration. In the meantime, the third and the last commission was sent to Gojjam. It included Dejazmatch Kifle Ergetu, the Minister of the Interior, and Dejazmatch Kifle Dadi, a Crown Councillor. They arrived at Dabra Marqos on July 5, to have direct talks with the rebels. The delegation traveled by air and road, listening to stories of repression and returned to Addis Ababa. It submitted a comprehensive report, stating that the provincial officials had lost the trust and confidence of the people. On 23 July 1969 Dejazmatch Tsehayu was transferred to Kafa and Dejazmatch Dereje Makonen replaced him. Other officials appointed by Tsehayu were replaced by the local gentry of Bichena and Dabra Marqos. A few days later, a general pardon was declared. Rebels were ordered to put down their arms and return to their farms. On September 7, all farmers were made free from all penalties for past failure to pay tax. But, they had to pay arrears by December 1972.

Before conditions returned to normality, over-zealous administrators began to collect taxes using forceful methods. This was followed by clashes in Damot and Mota. The most serious was the one that broke out on 17 October 1968, following the rebel attack on the police quarters at Dambacha district. After two days of fighting, that involved the Air Force, the rebels withdrew leaving behind 50 dead and many more wounded. On the government side, five were killed and six wounded. The Air Force attacked some villages in northern Damot and western Mota.

The state's Police commission paid a one-day visit to Gojjam in mid-December and recommended that a delegation including nobles from Dabra Marqos be sent to Damot to pacify the peasants. A delegation led by the renowned Gojjame nobleman, Haile Mariam Kebede, arrived at Feres Bet on December 21. It addressed a huge gathering, emotionally appealing to the people to put down their weapons and spare the land from violence. He also promised that rist land would never be measured but that tax had to be paid! Thereafter, the resistance decreased greatly. Only Dega - Damot refused to submit. The government ordered Territorial Army forces and peasants from Agaw Midir and Wenbera to invade Dega Damot. By February 1969, all resistance had been broken down and the situation was fairly calm.

In May 1969 the Emperor visited Gojjam. He gave promotions and feasts and awarded titles and medals, which was intended to please the gentry and the clergy. The peasants had also won significant concessions. Most of the unpopular bureaucrats had been removed and tax assessors were recalled. The income tax was postponed indefinitely. Moreover, farmers were freed from paying tax arrears for the previous 19 years. All of the peasants received pardon.

The Ethiopian Student Movement

The establishment of institutions of higher education was begun in the post-liberation period. The first university college was established in 1950, followed by opening of colleges in some other important towns of the country. Teachers and curricula were imported from the western world.

But due to official censorship, materials on Ethiopia were not available to enlighten the students and enable them to look critically at the existing social problems. The goal of the education system was not to produce a potential challenge, but to produce technocrats who would be supportive to the regime. However, as the students were exposed to western values and political systems, they started to make comparisons between their society and the western world. They started to question why their country remained backward.

Despite censorship and the unfavorable situation, student newspapers were started and associations were formed in the university. Then, students began to play an important role in exposing the reactionary nature of Haile Sellassie's regime. The first newspaper was "News and Views" and the first students association was the "University Student Union" established in 1959. In Ethiopia, the whole student body in general and the university students in particular played the role of a political opposition for many reasons. In the first place, the absence of political parties and a strong indigenous class of traders and entrepreneurs left only the students as focal point in expressing opposition against the regime. Secondly, the social respect given to the educated few, in a country of a high rate of illiteracy, gave this group of students a sense of responsibility for their country. Thirdly, the campus life gave student leaders the opportunity to discuss national issues and influence students so as to make them pay attention to the miseries of the masses.

The first social criticism against Haile Sellassie's regime was expressed in the form of traditional poetry by university students in their campus, in which the message is passed by means of understatement and word play.

The arrival of young men from English-speaking African countries had influence on the political awareness of the university students.

Scholarship students that came from different African countries had joined the University at Addis Ababa, after 1958. They were greatly shocked by the strict censorship and lack of political freedom in Ethiopia. They had wrongly believed that Ethiopia was a place of freedom and could be an example for Africa. The African students told their Ethiopian student friends about the struggle in their respective countries to gain independence and from colonial rule. No doubt the students drew lessons from these discussions.

More than that, however, it was the attempted coup d'état of 1960 which undermined the popularity of the Emperor. It helped the students to boldly engage in the struggle against the regime. Above all, it was only the university students who came behind the cause of the coup by staging demonstrations. After the coup failed, the students were made to apologize publicly in writing to the

Emperor. However, there was no doubt that the Emperor and the public were well aware of the students' support for the aims of the coup-makers.

In 1961, the consolidation of several colleges under a central administration as Haile Sellassie I University further created the opportunity for cohesion and political radicalism. The students made their challenge through organizing public demonstrations, particularly in favour of land reform. The worsening conditions of the peasantry and the hard life of the urban masses provided the objective basis for student radicalism. In the course of time, University student political radicalism spread into the high schools. It happened through the instrumentality of the Ethiopian University Student Service (EUSS), i.e. senior classes in the University used to give a one year teaching service in high schools before graduation. The programme, which started in 1965, provided a medium for closer communication between University students and high schools in particular. These "teachers" enlightened the students and increased their political awareness. Particularly they made them aware of the backwardness of their country as a result of the reactionary nature of the regime.

In 1965, the University students staged a demonstration in front of the Parliament shouting the revolutionary slogan "Land to the Tiller," while the deputies were debating the regulations of tenancy. The fact that the demonstration was staged in front of the Parliament was something new and significant in the history of modern Ethiopia. This was a new approach in which the students recognized the Parliament (as the people's representative) not the Emperor, as holder of the country's sovereignty. In the following years, demonstrations became annual events.

In 1967, the student newspaper "News and Views" was replaced by "Struggle". At the same time, student activists managed to unite the various college unions in Addis Ababa into one organization called the University Student Union of Addis Ababa (USUAA). It was done with the view of creating one mouth-piece for the University students of Addis Ababa. Thus, the student newspaper "Struggle" became the organ of spreading new political ideas among the students and the public at large. There was also a strong stand against the USA, which was giving massive military support to the reactionary imperial regime that was seen as an obstacle to the country's development.

In the November 1969 issue of "Struggle", an article was published on the nationalities problem in Ethiopia. The writer was one of the student activist called Walelign Makonnen who firmly supported cultural and linguistic independence of the nationalities. This became a challenge to the government whose ethnic policy was repressive. The Ethiopian press and radio informed the public that the students had to stop such activities, which their families should also forbid. The government saw the University students as a potential danger to its power. In late December, 1969, the president of the USUAA, Tilahun Gizaw was killed by government agents. This was the beginning of brutal measures against the students. The next day, a gathering of thousands of students mourning the death of the student leader was fired on and some lost their lives. The University was closed, but was reopened again after three weeks. But all this did not stop the movement. Through illegal pamphlets, the students continue their protest against the regime.

The Ethiopian student movement had also an external wing. The world-wide student movement, anti-imperialist and anti-right wing authoritarian regimes, had been flaring up in the 1960s, inspired by Marxist theory. These revolutionary ideas were transmitted to Ethiopian students at home through Ethiopian students abroad in Europe and the USA. Their journals "Tatek" (Gird yourself) and "Challenge" were brought into Ethiopia and put into circulation secretly. They gave direction to the Ethiopian student movement in general.

On the event of the revolution, the Ethiopian students at home got another opportunity to expose the reactionary nature of the regime. During the period under discussion the country suffered from the famine that hit hard Wollo and Tigray. People die in large numbers. Others left their homes for the urban areas. Despite the suffering of the people, the government was hiding the famine from the rest of the world. The students with some of their instructors resisted the government's policy of hiding the famine of 1972-74. By so doing they exposed the famine, which showed the moral and political lowliness of the regime to the public and accelerate its downfall. It should be underlined also that the famine was both a result of the absence of rains and man-made conditions.

The students were not organized as a political party to cause the final downfall of the monarchy and to play a viable role in the transfer of power in 1974. As a result the more organized military force played the key role in the overthrow of the feudal power and took over government power. However the student movement, at first gave direction and guidance to the new regime in 1974. The students' slogans of land reform, the right of nationalities and political liberties were taken away by the Derg as a means to consolidate its political position.

Ethio-Somali Conflict

On independence, British and Italian Somaliland were united and emerged independent as the Republic of Somalia on 1 June 1960. The new Republic was ambitious to build "Greater Somalia" and adopted a flag with a five-pointed star symbolizing the five territories which Greater Somalia wanted to possess. According to this design, Somalia was to comprise former Italian Somaliland, British Somaliland, French Somaliland (Djibouti), the Ogaden in Ethiopia and the Northern Frontier District (N.F.D) in Kenya. It remained a duty for the Republic to obtain the "lost" parts and bring together all five Somali territories within a single Somali state.

