

Document A: India.

from Kevin Reilly, ed, Readings in World Civilizations, Volume II, New York: St. Martin's Press,

CHAPTER ELEVEN

1995.

World War I and the Russian Revolution .

(pp. 229-232)

41. WORLD WAR I IN WORLD HISTORY

L. M. Panikkar

From an Asian perspective, according to this Indian historian and diplomat, World War I was a European civil war. But the involvement of African and Asian soldiers and colonial subjects made the war a major turning point in world history. In what ways were Africans and Asians involved in the war? How did that involvement change life in the colonies? Who were perceived as the anticolonial forces of the First World War? Who were the anticolonial forces after the war?

The Great War of 1914-18 was from the Asian point of view a civil war within the European community of nations. The direct participation of Asian countries, during some stages of this conflict, was at the invitation and by the encouragement of one of the parties, the *entente* Powers, and was greatly resented by the Germans. It is necessary to emphasize this internal character of the European conflict to realize its full significance on the development of events in Asia.

... [A]t the beginning of the twentieth century the European nations, in the enjoyment of unprecedented economic prosperity and political prestige, remained unshakably convinced that they had inherited the earth, and that their supremacy in Asia was permanent and was something in the nature of a predetermined Divine Order. It was the age of Kipling and the white man's burden, and it seemed the manifest destiny of the white race to hold the East in fee.

In 1914, when the German invaders had reached the Marne, divisions of the Indian Army under British officers had been rushed to France and had helped at the critical moment to stem the German tide. Later, they were extensively used in the defence of the Suez Canal and the Middle East and in campaigns elsewhere in Africa. In 1917, Siam declared war on Germany. An Indo-Chinese labour force had been recruited and was working in France. On August 14, 1917, China also joined the Allies. Thus all the nations of Asia were brought into the European civil war. However, opinion in India, China and even in Japan was at the time more pro-

German than pro-Ally. In India, except among the ruling princes, there was no pro-British feeling, and public opinion rejoiced at every report of German victory and felt depressed when the Allies were winning. China declared war only with the greatest reluctance and for the express purpose of checkmating Japanese plans of aggression. In Japan itself, after the Shantung Campaign, feeling against the Allies was most marked, and a Press campaign of great virulence was conducted against Britain at the end of 1916. Actually, though the Asian countries fought on the side of the Allies, public opinion in the East looked upon the conflict as a civil war in which neither party had a claim to the friendship of the peoples of Asia, and if any party could appeal to the sympathy of Asians it was the Germanic alliance which had no tradition of Asian conquest and was allied with the chief Muslim Power, Turkey.

But the participation of Asian people in the war had far-reaching consequences. The Indian soldier who fought on the Marne came back to India with other ideas of the *Sahib* than those he was taught to believe by decades of official propaganda. Indo-Chinese Labour Corps in the South of France returned to Annam with notions of democracy and republicanism which they had not entertained before. Among the Chinese who went to France at the time was a young man named Chou En-lai, who stayed on to become a Communist and had to be expelled for activities among the members of the Chinese Labour Corps.

More important than these influences was the fact that the French and British administrations in Asia had to appeal to their subjects for moral support. To ask Indians and Indo-Chinese to subscribe to war loans for the defence of democracy and to prevent the world being overwhelmed by German *Kultur*, would have sounded as strange and callous irony unless accompanied by promises of democracy for themselves and freedom for their own cultures. When, besides subscriptions for war loans, Indians and Indo-Chinese were pressed to join up and fight to save democracy, the contradictions of the position became too obvious even for the colonial administrators. In India the demand was made openly by the nationalist leaders that prior agreement on political problems was necessary before support of the war could be considered a national programme.

Politically, a further weakening of the colonial and imperialist position came about as a result of President Wilson's declaration of fourteen points. In 1917, the doctrine of the "self-determination of peoples" had the ring of a new revelation. Whatever its effect was on the suppressed nationalities of Europe, in Asia it was acclaimed as a doctrine of liberation. As every Allied Power hastened to declare its faith in the new formula of Wilson (and it was soon raised to the position of an accepted "war aim" in the propaganda campaign against the Germans), the colonial Powers found it difficult to oppose openly or resist publicly the claims of Asian nations based on this formula. It became difficult to proclaim self-determination of people as a great ideal for the establish-

ment of which Asian peoples should co-operate with Europeans and fight and lose their lives in distant battlefields, but which, however excellent, could not be applied to themselves. Self-government for colonial countries had thus to be accepted, and the claim to it could no longer be brushed aside as premature or stigmatized as sedition.

