Chapter 19
1919–1939
Nationalism in Asia, Africa, and Latin America

Chapter Themes

- Nationalism  Hope for a new world after World War I leads to the rise of nationalism in the Middle East and Africa. Section 1
- Change  Gandhi calls for non-violence in India’s struggle for independence. Section 2
- Conflict  Nationalists, Communists, and the Japanese compete for control of China. Section 3
- Conflict  Japan’s militarism and expansionism place it on a collision course with the West. Section 4
- Change  Nationalist forces in Latin America oppose increased American intervention. Section 5

The Storyteller

“I swear before country and history that my sword will defend our nation’s dignity, that it will be a sword for the oppressed. I accept the invitation to fight…. The last of my soldiers, the soldiers of freedom for Nicaragua, may die; but before that, more than a battalion of your blond invaders will have bitten the dust of my wild mountains.”

With these fighting words, General Augusto César Sandino challenged the United States Marines in 1927. Sandino was trying to drive out the “blond invaders” who had occupied Nicaragua for 15 years. In the years following World War I, nationalist leaders such as Sandino struggled to end foreign control and win independence for their countries around the globe.

Historical Significance

What factors led to the growth of nationalist and independence movements in Asia, Africa, and Latin America between 1919 and 1939?

- 1921  Harry Thuku organizes nationalists in Kenya.
- 1930  Mohandas K. Gandhi leads salt-tax march in India.
- 1934  Chinese Communists carry out the Long March.
- 1938  Mexico nationalizes oil wells.
The Destruction of the Old Order by José Clemente Orozco.
National Preparatory School, Mexico City, Mexico

Your History Journal
Choose a major event that occurred after 1930 in one of the nations featured in this chapter. Write a short radio news report describing the event for broadcast in the United States.
At the end of World War I, European powers continued to control most of the Middle East and Africa. Many colonies had assisted the Allies during the war, hoping to gain their independence as a reward. President Woodrow Wilson of the United States raised their hopes in 1918 by endorsing the concept of self-determination: the right of national groups to set up independent nations.

But instead of relaxing their grip, the European powers tightened it. Nationalists prepared to fight for independence and organized political demonstrations. They were eager to establish modern countries where their own cultures could flourish.

Turkey

For nearly 500 years, Turkish emperors called sultans ruled the vast Ottoman Empire, which at one time included parts of eastern Europe, the Middle East, and North Africa. During the 1800s, however, large sections of this empire broke away or were conquered. When World War I began, the Ottomans joined forces with Germany, hoping to save their remaining lands.

War With Greece

The Allied victory in World War I dashed Ottoman hopes. The Ottoman sultan, or ruler, lost all of his lands except the area of present-day Turkey. In 1919 the Greeks invaded Turkey in an attempt to complete the destruction of the Ottoman Empire. Turkish general Mustafa Kemal, however, rallied forces to his country’s defense. Kemal led a political group known as the Young Turks who wanted reforms to modernize Turkey. Turkish armies under Kemal counterattacked and defeated the Greeks in 1922.
The Turkish victory led to dramatic changes. The sultan gave up his throne, and the Turks formed a new country, the Republic of Turkey. Kemal became its first president. The new government moved the capital from Istanbul to Ankara, a city near the center of the country. Believing that Turkey needed to industrialize in order to assert its role in world affairs, Kemal’s government established industries and planned their growth. Tariffs on imports were raised to protect the new industries from foreign competition and to reduce dependence on foreign countries.

Kemal’s Reforms

Kemal carried out a number of radical reforms in Turkish society. As a result of Kemal’s policies, Turkey adopted a Western way of life. The Turks began using the Western calendar, the Latin alphabet, and the metric system. Kemal ordered men to stop wearing the fez, a traditional hat, and he tried to rid the country of the custom of veiling among women. He also urged Turks to use Western-style last names. To Westernize the government, he reformed the legal code and separated government and religion.

Some of Kemal’s changes were designed to promote national pride among the Turks. For example, he urged Turks to “purify” their language by ridding it of all words that had Persian or Arabic origins. He also changed his own name to Kemal Atatürk (keh•MAHL AT•uh•TUHRK), which means “father of the Turks.”

In defense of his reforms, Kemal said: “We have suffered much. This is because we have failed to understand the world. Our thoughts and our mentality will become civilized from head to toe.” Kemal ruled Turkey with an iron fist until his death in 1938. His policies were not always popular, but he changed Turkey from an ancient empire into a modern nation.

Iran

Located between Turkey and Pakistan, Iran is a land of mountains, deserts, and oil. At the end of World War I this land, known by its historic name of Persia, was ruled by a shah, or king. However, Great Britain and the Soviet Union each had controlling interests in Persia’s oil fields.

In 1921 nationalist forces led by Reza Khan, an army officer, wanted to cut back the foreign influence on their government and economy. The nationalists overthrew the shah and set up a new government. Like Atatürk, Reza Khan built schools, roads, and hospitals, and he allowed women more freedom. Improved communications helped unite the diverse groups in the country. Although adopting many Western ways, he tried to reduce Western political influence in Persia.