With this objective in mind, Somalia rejected all treaties concerning the boundaries between Somalia and Ethiopia. It rejected treaties signed before Somalia emerged as an independent state. The Constitution of the Somali Republic also contained provisions to promote the aim of Greater Somalia. The Somali politicians used all means to gain international support for their policy of Greater Somalia.

At the end of 1963 the British government sought to unite the Northern Frontier District of Kenya with Somalia. This idea was not accepted by the Kenyan leaders, and was abandoned. Afterwards, the Somali Republic broke off diplomatic relations with Britain and Kenya. This increased cooperation between Kenya and Ethiopia. Both agreed to a mutual defence pact. Following this, the Somali leaders began a series of clashes along the 1600 km Ethio-Somali border as early as 1964. As a matter of fact, they knew that they could not defeat Ethiopia but hoped to internationalize the boundary issue and gain

sympathy for the cause of Greater Somalia. They also hoped to re-direct the inter-clan conflicts in Somalia towards the issue of national unity. But the conflict ended when Somalia and Ethiopia issued a declaration in Khartoum announcing the end of the fighting.

Subsequently the Somali leaders appealed to the UN Security Council, but did not gain any positive response to their dream of “Greater Somalia”. At Somalia’s request, several meetings of the OAU were held. Finally, it was decided that the OAU should assert a principle about African borders. The first OAU summit, held in Cairo in July 1964, passed the Cairo Declaration on African borders, which said that “All member states pledge themselves to respect the borders existing on their achievement of national independence”. Somali leaders outrightly rejected the resolution.

When Somali leaders found that the African forum did not serve their cause, they shifted to the Muslim world, particularly Arab forums. In numerous Islamic conferences, the Somali leaders succeeded in having several anti-Ethiopian resolutions passed, pressing the Ethio-Israeli connection to strengthen Arab opposition against Ethiopia.

In July 1967, a government change took place in the Somali Republic, and the former Premier Ali Shermarke became President and the northern politician, Ibrahim Egal became Prime Minister. Ibrahim Egal’s government made a détente with Ethiopia and Kenya. It revived diplomatic relations. And the dream for Greater Somalia was left aside for the moment. However, the prospect of this detente became dim when General Siyad Barre took over political control through the coup d’état of 21 October 1969. Siyad Barre revived the policy of unifying all Somali – claimed territories. If this could not be achieved, he proclaimed support for the right of self-determination for Somalis wherever they were. Then the policy of “Greater Somalia” was changed to “Western Somalia”. That was done to fulfil the policy of expansion through rebels in eastern Ethiopia. Somalia’s irredentism led to a war of aggression against Ethiopia, as we shall see farther in the unit.

Activity

8.4. Popular Revolution and the Fall of the Monarchy

Terms to Know

- Constitutional reform
- Coup
- Derg
- Dual power
- Marxism-Leninism
- Military dictatorship
- Mutiny
- Popular revolution
- Radicalism
- Unrest

Causes

Since the attempted coup d'etat of 1960 Haile Sellassie's government had been confronted with mounting opposition. The leading forces in the opposition were students and intellectuals. They accused the government of failure to introduce reforms to achieve economic, political and social progress. In the opening years of the 1970s, the economic, political and social problems of the country were still awaiting solutions.

In February 1974, almost two years after the celebration of the Emperor's 80th birthday, a popular revolt against the regime broke out. There were several immediate causes for the outbreak of the revolt. But the most important was the famine of Wollo. Throughout 1973 and early 1974 the Wollo

famine claimed the lives of thousands of peasants, while forcing others to abandon their birth place. Although the government tried to hide the famine, foreign reports exposed it. Upon the exposure of the horrors of the famine, intellectuals and other enlightened Ethiopians bitterly attacked the regime for ignoring the suffering of the people.

Thus, public hatred against the regime grew strong and broke out into open revolt in February 1974.

Beginning of the Revolution

The first revolt, leading up to the popular mass uprising of February, took place in the army formerly an instrument of the regime. In January 1974 soldiers stationed in the town of Negele Borena mutinied against the bad conditions of their life. Before the government could pacify the soldiers, unrest spread to the capital the following month. The unrest was ignited by the rise in petroleum price. The rise in petroleum price actually resulted from the Arab-Israeli War of 1973. However, opposing the price rise, taxi drives in the capital went on strike in February 1974. They demanded fair charges for taxi journeys proportional to the increased price of petroleum. At the same time, there was a countrywide strike of teachers who opposed "the implementation of the educational reform program known as the Educational Sector Review". University and high school students organized violent demonstrations.

The situation became critical when soldiers in different army divisions joined the popular unrest. In late February, soldiers of the Second Division in Asmara, the Fourth Division in Addis Ababa and the Air Force in Debre Zeit mutinied.

Caught amid the mounting unrest, The Aklilu Habta-Wold cabinet was unable to pacify the situation. Aklilu, who had been a Prime Minister since 1961 resigned on 28 February 1974.

The Emperor appointed Lij Endalkachew Mekonnen to replace Aklilu as Prime Minister. The new prime minister promised to initiate reforms, "including constitutional reform." As a sign of this good will, he presented for the emperor's approval a cabinet consisting of educated and progressive ministers. Along with this, the government also tried to check "the popular unrest by withdrawing the Sector Review, reducing the price of petroleum and increasing the salaries of soldiers."

Despite these concessions from the government, unrest continued. Students were the leading agitators against the regime. They continued to challenge the government and also agitated others to join them in the struggle against the regime. As was discussed above, soldiers were active participants in the struggle. Already in February, they had set up a committee known as the Coordinating Committee of the Armed Forces, the Police and the Territorial Army. Committee, started to take its own independent measures. In late April, for instance, the Committee arrested Aklilu and many other government officials and high- ranking military officers.

In June the Committee made a call to military units throughout the country to send their representatives?excluding officers above the rank of major-to the capital. Upon the arrival of the delegates, a meeting was held on 28 June 1974 at the headquarters of the Fourth Division. This was the first meeting of the Derg (the Committee). Major Mengistu Haile Mariam, a delegate of the Third Army Division in Hararge, became the First Vice-Chariman of the Derg. Major Atnafu Abate, already active in the Committee and a delegate of the Fourth Army Division, became the Second Vice-Chariman.

The consolidation of the Derg marked the beginning of dual power in the country. This was because the Derg exercised its own power parallel to Endalkachew's government. The state of dual power did not last long. It came to an end on 1 August, when the Derg imprisoned Engalkachew and replaced him as Prime Minister by Lij Mikael Imiru.

Fall of the Monarchy

With the removal of Endalkachew and his government, the Derg became the only power in the country. So far the Derg had arrested many of the prominent figures of the regime. Now, the Emperor became their

target. The Derg carried out a propaganda campaign to discredit the Emperor until he was arrested and deposed on 12 September 1974.

Activity

8.5. The Military Dictatorship (1974 - 91)

Terms to Know

- Charter
- Communist dictatorship

- Democratic system of government
- Decentralization
- Extremism
- Federal republic
- Feudal system of land ownership
- Military dictatorship
- Mixed economy
- National self-determination
- Nationalization of property
- One-party system
- Provisional government
- Radicalism
- Villagization

Consolidation of Military Dictatorship and Measures Taken

Having put to an end the monarchy, the Derg proclaimed itself the provisional Military Administrative Council (PMAC) and assumed full power. Both before and after 12 September 1974, the Derg took several measures. Among these, some of the major ones were the following.

- Imprisonment of top military and civilian officials of the Haile Selassie regime.

- Banning of all anti - government strikes and demonstrations.
- Repression of all forms of protest.
- Execution of 52 renown officials and functionaries of the old regime, as well as General Aman Mikael Andom, the Derg's Chairman in November 1974.
- Conduct of the Development Through cooperation campaign or the Zemecha to spread literacy and organize the peasantry beginning from 1974.
- Proclamation of " Ethiopian Socialism" and adoption of the official name of the provisional Government of Socialist Ethiopia.
- Nationalization of banks, insurance, industrial and commercial companies, as well as all rural and urban land in 1975.
- Elimination of oponents to the personal dictatorship of Mengistu Haile Mariam was completed between 1977 and 1978.

Fig. 8.4 Major Mengistu Haile- Mariam (seted) and Lieutenat General Aman Michael Andom

When all political organizations in the capital collaborated with the Derg, only the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Party (EPRP) continued in its opposition to military rule, thus becoming its target. In cooperation with the All-Ethiopian Socialist Movement (Meison), the Derg began what it called the "Red Terror" against the EPRP, whose counter-attacks were designated "White Terror". However, before the Derg could totally eliminate the EPRP from the towns, it faced a challenge of a different kind. This was the invasion of Somalia.