Apart from these political considerations economic forces generated by the war were also helping to undermine the supremacy of the West. Japan utilized the four years of war for a planned expansion of her trade in the East. German competition had been eliminated. Britain and France, engaged in a mortal struggle when their entire resources of production had to be directed towards victory, had also left the field fairly open. India gained her first major start on the industrial road and, with the strain on British economy, Indian national capital was placed in a position of some advantage. In fact the full results of the weakening of European capitalism became evident only after the war when the preeminence of London was challenged by America, and British capital, though still powerful, began to be on the defensive in India. The growth of capitalist enterprise in India, and the development of industries and participation by Indian capital in spheres so far monopolistically held by Britain, like jute [a plant fiber used in making burlap—Ed.], resulted directly from the weakening of the economic position of Britain.

Two other results of a general character may be indicated. The first, the growth of a powerful left-wing movement in the countries of Western Europe, had a direct effect on shaping events in the Eastern Empire. The Labour Party in England during the days of its growth had been closely associated with the nationalist movement in India. In fact, Ramsay MacDonald, the leader of the Socialist Party after the war, had been one of its champions from the earliest days. Similarly, Annamite nationalism had worked hand in hand with left-wing parties in France. In the period that immediately followed the war these parties had come to possess considerable influence in national affairs and, as we shall see, were instrumental in giving effect to policies which loosened the old bonds of political domination.

The second factor was, of course, the influence of the Russian Revolution. Imperialism meant something totally different after Lenin's definition of it as the last place of capitalism and his insistence that the liberation of subject peoples from colonial domination was a part of the struggle against capitalism. Also, Russia's call for and practice of racial equality, abolition of the special privileges that Tsarist Russia had acquired in Persia and China, and her acceptance, in the first flush of revolutionary enthusiasm, of the independence of countries which had been previously annexed to Russia, made it difficult for Western nations which had so long claimed to stand for liberty and progress to deny the claims of Eastern nations.

Finally, the war had accelerated the pace of movements everywhere.

For example, in India, the movement for independence which was confined to the intelligentsia in 1914 became a mass movement of immense proportions in 1919. Everywhere the case was similar. The *tempo* of events had acquired a momentum which few had foreseen and none had forecast in 1918. The war, on the world scale it was conducted in 1914-18, was in itself a great world revolution, and an impenetrable chasm had been created between the days preceding August 1914 and those following November 11, 1918.

One fact which stands out clear and illustrates this chasm in thought is the lack of faith in imperialist ideals in the period that followed the war. With the solitary exception of Churchill, there was not one major figure in any of the British parties who confessed to a faith in the white man's mission to rule. Successive Viceroys of India, Liberal, Conservative and non-party, professed publicly their adherence to the cause of Indian freedom. Secretaries of State from Edwin Montagu (1917-22) to Pethick Lawrence, including such stalwarts of Conservatism as Sir Samuel Hoare (Lord Templewood), claimed that they were working for the freedom of the Indian people and not for the maintenance of British rule. The French were no doubt more brave in their words, but the faith had gone out of them also.

Nowhere did this come out more clearly than in the treatment of China. Incidents which previously would have been dealt with sternly and for which territories and indemnities would have been exacted, were now only the subjects of a mild protest. Chiang Kai-shek's armies occupied the concessions at Hankow, and for months Hong Kong was subjected to an intensive trade boycott; these events would earlier have immediately led to a display of overwhelming naval strength. Britain in 1926 was prepared patiently to negotiate. Even the "old Church hands," who had watched with regret the sudden eclipse of European prestige, though they acted the Blimps in their clubs, never seriously felt that Western authority could be reestablished over China by the use of gunboats. There was no conviction left of the European's superiority or sense of vision.

5
Andrea and Overfield, The Human Record, Vol. II, Boston:
Houghton Mifflin, 1998.

Document B: Syria.