The invasion of Somalia took the Derg by surprise. Ethiopia's military machine was not in a condition to stand large scale foreign invasion. The regular army which numbered no more than 50,000 troops was poorly armed. The USA had been the supplier of Ethiopia's military armaments. But it had withdrawn this support, when its relations with Ethiopia become strained following military rule. Even though the USA had promised to the Emperor in 1973 to supply a 100 million US dollar armament, including fighter and bomber airplanes, the delivery was held back. In contrast, Somalia undertook military preparations long before it started the invasion. The main supplier of Somalia's armaments was the Soviet Union.

After long preparations, Siyad Barre, the then leader of Somalia, awaited for an opportune time to begin the invasion of Ethiopia. When the popular revolution of 1974 broke out, Siyad Barre was convinced that the time had come to start an attack against Ethiopia. The attack began in 1977. By August 1977, the Somali regular army was in control of large parts of eastern Ethiopia. The Somali invasion united all Ethiopians to the defense of their country. Consequently, the Derg, which now assumed the role of a patriotic leader, successfully organized the training of a 300,000 peasant militia force and hastily sent it to reinforce the regular army. In the meantime, changes in the international alliance system favoured Ethiopia. Already having adopted Marxist-Leninist ideology, Mengistu hurried to make new relations with the Soviet Union. Ending their relations with Somalia, the Soviets started to arm Ethiopia. In addition, the Soviet allies, Cuba and South Yemen, sent their soldiers to fight on the side of Ethiopia. Thus, with the assistance of the Cuban and South Yemeni soldiers and Soviet military officers, the Ethiopian army started a counter-attack, which soon pushed back the Somali invaders. By March 1978, all Somali regular forces had been driven out from the territory of Ethiopia. The efficient Ethiopian Air Force and the heroic efforts of the peasant militia were very important in the decisive victory which Ethiopia gained over the Somali aggressors.

Fig. 8.5 Militia soldiers parading at the former Revolutionary Square, Addis Ababa

After victory over Somalia, three major issues took the attention of the military government. The first was the total elimination of the EPRP, from the towns, which it succeeded in the use of "Red Terror" in an organized manner through what it called the "Disclosure Campaign". As a result of fear and merciless torture, many people were forced to confess things they really did not know or had not done. In the process, thousands of innocent people became victims of the "Red Terror". But the EPRP continued its struggle by moving to the northern part of the country to undertake a rural guerrilla resistance. In 1977 Meison was identified as the Derg opponent and became a target for its attack.

The second issue which took attention of the Derg was the task of party formation. The Derg had planned for a communist party formation by merging political organizations that supported it. But it changed the strategy of party formation in 1979 from unity of different political organizations to recruitment of individuals loyal to the military government. Using that strategy a party known as the Workers Party of Ethiopia (WPE), and Mengistu became its Secretary-General in September 1984. This event marked the peak of the military dictatorship. As we shall see below, it also marked the beginning of the occurrence of events which hastened the downfall of the military dictatorship.

The third issue was the suppression of opposition groups and freedom fighters which had their bases in the northern part of Ethiopia. These were the Ethiopian Democratic Union (EDU), the Eritrean People's Liberation Front (EPLF) and the Tigray People's Liberation Front (TPLF). The EDU emerged only after the downfall of the old regime. Its leader was Ras Mengesha Seyoum, a grandson of Emperor Yohannes IV who was married to the granddaughter of Haile Selassie I. Members of the EDU were mainly northern aristocrats and high ranking military officers of the old regime. EDU was thus fighting to restore the feudal monarchy. There was some fighting between the EDU and the Derg. The EDU also fought against the TPLF in Tigray, where both had their bases. In this fighting the EDU met a crushing defeat and was totally driven out of Tigray.

In May 1976, the Derg issued a nine point program for the solution of the Eritrean problem. But there was no agreement and the negotiations broke down. In the following year, when the invasion from Somalia diverted the Derg's attention, the EPLF greatly expanded its control over Eritrea. It encircled Asmara and put Massawa under siege. By the end of 1977, only 5 per cent of Eritrea remained under the control of Derg.

The situation was reversed immediately after victory over Somalia. With full confidence, in the Derg started a massive attack against EPLF. The pressure of massive attacks forced the EPLF to evacuate many of the territories it held. In spite of this, the Derg did not succeed in expelling the EPLF from its strong base at Nakfa, in northern Eritrea. The Derg made another attempt at eliminating the EPLF in 1982. This

time, attacks against the EPLF were carried out under the so-called “Red Star Campaign”, which again failed to eliminate the EPLF.

Another political force fighting the Derg in the north was the TPLF. It was founded by a small group of university students who fled to Tigray in 1975. They began their struggle in Dedebit, a place located in the lowlands of Adiyabo in western Tigray. Initially, the TPLF obtained some support from the EPLF, mainly in military training and supply of some rifles. In the first phase of its struggle, the TPLF was engaged in a bloody war with the EDU. Having defeated and expelled the EDU from Tigray, the TPLF gradually expanded its control over Tigray. It also fought against EPRP and drove it away from Tigray. One of its earliest engagements with the Derg army was against the forces dispatched under the so-called Raza Campaign. In this engagement, the TPLF ambushed the Derg force and forced it to surrender. In the following years, the TPLF consolidated its power and expanded its military resources to become the leading force in the struggle against military rule.

By 1982 the TPLF was in command of a considerable force with a major part of Tigray under its control. At this time, the EPLF was in a critical condition due to the attacks the Derg launched under the Red Star Campaign. In fact, the EPLF was saved from total destruction by the force of TPLF who made a remarkable march along difficult terrain to Sahel and assisted the EPLF in pushing back the Derg army.

The failure of the Red Star Campaign was a turning point in the struggle between the Derg and the northern insurgents. In 1984 the Derg celebrated the inauguration of the Workers Party of Ethiopia and the 10th anniversary of the military government. The anniversary coincided with a severe famine that hit Ethiopia as a whole. In order to make political profit out of the famine, the Derg began massive resettlements of the peasants of Tigray and Wollo, the areas most affected by the famine, to the southwestern parts of Ethiopia. Part of the intention behind the resettlement programme was the isolation of the freedom fighters from the rural population in the north. Along with the resettlement program was villagization (concentration of peasants in large villages) which also intended to tighten control over the rural population. Both programs led to widespread peasant opposition against the military government. This created favourable conditions for the rise and growth of several movements fighting for national self-determination. Among these movements, some of them already in existence, were the Oromo Liberation Front (OLF), the Sidama Liberation Front (SLM), the Oromo Islamic Front (OLF), the Afar Liberation Front (ALF), the Benishangul Liberation Movement (BLF) and the Gambella Liberation Front (GLF).

Peasant opposition to the Derg's policies above all benefited the TPLF. The Front won popular support which strengthened its power. In a series of military victories, the Front expanded the territory under its control. Among the military victories, one particularly was very important. In February 1989, the TPLF fighters scored a remarkable victory on the Derg army at Enda Sellassie, western Tigray. Tens of thousands of the soldiers of the Derg army were captured. Many of their commanders were either killed in action or captured. The victory also helped the TPLF to capture artillery pieces and tanks.

The victory of Enda Sellassie had two consequences. Firstly, it led to the withdrawal of Derg troops from the whole of Tigray. This enabled the TPLF to extend the scope of this struggle beyond Tigray. Secondly, the victory was a crushing blow to the fighting morale of the Derg army. Moreover, the victory had another immediate consequence. This was the attempt of high ranking military officers to eliminate Mengistu from power. On 16 May 1989 the officers staged a coup in Addis Ababa. However, the coup was hastily begun to take the opportunity of Mengistu's absence from the capital, for he was on a state

visit to East Germany. The coup failed. As it was, within hours of its failure, Mengistu flew back to Addis Ababa to take his revenge. Then followed widespread arrests and all suspected officers were either executed or sentenced to serve long terms in prison. As a result, the army lost its best officers. The merciless punishment also demoralized the Derg officers and totally killed the fighting morale of the rank and file. Hence forward, the officers fought with less and less conviction, while the rank and file deserted and surrendered in thousands.

In addition to internal problems, things went against the military government in international politics. This was the collapse of the Soviet Union and the communist regimes in Eastern Europe. As a result, the military government not only lost its chief external support, but also faced open criticism of its rigidities from Soviet journalists and academicians. The half-hearted proclamation of a mixed economy in March 1990 was too late to change the situation for the better. The days of the military dictatorship were nearing their end. Hastening the downfall of the military dictatorship were actions taken by the TPLF, which will be treated below.

Fall of the Military Dictatorship

Immediately after controlling the whole of Tigray, the TPLF changed the strategy of its struggle to liberate Tigray to liberating the whole country from the rule of the military dictatorship and establish a democratic system in Ethiopia. To this end, the TPLF made the necessary organizational change by forming a broad front known as the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) in early 1990.

In addition to the TPLF, the EPRDF included such organizations as the Ethiopian Peoples' Democratic Movement now called the Amhara People's Democratic Movement (APDM) and the Oromo People's Democratic Organization (OPDO). In the campaigns of 1990 and 1991, the coalition forces of the EPRDF drove the Derg army out of Gondar, Gojjam, Wollo and Shoa and moved to the capital from the northern and western directions. On 21 May 1991, Mengistu fled to Harare, the capital of Zimbabwe. This marked the total collapse of the resistance of the Derg. In the north, the EPLF forces controlled Asmara and Assab and announced the formation of the Provisional Government of Eritrea. On 28 May 1991 the EPRDF forces entered Addis Ababa with no resistance and brought to an end to Mengistu's military dictatorship.

Fig. 8.6 A scene at the time of the entry of the EPRDF forces in Addis Ababa

The downfall of the military dictatorship marked the beginning of a new chapter in the history of Ethiopia. The process of building a democratic system in the country was soon undertaken. Following its entry into Addis Ababa, the EPRDF established a Provisional Government under Meles Zenawi as Acting Head of State. On 26 June the Provisional Government announced that a National Conference, to set up a Transitional Government, would meet on 1 July. Accordingly, all political forces in the country were invited to attend the conference. Then followed a five-day conference in Addis Ababa, attended by several political organizations. The conference concluded its sessions by establishing the Transitional Government of Ethiopia (TGE) and the Charter that would serve during the transitional period. The importance of the Charter was that for the first time in the history of Ethiopia, it gave rights to the nations and nationalities of the country to the use their languages in conducting education and administration. The Charter allowed nations and nationalities to use and develop their respective cultures.

During the first two years, the TGE was preoccupied with the tasks of restoring peace and security in the country, rehabilitation of the demobilized soldiers and forming local government. The latter was achieved in 1993, when local administration were established throughout the country. In April of the same year, referendum which voted Eritrean for independence was conducted. In May, 1993 Eritrea became a separate independent state.

In 1993, a new Constitution was drawn up. The constitution was approved by a Constituent Assembly in December 1994. After a nation wide election the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE) in August 1995.

Activity

Summary

With liberation from Italian occupation, Haile Selassie's monarchic rule was restored with British assistance in 1941. It lasted until 1974. Haile Selassie built an autocratic state.

During Haile Selassie's absolutist rule very modest modernization was seen. It was in the field of education, industry, trade, health services and transport, to name some areas, that attempts were made. The greatest advances were made in the military area. Generally, his regime did not bring about as much socio-economic progress as the country needed. Feudal relationships continued to govern the socio-economy of the rural population. The peasants made up about 85 per cent of the country's total population. The economy was backward and stagnant. Peasants were poor and led a miserable life.

In its various schemes, the Ethiopian state under the Haile Selassie had at first the support the British until 1953, and that of the Americans from 1953 onwards. Haile Selassie's government was able to get the Ogaden, Haud and Eritrea, through diplomacy. Under Haile Selassie, Ethiopia was militarily an ally of the USA. Ethiopian troops served as UN international peace-keeping force in the Korean War and the Congo Crisis.

The undemocratic political and backward socio-economic conditions of the country under Haile Selassie became unbearable to the Ethiopian people. Oppositions to the regime mushroomed. Assassination attempts were made on the Emperor. Peasant revolts took place. A major coup d'etat was attempted to overthrow him. The Ethiopian Student Movement continuously opposed his regime. The Eritrean liberation movements fought against his military forces, though they were not strong at the time.

Haile Selassie's regime and the monarchy were finally destroyed by the Ethiopian popular revolution of 1974. Revolution led the country to the socialist military dictatorship of the Derg. Under the Derg, the Ethiopian people suffered greatly, though some progressive measures were taken. Opposition forces, national liberation movements and the people of Ethiopia overthrew the Derg and ended the military dictatorship on 1991. Under the EPRDF, a Transitional Charter was adopted, and a Transitional Government led by the was established. Finally the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia was established in 1995.

Review Questions

Part I. Match the items in column Z with those in Y

Y

Z

- ____ 1. MAAG
- ____ 2. Korean War
- ____ 3. Belay Zeleke
- ____ 4. Air Force
- ____ 5. (Army) Military Academy
- ____ 6. Mengistu Neway
- ____ 7. Waqo Gutu
- ____ 8. EPLF
- ____ 9. PMAC
- ____ 10. Transitional Charter
- ____ 11. Autocracy

- A. Coup d'etat
- B. Shabiya
- C. American military aid
- D. Patriot
- E. Derg
- F. One-person rule
- G. Kagnev Battalion
- H. Gojjam
- I. EPRDF
- J. Bale
- K. Debre Zeit
- L. Harar
- M. British assistance
- N. Jabah

Part II. Choose the best possible answer from the alternatives given for each question.

1. The government that took power in Ethiopia after the fall of the Derg in 1991 was the
 - a. Provisional Government
 - b. Transitional Government
 - c. Federal Government of Ethiopia
 - d. None
- _____ 2. Under the Military Dictatorship in Ethiopia,
 - a. land was nationalized
 - b. the country became socialist
 - c. the Eritrean liberation movements became strong
 - d. All of the above
- _____ 3. During the pre-Derg period, the Ethiopian Student Movement
 - a. stood against communism
 - b. was anti-American
 - c. did not support democracy
 - d. All of the above
- _____ 4. In which peasant rebellion was a foreign state involved?
 - a. Bale
 - b. Gedeo
 - c. Rayya
 - d. Gojjam
5. The 1960 failed coup d'etat had appointed _____ as Head of State
 - a. Ras Imru Haile Selassie
 - b. Mikael Imru
 - c. Asfa Wosen
 - d. Asrate Kassa
6. The Weyyane rebellion of 1942 - 43
 - a. started in northern Tigray
 - b. failed to achieve its goals
 - c. was the work of the British
 - d. was supported by local peasants and by the nobility of Eritrea.
7. The Ethio-Eritrean Federation was concluded
 - a. in line with the decision of the UN Security Council
 - b. in line with the decision of the UN General Assembly

- c. through the use of force by the Ethiopian government
- d. through the use of force by the Eritrean Unionist Party

_____ 8. Which of the following was true about the regime of Haile Selassie?

- a. Its system of government favoured the rich.
- b. It achieved sufficient expansion in education.
- c. It introduced land reforms.
- d. It suffered defeat in the hands of the Republic of Somalia?

9. During the Korean War, Ethiopia

- a. took the side of North Korea
- b. sent her troops to serve under the UN
- c. failed to meet her international obligations
- d. None of the above

10. The Ethiopian Navy was established with the assistance of

- | | |
|-----------|------------|
| a. Norway | c. Britain |
| b. Sweden | d. USA |

Part III. Fill in the blanks with correct responses.

1. In 1941, Eritrea was occupied by the British as _____.
2. During the period 1941 to 1974, the Ethiopian Army was served by two military schools known as _____ and _____.
3. Bitwoded Negash made a plot to overthrow Emperor Haile Selassie, with a plan to _____ in Ethiopia.
4. Until 1974, in Sub-Saharan Africa Ethiopian military forces were rated as _____ to none.
5. The 1955 Revised Constitution was _____ democratic.
6. The failed coup d'etat of 1960 was organized by _____ and _____.
7. Tenancy was higher in _____ than in _____ Ethiopia.
8. The first college of higher education to be opened in Ethiopia was _____.
9. _____ was the cause for the armed struggle for Eritrean Liberation Fronts.

10. _____ were territories that Somalia claimed in East Africa to be hers, on independence.

11. In 1974 the military was able to take government power in Ethiopia, because _____.

12. The people of Ethiopia in the end stood united against the Derg, because _____

Part IV. Give short answers to the following questions.

1. Explain the causes for the famine of 1972- 74.
2. Explain why Eritreans fought for a separate and independent state from the rest of Ethiopia.
3. What were the main socio-economic and political features of the Derg?
4. What were the main characteristics of Haile Selassie's regime?
5. Why did Haile Selassie fall in 1974?
6. Describe peasant socio -economic grievances under Haile Selassie's absolutist state.
7. Why did the 1960 coup d'etat fail?
8. Why did Ethiopia send her troops to the Korean War?
9. How did Ethiopia get involved in the Congo Crisis?
10. Why did some members of the ruling class oppose Haile Selassie's government?