The Betrayal of Arab Nationalism

98 ▼ *General Syrian Congress at Damascus,*
RESOLUTION OF JULY 2, 1919

Although the statesmen who fashioned the peace treaties following World War I recognized the principle of national self-determination in redrawing the political map of Europe, old-style imperialism was still the order of the day when they dealt with territories formerly controlled by Ottoman Turkey and Germany. Their fate was determined by Article 22 of the League of Nations Covenant, which was part of the overall Paris peace settlement. Under Article 22 Germany's colonies in Africa and Asia and the Arab regions of the defunct Ottoman Empire became mandates of the League of Nations, the international organization inspired by U.S. President Woodrow Wilson. These mandates were to be administered, however, by Great Britain, France, Japan, Australia, and South Africa, and the system was correctly viewed as a thinly disguised version of traditional imperialism.

It became apparent in the opening weeks of the Paris peace conference that Great Britain and France would not honor their wartime promises to Arab leaders for independence and instead planned to divide the Arab Middle East between them. This disturbed Wilson, who proposed in March 1919 that a commission of inquiry composed of U.S., British, French, and Italian representatives go to Palestine, Syria, Iraq, and Armenia to obtain information needed to reach, in Wilson's words, the "most scientific basis" for a settlement. The French, however, refused to name a representative, and the British and Italians withdrew, so the Inter-Allied Commission became a U.S. undertaking, led by educator Henry C. King and industrialist and diplomat Charles R. Crane. In anticipation of the commission's inquiry, Syrian nationalists called a congress, which Palestinian and Lebanese delegates also attended, and adopted the following resolution on July 2, 1919.

The King-Crane Commission included the resolution in its report, but Britain and France ignored it and proceeded with their plans. In March 1920 a second

Syrian congress proclaimed Syrian independence, but the new state, which included Palestine and Lebanon, lasted only four months. In July the French demanded unqualified acceptance of the French mandate and easily crushed the resistance of the Syrian army, whose ammunition ran out after only a few hours of fighting. On July 25 the French entered Damascus, ushering in two decades of turbulent French rule.

QUESTIONS FOR ANALYSIS

1. In what ways does the resolution reject the premises of Article 22 of the League of Nations Covenant?
2. How do the delegates envision the mandate system if forced to accept it?
3. How does the resolution distinguish between Zionists and Jews already residing in Palestine?
4. Why did the delegates prefer the United States as the nation to offer Syria economic and technical aid?
5. All the resolutions except resolution 5 were accepted unanimously at the congress. Why was it the exception?

We the undersigned members of the General Syrian Congress, meeting in Damascus on Wednesday, July 2nd, 1919, . . . provided with credentials and authorizations by the inhabitants of our various districts, Muslims, Christians, and Jews, have agreed upon the following statement of the desires of the people of the country who have elected us to present them to the American Section of the International Commission; the fifth article was passed by a very large majority; all the other articles were accepted unanimously.

1. We ask absolutely complete political independence for Syria within these boundaries. The Taurus System on the North; Rafah and a line running from Al Jauf to the south of the Syrian and the Hejazian line to Akaba on the south; the Euphrates and Khabur Rivers and a line extending east of Abu Kamal to the east of Al Jauf on the east; and the Mediterranean on the west.¹

¹The region described includes today's states of Syria, Lebanon, Israel, and Jordan.

2. We ask that the Government of this Syrian country should be a democratic civil constitutional Monarchy on broad decentralization principles, safeguarding the rights of minorities, and that the King be the Emir Feisal, who carried on a glorious struggle in the cause of our liberation and merited our full confidence and entire reliance.²

3. Considering the fact that the Arabs inhabiting the Syrian area are not naturally less than other more advanced races and that they are by no means less developed than the Bulgarians, Serbians, Greeks, and Romanians at the beginning of their independence, we protest against Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, placing us among the nations in their middle stage of development which stand in need of a mandatory power.

4. In the event of the rejection by the Peace Conference of this just protest for certain con-

²Prince Feisel (also spelled *Fayzel* and *Faysal*), the son of Sharif Husayn, was an Arab military hero in the Anglo-Arab struggle against the Turks. After the French drove him from Syria in 1920, the British installed him as the first king of Iraq.

siderations that we may not understand, we, relying on the declarations of President Wilson that his object in waging war was to put an end to the ambition of conquest and colonization, can only regard the mandate mentioned in the Covenant of the League of Nations as equivalent to the rendering of economical and technical assistance that does not prejudice our complete independence. And desiring that our country should not fall a prey to colonization and believing that the American Nation is furthest from any thought of colonization and has no political ambition in our country, we will seek the technical and economic assistance from the United States of America, provided that such assistance does not exceed 20 years.

5. In the event of America not finding herself in a position to accept our desire for assistance, we will seek this assistance from Great Britain, also provided that such assistance does not infringe the complete independence and unity of our country and that the duration of such assistance does not exceed that mentioned in the previous article.

6. We do not acknowledge any right claimed by the French Government in any part whatever of our Syrian country and refuse that she should assist us or have a hand in our country under any circumstances and in any place.

7. We oppose the pretensions of the Zionists to create a Jewish commonwealth in the southern part of Syria, known as Palestine, and oppose Zionist migration to any part of our country; for we do not acknowledge their title but consider them a grave peril to our people from the national, economical, and political points of view. Our Jewish compatriots shall enjoy our common rights and assume the common responsibilities.

8. We ask that there should be no separation of the southern part of Syria, known as Palestine, nor of the littoral western zone, which in-

cludes Lebanon, from the Syrian country. We desire that the unity of the country should be guaranteed against partition under whatever circumstances.

9. We ask complete independence for emancipated Mesopotamia³ and that there should be no economic barriers between the two countries.

10. The fundamental principles laid down by President Wilson in condemnation of secret treaties impel us to protest most emphatically against any treaty that stipulates the partition of our Syrian country and against any private engagement aiming at the establishment of Zionism in the southern part of Syria; therefore we ask the complete annulment of these conventions and agreements.⁴

The noble principles enunciated by President Wilson⁵ strengthen our confidence that our desires emanating from the depths of our hearts, shall be the decisive factor in determining our future; and that President Wilson and the free American people will be our supporters for the realization of our hopes, thereby proving their sincerity and noble sympathy with the aspiration of the weaker nations in general and our Arab people in particular.

We also have the fullest confidence that the Peace Conference will realize that we would not have risen against the Turks, with whom we had participated in all civil, political, and representative privileges, but for their violation of our national rights, and so will grant us our desires in full in order that our political rights may not be less after the war than they were before, since we have shed so much blood in the cause of our liberty and independence.

We request to be allowed to send a delegation to represent us at the Peace Conference to defend our rights and secure the realization of our aspirations.

³The region of modern Iraq.

⁴This passage refers to the Balfour Declaration, in which Great Britain pledged its support for a Jewish state in Palestine, and the Sykes-Picor Agreement of 1916, in which Great Britain and France agreed to divide former Ottoman territories between them.

⁵Wilson's Fourteen Points.

AN ADDRESS TO TWO HUNDRED MILLION
FELLOW COUNTRYWOMEN
by Qiu Jin

Alas! The greatest injustice in this world must be the injustice suffered by our female population of two hundred million. If a girl is lucky enough to have a good father, then her childhood is at least tolerable. But if by chance her father is an ill-tempered and unreasonable man, he may curse her birth: "What rotten luck: another useless thing." Some men go as far as killing baby girls while most hold the opinion that "girls are eventually someone else's property" and treat them with coldness and disdain. In a few years, without thinking about whether it is right or wrong, he forcibly binds his daughter's soft, white feet with white cloth so that even in her sleep she cannot find comfort and relief until the flesh becomes rotten and the bones broken. What is all this misery for? Is it just so that on the girl's wedding day friends and neighbors will compliment him, saying, "Your daughter's feet are really small"? Is that what the pain is for?