UNIT NINE

AFRICAN NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENTS AND INDEPENDENCE

SINCE 1945

Introduction

Pan- Africanism, a movement which started in the pre-1945 years, was re-oriented since 1945, and focused on the liberation of the continent of Africa from colonialism. Using both violent and non-violent forms of struggle, Africa was able to achieve independence from colonial rule, during the post-1945 period. The formation of the organization for African Unity was another outcome of the Pan-African movement. The OAU had both successes and failures. With the independence of African nations, the peoples of Africa saw new political and socio-economic developments.

In the first two sections of this unit are examined Pan-Africanism and the liberation of Africa from colonialism. The Organization for African Unity is dealt with in the next section. The last section focuses on issues of development in independent Africa.

Objectives

After completing this unit, students will be able to:

- * identify the contributions of Pan-Africanism to the national liberation struggle of Africa from colonialism;
- * discuss the national liberation movements and the struggle of Africans for independence;
- * identify the African states that were formed at liberation from colonialism;
- * identify the successes and failures, as well as the major problems of the Organization for African Unity;
- * give a short account of political and socio-economic conditions in independent Africa;
- * identify the major problems of independent Africa;
- * appreciate the African struggle for national independence;
- * draw a political map of Africa, showing the independent states of Africa; and
- * appreciate the struggle of Africa for development.

9.1. Pan-Africanism Since 1945

Terms to Know

- African-American
- Nationalism
- African brotherhood
- Negro
- African nationalism
- Pan-Africanism
- African unity
- Racial equality
- Black peoples
- Racism
- Conference
- The New World
- Congress
- West Indies
- Justice

The term Pan-Africanism expresses two main ideas. Firstly, it is an expression of a desire for African unity. Secondly, it aims at fomenting a sense of unity among all black peoples of the world, whose ancestors originally came from Africa. The second expression is broader than the first. This is because Pan-Africanism, in its second expression, assumes a common brotherhood of all black peoples of Africa, North and South America, and the West Indies.

What was the original purpose of the Pan-African Movement?

The origin of the idea of Pan-Africanism was from outside Africa, in the New World. It was a movement which originated in America and the Caribbean by people of African descent. These people felt

that they had been made homeless by their transfer to foreign countries and made to live in a social environment unknown to them. They wanted to have equality with the other races and justice for black peoples. Originally, it was a form of opposition of black people against racism. Despite such feelings, however, many of the descendants of the slaves did not know much about Africa. They thought of Africa as a continent where black people lived in happiness and freedom. Apparently, this view of an Africa without frontiers or divisions seems to have led to the birth of the idea of united Africa. The term "Pan" is of Greek origin and means "all", hence Pan Africanism means "all African".

The First Pan-African Conference (Congress) was held in London in 1900.. This was earliest organized form of political expression of Pan-Africanism. The conference was organized by a Trinidad (West Indies) lawyer, H. Sylvester Williams. The participants of the conference came mainly from America and the West Indies. Before 1945, four Pan-African Conferences were held. Two famous leaders of Pan-Africanism during that period were Dr. William E. Burghardt Du Bois (1868-1963) and Marcus Garvey (1887 - 1940). Du. Bois was an African-American scholar and writer. He became an organizer and preacher of Pan-Africanism. He came to be known as the Father of Pan-Africanism.

What was a major point of difference between Du Bois and Garvey?

Garvey was a Jamaican who moved to and lived in the U.S.A. He also met his death there, at the hands of white racists. Garvey was the founder and leader of the Universal Negro Association. Du Bois and Garvey had some differences on the future of blacks living outside Africa. Du Bois maintained that blacks outside Africa should struggle for the respect of their rights in the countries they lived in. But Garvey insisted that the only future for blacks in America and the West Indies was to return to Africa. On the basis of this idea, Garvey organized a "Back to Africa" movement. The Universal Negro Improvement Association established by Garvey in 1914, was meant to promote this Back to Africa movement. Although the idea of the movement attracted millions of blacks, it achieved very little.

What do you understand by African unity?

The Manchester Conference was also important in another way. It marked the emergence of new tendencies in the Pan-African movement. As was stated earlier, one of the ideas contained in Pan-Africanism was a desire for African unity. The movement's slogan for this leading idea was: United Africa. After 1945, however, there was a division in the opinion over creating a united single Africa. Remaining loyal to the original ideals of Pan-Africanism, some nationalist leaders considered the creation of nation-states as the first step towards creating a larger United Africa. Among this group of leaders were Julius Nyerere, the President of Tanzania, and Kwame Nkrumah, the President of Ghana.

Opposite to this idea, however, new tendencies began to develop after independence. In many countries nationalists began to concentrate mostly on their own countries. According to these nationalists, Pan-Africanism could only be successful in independent Africa so long as it did not weaken the position of individual nation states. This division in Pan-Africanism, became a source of problem, which continued to trouble the unity of African states in the post-independence period.

Activity

Answer the following questions briefly.

1. Define Pan-Africanism.
2. Identify the following
 - i) Du Bois
 - ii) Garvey
 - iii) Nyerere
3. Explain the contributions of Pan-Africanism for the struggle of African independence, in the post-1945 period.

9.2. National Liberation Movements

Terms to Know

- Autonomy
- Independence

- Referendum
- Colonialism
- Independent state
- Settler
- Colonialist
- Nationalism
- Struggle
- Colonist
- National liberation
- Terrorism
- Colony
- National liberation front
- Unilateral
- Demobilization
- National liberation movement
- Violent method of struggle
- Guerrilla war
- Non-violent method of struggle

Several factors affected the nature of national liberation movements in Africa. The most important were the attitudes and political traditions of colonial powers, whether or not the colonies contained white settlers, and the political experience of African nationalists. On the basis of these elements, national liberation movements took mainly two courses, violent or non-violent. To elaborate this point, cases of violent and non-violent struggles from the French, British and Portuguese colonies are treated below.

Give examples of British colonies that achieved independence through non-violent struggle.

In West Africa, where both the French and the British had colonies, independence was achieved fairly smoothly. The main reason for this was that West Africa had no white settlers. Added to this, the nationalist movements in West Africa had long history and better experience enabling them to provide leadership and facilitate the struggle for independence. The move towards independence was hastened by the effects of the Second World War. During the war, the Allied Powers had used slogans meant to rouse peoples of the world against the Axis Powers. For instance, Article Three of the Atlantic Charter promised to "respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live". In effect, African nationalists believed that the article meant that at the end of the war they would have the right to demand and be granted independence.

Although Britain was well disposed towards granting independence to her colonies, nationalist struggle and conflicts became bitter. The main reason for this was disagreement on how soon self-government and independence should come. Britain maintained that "it would take some time since she felt she still had to train the nationalists in the business of running a modern state." But the nationalists, impatiently, rejected the British view that they were not ready to exercise political power.

Nationalist agitation in British West Africa was especially strong in the Gold Coast (Ghana) and Nigeria. In these two colonies, the nationalists had two of the ablest leaders, Nnamdi Azikwe of Nigeria and Kwame Nkrumah of the Gold Coast. Both were educated in America and returned to their countries in the 1930s and 1940s, respectively. They then activated the nationalist movement in British West Africa and after the war became leading figures in the conflict with the British colonial government.

Fig 9.1 Nnamdi Azikwe of Nigeria

Between 1945 and 1954 the bitter clashes between African nationalists and Britain were observed, mainly in the Gold Coast and Nigeria. The former accused the British officials of trying to keep their rule in West Africa by claiming to train Africans in the management of a modern state. As a result of nationalist pressure in the Gold Coast and Nigeria, the African nations of West Africa were able to win full independence. On March 6, 1957, the Gold Coast achieved independence adopting the new name Ghana. Nigeria followed suit on October 1, 1960, while Sierra Leone became independent on April 27, 1961 and Gambia on February 18, 1964.

How did France try to maintain its control over her African colonies?

After 1945, France was aware of the need to grant more political and civil rights to its colonial people of French West Africa. However, originally, the French government, did not plan to give independence for the French African colonies, but only rights as part of an association with France itself. In line with the above policy, France introduced reforms. Each colony in French West Africa was allowed to elect a territorial assembly.

Compared with the pre-war situation in the French colonies, this was a big progress. Yet, the reforms were not enough. One of the reasons for this was that the colonies did not have legislative power. The French Minister of Colonies made the laws for French West Africa. Meanwhile, radical nationalists demanded full independence.

Why did the French allow a referendum to be conducted in their colonies of West Africa in 1958?

In 1958 General Charles de Gaulle became French President and a new French constitution was issued in the same year. In the new constitution, de Gaulle intended to transform the French Union into the French Community. This was a sort of French Commonwealth of Nations similar to that of the British. But unlike the British Commonwealth, it was to be under effective control of France. The French Community would have an Executive Council consisting of the French President, a number of French Ministers and Prime Ministers of the member states. The Council would be responsible for issues of common interest to the community such as defence, foreign affairs and economic policy. It was planned that each of the colonies of French West Africa would hold a referendum on the new constitution. They were to choose between voting 'Yes' and becoming autonomous republics within the French Community, or voting 'No' and becoming immediately independent outside it. According to de Gaulle, those who chose 'No' would lose French economic and technical assistance.