But that is not the worst of it. When the time for marriage comes, a girl's future life is placed in the hands of a couple of shameless matchmakers and a family seeking rich and powerful in-laws. A match can be made without anyone ever inquiring whether the prospective bridegroom is honest, kind, or educated. On the day of the marriage the girl is forced into a red and green bridal sedan chair, and all this time she is not allowed to breathe one word about her future. After her marriage, if the man doesn't do her any harm, she is told that she should thank Heaven for her good fortune. But if the man is bad or he ill-treats her, she is told that her marriage is retribution for some sin committed in her previous existence. If she complains at all or tries to reason with her husband, he may get angry and beat her. When other people find out they will criticize, saying, "That woman is bad; she doesn't know how to behave like a wife." What can she do? When a man dies, his wife must mourn him for three years and never remarry. But if the woman dies, her husband only needs to tie his queue with blue thread. Some men consider this to be ugly and don't even do it. In some cases, three days after his wife's death, a man will go out for some "entertainment." Sometimes, before seven weeks have passed, a new bride has already arrived at the

Ridding China of Bad Customs / 343

door. When Heaven created people it never intended such injustice because if the world is without women, how can men be born? Why is there no justice for women? We constantly hear men say, "The human mind is just and we must treat people with fairness and equality." Then why do they greet women like black slaves from Africa? How did inequality and injustice reach this state?

Dear sisters, you must know that you'll get nothing if you rely upon others. You must go out and get things for yourselves. In ancient times when decadent scholars came out with such nonsense as "men are exalted, women are lowly," "a virtuous woman is one without talent," and "the husband guides the wife," ambitious and spirited women should have organized and opposed them. When the second Chen ruler popularized foot-binding, women should have challenged him if they had any sense of humiliation at all. . . . Men feared that if women were educated they would become superior to men, so they did not allow us to be educated. Couldn't the women have challenged the men and refused to submit? It seems clear now that it was we women who abandoned our responsibilities to ourselves and felt content to let men do everything for us. As long as we could live in comfort and leisure, we let men make all the decisions for us. When men said we were useless, we became useless; when they said we were incapable, we stopped questioning them even when our entire female sex had reached slave status. At the same time we were insecure in our good fortune and our physical comfort, so we did everything to please men. When we heard that men like small feet, we immediately bound them just to please them, just to keep our free meal tickets. As for their forbidding us to read and write, well, that was only too good to be true. We readily agreed. Think about it, sisters, can anyone enjoy such comfort and leisure without forfeiting dearly for it? It was only natural that men, with their knowledge, wisdom, and hard work, received the right to freedom while we became their slaves. And as slaves, how can we escape repression? Whom can we blame but ourselves since we have brought this on ourselves? I feel very sad talking

about this, yet I feel that there is no need for me to elaborate since all of us are in the same situation.

I hope that we all shall put aside the past and work hard for the future. Let us all put aside our former selves and be resurrected as complete human beings. Those of you who are old, do not call yourselves old and useless. If your husbands want to open schools, don't stop them; if your good sons want to study abroad, don't hold them back. Those among us who are middle-aged, don't hold back your husbands lest they lose their ambition and spirit and fail in their work. After your sons are born, send them to schools. You must do the same for your daughters and, whatever you do, don't bind their feet. As for you young girls among us, go to school if you can. If not, read and study at home. Those of you who are rich, persuade your husbands to open schools, build factories, and contribute to charitable organizations. Those of you who are poor, work hard and help your husbands. Don't be lazy, don't eat idle rice. These are what I hope for you. You must know that when a country is near destruction, women cannot rely on the men any more because they aren't even able to protect themselves. If we don't take heart now and shape up, it will be too late when China is destroyed.

Sisters, we must follow through on these ideas!

Translated by Nancy Gibbs

With the advent of World War I, Ho went to live in London, where he worked as a snow shoveler and as a cook's helper under Escoffier, the master chef, at the Carlton Hotel. Escoffier, it is said, promoted Ho to a job in the pastry kitchen and wanted to teach him the art of cuisine. However that may be, the 24-year-old Vietnamese was more interested in politics. He joined the Overseas Workers Association, composed mostly of Asians, and agitated, among other things, for Irish independence.

Sometime during the war, Ho gave up the Carlton's kitchen for the sea and journeyed to the United States. He is believed to have lived in Harlem for a while. Ho himself often referred to his American visit, although he was hazy about the details. According to his close associate, Pham Van Dong, what impressed Ho in the United States were "the barbarities and ugliness of American capitalism, the Ku Klux Klan mobs, the lynching of Negroes."

Out of Ho's American experiences came a pamphlet, issued in Moscow in 1924, called "La Race Noire" ("The Black Race"), which assailed racial practices in America and Europe.

About 1918 Ho returned to France and lived in a tiny flat in the Montmartre section of Paris, eking out a living by retouching photos under the name of Nguyen Ai Quoc.

At the Versailles Peace Conference of 1919 Ho emerged as a self-appointed spokesman for his native land. Seeing in Woodrow Wilson's proposal for self-determination of the peoples the possibility of Vietnam's independence, Ho, dressed in a hired black suit and bowler hat, traveled to the Palace of Versailles to present his case. He was, of course, not received, although he offered a program for Vietnam. Its proposals did not include independence, but basic freedoms and equality between the French rulers and the native population.

Whatever hopes Ho may have held for French liberation of Vietnam were destroyed in his mind by the failure of the Versailles Conference to settle colonial issues. His faith was now transferred to Socialist action. Indeed, his first recorded speech was at a congress of the French Socialist party in 1920, and it was a plea not for world revolution but "against the imperialists who have committed abhorrent crimes on my native land." He bid the party "act practically to support the oppressed natives."

Immediately afterward Ho became, fatefully, a founding member of the French Communist party because he considered that the Socialists were equivocating on the colonial issue whereas the Communists were willing to promote national liberation.

Andreas and Overfield, The Human Record, vol. II, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.,
1998 (pp 430-432)

Document E: Africa

A Plea for Racial Equality

102 ▼ *Second Pan-African Congress, MANIFESTO*

In the early stages of African colonialism, when Africa itself had few nationalist leaders, the most eloquent and influential spokesmen for Africa were blacks from the United States and the British West Indies. The most prominent of these early prophets of nationalism and Pan-Africanism was W. E. B. DuBois. Born in Massachusetts in 1868, he became in 1895 the first African American to receive a doctorate from Harvard University. Having achieved prominence among African Americans for his writings and his role in founding the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), DuBois in 1919 helped organize the first Pan-African Congress in Paris in the hope of influencing decisions being made at the Paris Peace Conference. A second meeting, which was held sequentially in London, Brussels, and Paris in 1921, was attended by 113 delegates from Africa, the United States, England, and the British West Indies. At the close of the 1921 congress, the delegates adopted the manifesto that follows.

QUESTIONS FOR ANALYSIS

1. On what grounds does the manifesto reject the idea of inequality among the world's races?
2. According to the manifesto, what is the main obstacle to African advancement?
3. What is the attitude of the manifesto toward whites?
4. According to the manifesto, why should "advanced" people aid the Africans?
5. Do the authors of the manifesto feel that Africa is ready for self-government? Why or why not?

The absolute equality of races, — physical, political and social — is the founding stone of world peace and human advancement. No one denies great differences of gift, capacity, and attainment among individuals of all races, but the voice of science, religion, and practical politics is one in denying the God-appointed existence of super-

races, or of races naturally and inevitably and eternally inferior.

That in the vast range of time, one group should in its industrial technique, or social organization, or spiritual vision, lag a few hundred years behind another, or forge fitfully ahead, or come to differ decidedly in thought, deed and

ideal, is proof of the essential richness and variety of human nature, rather than proof of the co-existence of demi-gods and apes in human form. The doctrine of racial equality does not interfere with individual liberty, rather, it fulfils it. And of all the various criteria by which masses of men have in the past been pre-judged and classified, that of the color of the skin and texture of the hair, is surely the most adventitious [accidental] and idiotic.

It is the duty of the world to assist in every way the advance of the backward and suppressed groups of mankind. The rise of all men is a menace to no one and is the highest human ideal; it is not an altruistic benevolence, but the one road to world salvation.

For the purpose of raising such peoples to intelligence, self-knowledge, and self-control, their intelligentsia of right ought to be recognized as the natural leaders of their groups.

The insidious and dishonorable propaganda, which, for selfish ends, so distorts and denies facts as to represent the advancement and development of certain races of men as impossible and undesirable, should be met with widespread dissemination of the truth. . . .