The economies of the French West African colonies were highly dependent on French assistance. Voting 'No' seemed dangerous to many colonies. Because of this, almost all colonies voted "Yes". Only Guinea voted "No" and became fully independent. Other colonies of French West Africa became autonomous within the Community. Meanwhile, France immediately recalled all her professionals and technical assistants from Guinea and stopped other assistance to Guinea. But the President of

independent Guinea, Sekou Toure, turned to the Soviets. The U.S.S.R. soon responded favourably and filled all the gaps created by French withdrawal. But the Soviet advance worried France very much. At the same time, leaders in other colonies of French West Africa began to demand full independence. France accepted the demand for full independence. And by November 1960 all French West African colonies achieved full independence. Except Guinea, all of them maintained their close ties with France. They were Cameroon, Togo, Dahome (Benin), Niger, Upper Volta (Burkina Faso), Ivory Coast, Chad, Ubangishari (Central African Republic), Middle Congo (Republic of Congo-Brazzaville), Gabon, Senegal, French Sudan (Mali) and Mauritania.

In contrast to the French and British West African colonies, there were colonies where independence was achieved only after violent armed struggle. These colonies shared one common element. This was the existence of a large number of white settlers in each of them. In such colony independence was achieved after violent and long armed struggle. One such colony was Algeria, a French colony since 1830 in North Africa. The French administered Algeria as part of France. There were large numbers of white settlers in Algeria. These white settlers in Algeria were known as colons (colonists). They numbered about one million in 1960. They considered Algeria as belonging to themselves alone.

Why did the Algerians have to fight a long war for freedom?

There was much delay in the rise of the Algerian liberation struggle. This was the result of the French policy of assimilation which exercised strong influence upon many Algerians. Until the end of the Second World War, many Algerian elites including Ferhat Abbas believed that Algeria was part of France.

The enthusiasm shown for French nationality such as by Ferhat Abbas did not last long. Ferhat and other assimilationists soon discovered the fact that an Algerian Nation did exist and its freedom should be restored. But the colons did all they could to resist the independence of Algeria. As a result, the Algerians had to fight one of the bloodiest wars of independence in colonial Africa against the French government and French settlers in Algeria.

The Algerian war of independence began in November 1954. At the time, the French were at war in Indochina, which they soon gave up after a humiliating defeat. Because of this, France was determined to make up in Algeria for the loss in Indochina. The leaders of the Algerian war liberation were a different sort of Algerians from men like Ferhat Abbas. They were mainly soldiers trained for the French army and Algerians of peasant origins. One of them was Ben Bella, a man who later became the first President of independent Algeria.

Ben Bella and his comrades set up an organization called the Revolutionary Committee for Unity and Action to fight for independence. The organization later changed its name to the National Liberation Front, abbreviated in French as FLN.

In a short time, the FLN became very strong, mainly because of the financial assistance it got from Egypt, Morocco, Tunisia and the Arab League. The FLN fighters were trained in Tunisia, Morocco, Egypt and in the former East Germany. By

1956 the FLN had established itself in Algeria as a highly organized and structured fighting force. Along with military operations, it conducted an active propaganda campaign. Its members advocated the kind of social changes they would bring in independent Algeria as follows:

The Algerian revolution is not and cannot be a mere fight for the conquest of political power. It is an economic and social, as well as a political revolution. Independence cannot be an end itself.. The Algerian workers are fighting in order to guarantee land for the peasant, work for the worker and better living conditions.

Such was their propaganda that the FLN won strong support from among the majority of the Algerians and harassed the French army.

The Algerian war created serious political crisis in France. The downfall of the French Fourth Republic was partly the result of the Algerian problem. The crisis brought Charles de Gaulle, who lost his office earlier, back to power in May 1958. In 1959, he offered the Algerians three choices: "integration, absolute independence, or independence in co-operation with France." The FLN made it clear that they were fighting for absolute independence. This was what the colons hated. In 1960 and 1961 the colons and some French generals attempted to overthrow de Gaulle. Both in Algeria and France they set up the terrorist organization called the Secret Army which targeted for attack all who favoured the independence of Algeria.

How was Algeria able to get its independence from France?

De Gaulle faced serious challenges in his attempt to find a solution for the Algerian problem. In 1960 he learnt that the FLN had strong popular backing in Algeria. He also realized that the FLN fighters were costing the French a lot in terms of money and manpower. These convinced him to sit for negotiations

with the FLN. And on March 18, 1962, France and the FLN signed the Evian Agreement, which ended the Algerian war. On July 1, 1962 Algeria became independent.

The independence of the Portuguese colonies of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea were other examples of violent struggle for liberation. Angola and Mozambique, with large territories, had significant numbers of white settlers. But the real problem for independence in these Portuguese colonies was not the existence of white settlers. The problem was the fact that Portugal itself was under the rule of an outdated dictatorship. Since 1932 Antonio Salazar had been the Prime Minister of Portugal and ruled the country as a dictator. In 1968 he was succeeded as Prime Minister by Marcello Caetano. Both Salazar and Caetano considered Portuguese controlled areas in Africa as overseas territories, which were not colonies, but part of Portugal. Because of this, during their rule in Portugal, they totally rejected the demand for independence which led to violent armed struggle.

Why did Portuguese colonies have to fight bloody wars for liberation?

Liberation movements in Portuguese colonies began in the early 1960s: in Angola as early as 1961, in Portuguese Guinea in 1963 and in Mozambique in 1964. The independence struggle, particularly in Angola and Mozambique, was very bitter. In Angola the struggle was led mainly by the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola MPLA and in Mozambique by Front for the Liberation of Mozambique (FRELIMO). Agostino Neto was the leader of MPLA. Eduardo Mondlane led FRELIMO, until he was killed in a bomb explosion in 1969 and was succeeded by Samora Machel.

From the very beginning, the major liberation movements both in Angola and Mozambique were led and supported by Marxists who organized the freedom fighters. The movements also obtained foreign assistance: MPLA from Guinea and FRELIMO from Tanzania and later from Zambia. Portugal sent in more and more troops who were supported by white mercenaries from the west and from the Republic of South Africa. In the early 1970s, there were about 150,000 Portuguese troops hopelessly trying to crush the nationalists.

Fig 9.5 MPLA units fighting under difficult conditions

As the war of independence continued it became a heavy burden on the Portuguese economy. In the early 1970s, the Portuguese had to spend 40 per cent of their government's income on the armed forces. As a result, Portugal began to face political crisis at home. In 1973 Guinea made a unilateral declaration of independence (UDI). Meanwhile, violence in Mozambique was growing. The consequence was the overthrow of Caetano in Portugal in 1974. The coup was led by General Antonio de Spínola, who replaced Caetano in power. General Spínola, with first-hand experience of the wars in Africa, understood the hopelessness of attempting to crush the liberation movements. Moreover, radical elements in the Portuguese army demanded an immediate end to the colonial empire. Portugal had no alternative than give independence to its colonies. Accordingly, Guinea became independent as the Republic of Guinea - Bissau. Mozambique achieved independence in June 1975 under Samora Machel's FRELIMO government. In the same year, Sao Tome and the Cape Verde Islands also became independent.

The independence of Angola was arranged for November 1975. However, the Portuguese did not transfer power properly to MPLA. Like their Belgian counterparts in the Congo (Zaire), the Portuguese made a hasty and mismanaged withdrawal. This resulted in power struggle between MPLA and its opponents National Front for the Liberation of Angola FNLA and National Union for the Total Independence of Angola UNITA. The neighbouring countries as well as the opponents in the Cold War took sides with the opposing forces in Angola. In early 1976 an independent Angolan People's Republic was set up under Agostino Neto's MPLA government. But the government had to fight against its opponents, especially Jonas Savimbi's UNITA. UNITA continued guerilla warfare against MPLA for many years to come.

In East Africa, the British colony of Kenya was another example of a violent liberation struggle. Kenya had a large number of white settlers. Since the establishment of the colony in 1895, the white settlers were able to own almost all the fertile highlands of Kenya, taking it from the Africans. This created serious land shortage, which resulted in serious tension especially after 1930. Until 1930, the European settlers often rented their estates to African farmers, but from 1930 on they started to uproot these farmers from the rented farms. That was in order to set up large farmlands operated by wage labour. The nationalist movement in Kenya started as early as the 1920s, when the first political organization, the Kikuyu Central Association, emerged. Anti-colonial organizations, which were set up among various ethnic, social and professional groups, continued to expand until the end of the Second World War. The effects of the Second World War gave additional energy to the liberation struggle in Kenya. The end of the war had created a large number of demobilized soldiers, who were unable to get jobs. To all these was added the long standing land problem in Kenya, which led to the violence of the post-war years.

What was the role of the Mau Mau in the struggle for the independence of Kenya?

In the post-war years, the problem of land shortage became acute. Together with other grievances, it gave rise to a violent rising known as the Mau Mau Rebellion. The movement started as an underground movement. The British colonial government detected the movement in the late 1940s. From 1950 onwards, the Mau Mau began administering oaths to members. The oaths required members to support the colonial organization and fight against the colonial regime until independence was attained. In 1951 the colonial government clearly marked the activities of the movement and banned it. But it was too late. In October 1952 the situation became very serious and a state of emergency was declared. British troops tried to arrest the Mau Mau leaders, which was meant to contain the danger.

The Mau Mau had members in almost all tribes of Kenya, but its main centre of activity was the Kikuyu inhabited districts. The movement used violence as a means to independence. Numbers of people were killed for assisting the government. Many white settlers were also killed. Meanwhile, the government ordered brutal action against the Mau Mau rebels. Rebel war camps were bombed. Villages were uprooted and people transferred to other areas. When the rebellion was finally crushed in 1960, the government forces had killed some 7,800 people, having lost 500 men themselves.

After the Mau Mau rebellion, the Kenya African National Union (KANU) emerged demanding the independence of Kenya. In 1952 Jomo Kenyatta, who later became the leader of KANU, had been arrested. He was accused of organizing the Mau Mau Rebellion. But he was released from prison in August 1961. After a series of negotiations and preparations, Kenya achieved independence in 1963. Jomo Kenyatta became its first President.

Other African countries also achieved their independence either through violent or non-violent struggle. Among those were the Sudan in 1956 British and Italian Somaliland in 1960 and Djibouti in 1977. Indeed, except for Ethiopia, the Republic of South Africa, Liberia and Egypt, the independence of all other African countries had been attained after 1945. See the map on the next page for the rest. The process of independence continued until the early 1990s when Namibia became independent and the apartheid policy in the Republic of South Africa was destroyed. Thus, colonial rule in Africa was totally eliminated.

Activity

Give brief answers to the following questions

1. Why did Africans have to use violence to gain their independence from colonial rule?

2. What were the favorable conditions that helped African national liberation movements to be successful in the post-war years?
3. Discuss the liberation struggle in Angola.
4. Explain the Mau Mau Rebellion.

Map 1. The independence of Africa

9.3. The Organization of African Unity

Terms to Know

- Border dispute
- Continental organization
- Regional organization
- Charter
- General secretariat
- Secretariat
- Civil war
- International relations
- Solidarity
- Commission
- Mediation
- Sovereignty
- Continental state
- Nation-state
- Territorial integrity
- Conciliation
- Neutrality

The idea of forming the Organization for African Unity (OAU) was a result of the Pan-African Movement. As was pointed out earlier, one of the ideas expressed in Pan-Africanism was the desire for African unity. To achieve this goal, the necessary steps had to be taken by Africans themselves. An opportunity for that appeared in 1957. In that year Ghana became the first black African country to gain independence after World War II. The first leader of independent Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah, was one of the African nationalists to participate at the Manchester Pan-African Conference of 1945.

How did the OAU come into existence?

In April 1958 Nkrumah invited all independent African countries to an All-Africa People's Conference at Accra. Eight independent African countries: Ghana, Egypt, the Sudan, Tunisia, Morocco, Libya, Liberia and Ethiopia participated in the conference. This conference was important for two reasons. Firstly, representatives of nationalist movements from 28 non-independent African countries attended the conference as observers. The intention was that from what they saw at the conference, nationalist representatives could hasten the process of independence in their respective countries. Secondly, many of the resolutions of the conference became corner stones for OAU that was established five years later. One of those read:

The member states declared that they would observe a policy of 'positive neutrality'. They pledged themselves to observe one another's political and territorial integrity and to settle their differences by conciliation and mediation within the African community.

The main objective of the Accra conference was to set up the Organization for African Unity. However, with regard to the structure of the organization, there was no consensus among African states. This led to the emergence of two groups of states with different ideas.

In 1961, the two groups held separate conferences at Casablanca and Monrovia. Afterwards, they were identified as the Casablanca Group and the Monrovia Group. The Casablanca Group included Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Algeria, Egypt and Morocco. The Monrovia Group consisted of Sierra Leone, Liberia, Nigeria, Togo, Ethiopia and Libya. The Casablanca group was led by Kwame Nkrumah. States in this group were regarded anti-Western, while those in the Monrovia group were considered as pro-Western. Their attitude towards the ex-colonial powers was one point of difference between the two groups. More than this, however, the main point of difference between the two groups was the issue of

a unified Africa under one government and one head of state. Nkrumah advocated the creation of a single African state, each African state giving up its sovereignty. His proposal would reduce the new nation-states to mere provinces of the continental state. But most African states wanted "functional cooperation rather than integration. This and other points of difference continued to undermine the solidarity of African states. For the time being, however, an agreement was reached, to postpone the final goal of forming a United States of Africa and form the organization of African Unity (OAU). The OAU was formed in May 1963 in Addis Ababa. At the founding conference, held in Addis Ababa, 31 independent states signed the Charter of the Organization. The purposes of the OAU, as contained in the Charter, included:

To promote the unity and solidarity of the African states, to coordinate and intensify their cooperation and efforts to achieve a better life for the peoples of Africa and the hope to eradicate all forms of colonialism from the continent.

The functions of the OAU were performed by various organs, commissions and committees set up for the purpose. The highest organ was the Assembly of the Heads of State and Governments. This organ met at least once a year. Another organ was the Council of Ministers made up of the Foreign Ministers of member states. The Council met twice a year and prepared agenda for the annual meetings of the Heads of States and Governments. The most important organ was the General Secretariat. It did most of the work of the OAU. The Office of the General Secretariat was in Addis Ababa. The first General Secretary of the OAU was a Guinean, Diallo Telli. The OAU also had various commissions set up to deal with the social, economic, educational, health and nutritional problems of Africa.

The record of the performance of the OAU, especially during its early years, showed both successes and failures. To begin with successes, the OAU, through its Committee for Liberation, assisted the liberation movements of the non-independent nations. On several issues at the United Nations, African states often took a united stand. Several border disputes have also been settled through the efforts of the OAU. Probably, the greatest achievement in this respect was the Nigerian crisis in 1967. Although four states - Ivory Coast, Tanzania, Zambia and Gabon - recognized the separatist state of Biafra, the vast majority of African states kept their pledge to Article III (3) of the OAU Charter: "respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of each member state and for its inalienable right to independent existence". In accordance with this article, they "adopted a policy of trying to reconcile the two parties in the civil war within the framework of Nigerian unity." Eventually the crisis was solved.

Several factors were responsible for failures of the OAU in its performance. Among the factors, one was difference of opinion among member states on methods to be used in accomplishing the tasks of the organization. As was indicated above, the attitude adopted towards the ex-colonial powers and the structure of the OAU were other points of difference among member states. In addition, there were other differences. Firstly, there were differences in official languages used by African states. English, French, Portuguese, Spanish and Arabic speaking states exhibited differences in the OAU, though this

should not have been an insoluble obstacle to unity of action, had there been the desire to achieve it. Secondly, many states were members of other non-African organizations. In North Africa many states belong to the Arab League and their interest was to fight against Israel. The problem was that some members of the Arab League tried to bring the Israeli issue to the OAU forum. Thirdly, although the OAU had set up various commissions to deal with social, economic, and related problems, there was little achievement in this field. Despite its weaknesses, the OAU struggled to strengthen the solidarity of African states to overcome the many problems facing the continent. To this end, at the 36th OAU Summit, held in Algiers in 2000, the Heads of African States and Governments decided to transform the OAU into the African Union. This was the original goal expressed in Pan-Africanism. How far the establishment of the African

Union will be successful is something that the future will only show.

Activity

Give short answers to the following questions.

1. What was the role of Kwame Nkrumah, in the formation of the OAU?
2. How did Addis Ababa come to be the headquarters of the OAU?
3. List down the achievements and failures of the OAU.

9.4. Contemporary Africa

Terms to Know

- Assassination
- Democracy
- Ideology
- Budget
- Democratic rights
- Illiteracy
- Cash- crop
- Donor agency
- Independence
- Citizen
- Drought
- Pandemic
- Colonialism
- Ethnicism
- Periodic elections
- Contemporary
- Famine

- Poverty
- Coup d'etat
- Genocide
- Political party
- Constitution
- HIV/Aids
- Scholar
- Civil war
- Human rights
- World market

In terms of chronology, contemporary Africa is in the post-colonial period. But colonialism did not end at one specific time. It took Africa some 40 years to achieve complete independence. Therefore, we need to have a dividing line,, from where to start the treatment of this section. Perhaps, it would be correct to start from the year 1963, when the Organization for African Unity came into being. At the time, around 31 states were fully independent. All of these states, as well as those who were to achieve independence in the following years, faced more or less similar political, economic and social problems.