If it be proven that absolute world segregation by group, color, or historic infinity is best for the future, let the white race leave the dark world and the darker races will gladly leave the white. But the proposition is absurd. This is a world of men, of men whose likenesses far outweigh their differences; who mutually need each other in labor and thought and dream, but who can successfully have each other only on terms of equality, justice, and mutual respect. They are the real and only peacemakers who work sincerely and peacefully to this end.

The beginnings of wisdom in interracial contact is the establishment of political institutions among suppressed peoples. The habit of democracy must be made to encircle the earth. Despite the attempt to prove that its practice is the secret and divine gift of the few, no habit is more

natural or more widely spread among primitive people, or more easily capable of development among masses. . . .

Surely in the 20th century of the Prince of Peace,¹ . . . there can be found in the civilized world enough of altruism, learning, and benevolence to develop native institutions for the native's good, rather than continue to allow the majority of mankind to be brutalized and enslaved by ignorant and selfish agents of commercial institutions, whose one aim is profit and power for the few.

And this brings us to the crux of the matter: It is the shame of the world that today the relation between the main groups of mankind and their mutual estimate and respect is determined chiefly by the degree in which one can subject the other to its service, enslaving labor, making ignorance compulsory, uprooting ruthlessly religion and customs, and destroying government, so that the favored Few may luxuriate in the toil of the tortured many. . . .

The day of such world organization is past and whatever excuse be made for it in other ages, the 20th century must come to judge men as men and not as material and labor. . . .

What do those wish who see these evils of the color line and racial discrimination and who believe in the divine right of suppressed and backward peoples to learn and aspire and be free?

The Negro race through its thinking intelligentsia is demanding:

1. The recognition of civilized men as civilized despite their race or color
2. Local self-government for backward groups, deliberately rising as experience and knowledge grow to complete self-government under the limitations of a self-governed world
3. Education in self-knowledge, in scientific truth and in industrial technique, undivorced from the art of beauty
4. Freedom in their own religion and social customs, and with the right to be different and non-conformist

¹Jesus.

432 *Global Society and Its Challenges*

- 5. Co-operation with the rest of the world in government, industry, and art on the basis of Justice, Freedom, and Peace
- 6. The ancient common ownership of the land and its natural fruits and defense against the unrestrained greed of invested capital
- 7. The establishment under the League of Nations of an international institution for the study of Negro problems
- 8. The establishment of an international section in the Labor Bureau of the League of Nations, charged with the protection of native labor.

The world must face two eventualities: either the complete assimilation of Africa with two or three of the great world states, with political, civil, and social power and privileges absolutely

equal for its black and white citizens, or the rise of a great black African state founded in Peace and Good Will, based on popular education, natural art, and industry and freedom of trade; autonomous and sovereign in its internal policy, but from its beginning a part of a great society of peoples in which it takes its place with others as co-rulers of the world.

In some such words and thoughts as these we seek to express our will and ideal, and the end of our untiring effort. To our aid we call all men of the Earth who love Justice and Mercy. Out of the depths we have cried unto the deaf and dumb masters of the world. Out of the depths we cry to our own sleeping souls.

The answer is written in the stars.

Benjamin Keen, A History
of Latin America, Boston;
Houghton-Mifflin Co, 1902.

(pp 531-532)

Quiet Imperialism:

The Post-World War I Years

United States investment in Latin America grew rapidly in the period between 1914 and 1929. The world war enabled American entrepreneurs to buy up much of the large British and German investment in the region. Total U.S. investment in Cuba and the West Indies, for example, rose from \$336 million in 1914 to \$1.2 billion in 1929, nearly four times the amount. United States capital in Central America more than tripled, while investment in South America skyrocketed to about an eightfold increase; investment in South America doubled every five years. In 1929 total U.S. investment in Latin America had reached the staggering sum of \$5.4 billion, or 35 percent of all U.S. foreign investment.

Much of the new investment went into oil: U.S. companies channeled \$235 million to Venezuela, \$134 million to Colombia, \$120 million to Mexico, and \$50 million to Peru for oil exploration and production. Another \$163 million went to manufacturing enterprises in South America. U.S. companies also invested heavily in Chilean copper and nitrate, in Argentine beef, and in Cuban sugar.