What were the major political problems of African states?

In the 1960s and 1970s and later, the major problem in many African countries has been lack of political stability. The post-independence decades were especially marked by coupd'etats and counter - coups. Governments in many countries collapsed one after the other in quick succession. For instance, between 1963 and 1969 five violent changes of government occurred in Dahomey (later Benin). In many countries leaders were assassinated. As the following selected events show, the problem affected every part of the continent.

- In December 1962, Habib Borgiba, President of Tunisia, barely escaped death from an attempted assassination.

- In August 1963, President Fulbert Youlou of Congo Brazzaville was overthrown.
- In June 1965, a military coup in Algeria overthrew President Ben Bella.
- In January 1966, a coup in Nigeria destroyed the lives of many political leaders.
- In February 1966, Kwame Nkrumah was overthrown from power.
- In September 1969, the army took power in Libya, removing King Idris.
- In February 1971, an army officer, Idi Amin, took power in Uganda after overthrowing Milton Obote.

It is proper to ask why these political shake-ups took place. Among the explanations to this question, two are important. One of the explanations is that in some countries the ex-colonial powers quickly withdrew before Africans got enough experience in self-government. Some scholars do not accept this explanation. They argue that it was only in former Belgian Congo and Angola that the colonial regimes made hasty withdrawals. In other colonies, especially in French and British colonies, educated groups were given enough time to have experience in administration before the withdrawal was effected. The second explanation maintains that: "...the political systems and organs of government left behind by the ex-colonial powers were really unsuitable for, and unworkable in Africa." According to some scholars, this explanation is to some extent correct. The political system that was left behind by colonial powers was based on western democracy. This system works best where two or more political parties, with ideology-based programs, operate within the framework of a constitution. And that has to be done through periodic elections in which citizens, who are nearly all literate, participate. These conditions were not ripe in Africa.

In the pre-colonial period the political tradition among the peoples of Africa was the rule of kings and chiefs who exercised unlimited power. At the time of independence, the great majority of African peoples were illiterate. Under such conditions, there could be no meaningful political participation such as is required for political systems based on western democracy.

In fact, there were countries where two or more political parties existed. Yet, once in power, most of these parties desired to stay in power indefinitely. Moreover, they took strong measures to eliminate opposition. Although they claimed to rule on a constitutional basis, they suppressed civil and democratic rights and violated human rights. All this crystallized opposition against ruling parties and governments, becoming a source of political instability.

What have been the ethnic problems of Africa?

Colonialism has also left behind legacies of problems which contribute to political instability. One result of colonialism was the creation, supposedly, of nation states. However, many of these nation states are ethnically very diverse. For instance, Gabon has about 40 ethnic groups; Nigeria over 250; Tanzania more than 120 and Zambia about 73. Many of these ethnic groups had fought bitterly against one another in the pre-colonial period. They had never planned of living together within the same boundaries under one administration. Despite years of interaction under the colonial regime, the pre-colonial ethnic conflicts had not died out. They reappeared upon independence and became a source of

political instability. In some countries, ethnic conflicts have grown into bloody civil wars and genocide. This was what happened in Congo-Kinshasa in 1960 and in Nigeria in 1967, following secessionist movements in Katanga and Biafra respectively, and recently in Rwanda.

The economic system inherited by independent African states was another source of problems. The major problem in the economy of Africa has been lack of diversity. Throughout the colonial period, Africans were encouraged only to produce raw materials for export. The colonial regimes made little effort to establish factories that would produce manufactured goods. Colonies were made producers of mineral ores for the industries of Europe and the rest of the industrially advanced world. In the field of agriculture, Africans were encouraged to specialize on single crop products, or mono-crop products as they are widely known. The prices of such single products in world markets have not been stable. Moreover, their prices were sometimes fixed in the major cities of the advanced countries, according to the interests of international monopolies. Thus, whenever prices of such products fell on the world market, African states often faced crisis, which in turn became a cause for political instability.

What have been the major economic problems of African countries?

Many African countries have natural resources. However, they lack the capital and the technical skill that are necessary to develop the resources. On the other hand, the economy of African countries is based on agriculture. But, the agricultural techniques are still backward. The majority of the rural population uses traditional methods and techniques of agriculture. Because of this, food shortage was and still is a great problem in African countries. This problem is further made worse by rapid population growth, especially in the cities, That is because of population movement into cities from rural areas. This leads to problems of urban poverty, unemployment and crime. Big cities outgrow the services necessary for decent urban life as money to provide these services is not available.

There is also the problem of environmental degradation, aggravated by backward agricultural techniques. As a result, in many countries to the south of the Sahara, desertification has been expanding rapidly. Consequently, many countries have been hit by periodic drought. In such countries, governments are forced to spend their small annual income on food imports, or depend on international donor agencies. The HIV/Aids pandemic has also worsened conditions in most of Black Africa. Donor agencies, moreover, have their own agenda and priorities which may not be a priority to aid recipient countries. Donor projects are sometimes inappropriate. A very large part of donor budgets is spent on their own staff, mostly foreigners. Most donor funds are spent in urban areas and capital cities. Not much gets to the countryside and the poor. On the other hand, when natural or man-made disasters occur, donor agencies (usually called Non-Governmental Agencies NGOs) do operate in the countryside and have saved very many lives. In this respect, their work is highly appreciated. All these problems have made hunger, illiteracy and poor health the lot of millions in contemporary Africa.

Activity

Answer the following questions briefly

1. In what ways did the colonial heritage affect the development of independent Africa?
2. Can you identify the major political and socio-economic problems of independent African states?
3. Point out some of the major successes of independent Africa.

Summary

The period after 1945 was a time of successful African struggle for independence. Using both non-violent and violent forms of struggle, Africans were able to free themselves from colonial rule. They founded independent states.

In their struggle for independence and development, Africans have come closer together. The Pan-African movement and the foundation of the OAU proved to be very helpful on this score.

Independent Africa has experienced both successes and failures. Attempts to develop democratic governance and society, and also live in good neighbourliness have met obstacles. Socio-economic developments have been slow and backward. But Africa must persevere and forge ahead.

Review Questions

Part I. Fill in the blanks

1. W.E.B. Du Bois is considered to be the _____ of Pan-Africanism.
2. In North America, the "Back to Africa!" movement was initiated by _____.
3. Since 1945, the first African state to gain national independence through armed struggle was _____.
4. The present Republic of South Africa became independent from colonial rule in _____.
5. The Mau Mau was an anti-colonial movement in _____.
6. Italian and British Somaliland were united as one state under the name _____.
7. The Portuguese colonies of Africa were able to gain their national independence through _____ methods.

8. The first Secretary-General of the OAU was _____.
9. _____ was a success of the OAU.
10. _____ have been a serious political problem of independent African states.

Part II. Choose the best possible answer for each of the following questions.

1. At the time of its foundation, the General Secretariat of the OAU was located at

- | | |
|------------|----------------|
| a. Nairobi | c. Addis Ababa |
| b. Accra | d. Cairo |

2. Of the following, a major failure of African states has been.

- a. fighting against colonialism
- b. building democracy
- c. neglect of agriculture
- d. failure to maintain their colonial boundaries

3. Which of the following has been a major problem for Black African states?

- | | |
|------------|-------------|
| a. Drought | c. HIV/Aids |
| b. Famine | d. All |

4. Which of the following has not been a major feature of the African economy?

- | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|
| a. Mono-crop production | c. Lack of capital |
| b. Industrialization | d. Rural economy |

5. Which of the following fought for the independence of Namibia?

- | | |
|----------|---------|
| a. SWAPO | c. MPLA |
| b. FLN | d. ZANU |

Part III. Match the items in column S with those in T.

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| T | |
| S | |
| 1. Ben Bella | |
| A. Kenya | |
| 2. De Gaulle | |
| B. Egypt | |
| 3. UNITA | |

- C. Algeria
- 4. KANU
- D. France
- 5. Garvey
- E. Haile Selassie
- 6. Pandemic
- F. Jamaica
- 7. United States of Africa
- G. Nkrumah

- H. HIV/Aids

- I. Father of Pan-Africanism

- J. Angola

Part IV. Give short answers to the following questions.

1. What were the two major goals of Pan-Africanism, in the immediate post-WWII period?
2. Through what ways did African liberation movements gain the independence of Africa from colonial rule?
3. What were some of the major achievements and failures of the OAU?
4. What are some of the major political and socio-economic problems of independent Africa?