This period marked the full-fledged involvement of large U.S. corporations, later called multinationals, in Latin America. Such giants as Standard Oil of New Jersey, the American Smelting

and Refining Company, International Telephone and Telegraph, American Foreign Power, and Armour established or added to their vast stake in the region.

The basic goal of United States policy in Latin America did not change during the postwar period; it remained the protection of American economic interests. However, public opinion and realism dictated modifications. The American people were badly disillusioned by the negotiations over the Versailles treaty and the subsequent rejection of the treaty and the League of Nations by the U.S. Senate. Americans were weary of overseas adventures and crusades. The United States remained dominant in the Caribbean, exerting decisive influence in the affairs of Mexico and Cuba and continuing to occupy the Dominican Republic, Haiti, and Nicaragua during the 1920s, but there was growing opposition to the old-style imperialism.

Foreign policy makers in the U.S. also realized that growing anti-American feeling in Latin America, primarily a response to U.S. actions in the Caribbean, posed a serious long-term danger to American economic interests. An early sign of a shift in United States policy came in 1921, when the Colombian government threatened to cancel the concessions of American companies to explore and drill for oil. The United States responded by paying Colombia \$25 million to compensate for the loss of Panama. This act had a dual meaning: it served to protect U.S. economic interests, and it symbolized a less aggressive policy toward Latin America. The shift in American tactics became even clearer when the United States removed its troops from Cuba in 1922, from the Dominican Republic in 1924, and from Nicaragua in 1925. Despite these actions, the United States encountered bitter criticism of its role in the hemisphere at the Pan-American conferences held in Santiago in 1923 and Havana in 1928.

The most important indication that the United States had largely abandoned military intervention as a major tactic was its restraint in dealing with Mexico, the biggest trouble spot in the hemi-

sphere during the 1920s. The Mexican constitution of 1917, as noted previously, was a most radical document by contemporary standards. The constitution's provisions on landownership and ownership of subsoil rights seriously endangered U.S. investments. American oil companies, in particular, objected to the new laws, which sought to reclaim Mexico's rich natural resources from foreign control.

Throughout the 1920s, the United States and Mexico haggled over application of the constitution. Several times, they reached temporary compromises, but the basic disagreement inflamed relations until World War II. The United States did not intervene militarily to protect the very large U.S. investments in Mexico because three circumstances discouraged such action. First, public opinion opposed further foreign adventures. Second, a military invasion would have been prohibitively costly in terms of both manpower and finances. Finally, American entrepreneurs with interests in Mexico disagreed sharply over the proper course of action. The oil companies, who were most threatened by the constitution, favored intervention. The banks and the mining companies, whose interests would have been in greater danger in the event of war between the United States and Mexico, opposed intervention. The controversy abated during the late 1920s, when the Calles regime made significant concessions with regard to American oil interests in Mexico.

President Herbert Hoover and Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson continued to shift toward moderation and stepped up U.S. efforts to win good will in Latin America. During the interim between his election and inauguration, Hoover toured Latin America. On taking office, he abandoned Wilson's policy of denying recognition to "unworthy" governments. The Clark memorandum, published in 1930, was a milestone in Hoover's efforts. It declared that the Roosevelt Corollary had no support in the Monroe Doctrine; consequently, the United States would no longer interfere in the internal affairs of Latin American nations under the provisions of the doctrine. But

the president carefully refrained from rejecting intervention outright. In 1933 he withdrew United States troops from Nicaragua and would have removed them from Haiti as well had the Haitians not objected to the withdrawal terms.

The Global Experience: Readings
In World History, vol. II, Prentice Hall 1987

50

The Balfour Declaration

To enlist Jewish support for the War, Arthur James Balfour, British Foreign Secretary, wrote the following letter to Lord Rothschild, a prominent Jewish leader, and had it printed in *The Times*. The letter contains the official statement that soon became known as the Balfour Declaration.

Foreign Office
November 2nd, 1917

Dear Lord Rothschild:

I have much pleasure in conveying to you, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations which has been submitted to, and approved by, the Cabinet:

His Majesty's Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.

I should be grateful if you would bring this declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation.

Yours,
Arthur James Balfour

From *The Times* (London), November 9, 1917.