Reza wanted to change the Persian monarchy into a republic. However, traditional Muslim leaders opposed this change, so Reza ruled as a dictator. Later, in 1925, he declared himself shah and
adopted the new name Reza Shah Pahlavi (rih•ZAH SHAH PAL•uh•vee). Pahlavi was the name of the ancient Persian language. Reza Shah Pahlavi earned money from Persia’s oil fields and factories and from his vast royal estates.

During the 1930s, Reza Shah Pahlavi aligned his country with Germany. He admired Hitler, in part because he believed that Germans and Persians shared a common ancestry in the ancient Aryan, or Indo-European, peoples. In 1935 he changed the country’s name from Persia to Iran, a variation of the word Aryan. In 1941, when Great Britain and the Soviet Union were at war with Germany, British and Soviet forces deposed Reza Shah Pahlavi and replaced him with his son, Mohammad Reza Pahlavi. The new ruler permitted British and Soviet troops to remain in Iran.

Palestine

While Iran was trying to free itself from European control, another Middle Eastern region was just coming under British domination. After World War I, the newly formed League of Nations gave Great Britain a mandate over Palestine. This region had been part of the Ottoman Empire. Britain was eager to benefit from control of Palestine’s strategic location at the eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea.

In Palestine, the nationalism of two groups—Jews and Arabs—came into conflict. The Jews claimed the land on the basis of their biblical heritage and the continuing presence of Jews in the area since ancient times. Arabs pointed out that their ancestors had lived there for many centuries also. During this period, Palestine’s small number of Jews and large number of Arabs lived together peacefully much of the time.

Beginning in the late 1800s, the number of Jews in Palestine began increasing. European Jews, facing harsh anti-Jewish pogroms in Russia and stirred by a growing sense of nationalism, believed they should reestablish a Jewish national homeland in Palestine. This movement, known as Zionism, became an organized political force in the late 1890s under the leadership of Theodor Herzl, a prominent Austrian Jewish writer and journalist. By World War I, about 500,000 Arabs and 85,000 Jews lived in Palestine.

During World War I, the British government promised independence to the Arabs in return for their help against the Ottoman Turks and also promised a homeland to the Jews. The Balfour Declaration—a letter from British Foreign Secretary Arthur Balfour in 1917 to the English Zionist Federation—promised Great Britain’s help in establishing “a national home for the Jewish people” in Palestine. Great Britain’s pledge of support, however, was on the condition that the civil and religious rights of other communities be protected. In September 1923, the British mandate officially came into force in Palestine in spite of Great Britain’s conflicting promises to the area’s Jewish and Arab communities.

In 1919

Egyptian nationalists protested the arrest of their leader Saad Zaghlul by the British. What two other nationalist leaders rose to prominence in the Middle East after World War I?
Under the British mandate, tensions heightened between Arabs and Jews. As the persecution of Jews in Nazi Germany increased, so did Jewish immigration to Palestine. As more Jews moved into a region long inhabited by Arabs, the two groups clashed. Riots broke out, resulting in hundreds of casualties. When Great Britain tried to limit Jewish immigration, Zionists responded in anger. By the end of the 1930s, Great Britain’s ambiguous promises had angered both Jews and Arabs, and the conflict in Palestine was worsening.

Egypt

Palestine’s neighbor Egypt also confronted troubles after World War I. Under British occupation since 1882, Egypt was beginning to feel the power of nationalism. Saad Zaghlul (zag•LOOL) led the nationalist forces in Egypt demanding independence. The British tried to weaken the nationalist cause by arresting Zaghlul, but their action only sparked riots and violence. Finally, in 1922, Great Britain granted Egypt limited independence. However, the British kept control of the Suez Canal.

Tensions continued over the next decade between Egypt and Great Britain. But when Italy invaded Ethiopia in 1935, the British decided they needed Egypt’s help to prevent further Italian aggression. As a result, the British government granted Egypt its complete independence in 1936 and helped it become a member of the League of Nations the following year. Great Britain also withdrew all British troops from Egypt, except for those in the Suez Canal zone.

Kenya

South of Egypt, in central East Africa, lay another part of Great Britain’s empire: Kenya. During World War I, about 45,000 Kenyans died while helping the British fight the Germans in East Africa. The survivors returned home after the war with dreams of independence and a new life. However, instead of granting Kenya its independence, the British allowed European settlers to seize the land of many Kenyans in order to start large coffee plantations and other agricultural operations. The settlers hired Kenyans at low wages and made them work under harsh conditions. Resentment of British rule in Kenya gave rise to a

Imperialist Boundaries

During the late 1800s, European powers carved up Africa without respect to the continent’s historic ethnic boundaries. Colonial boundary lines split groups of people and joined them to other groups with different religious beliefs, customs, and languages. This often led to unwanted rivalries and hostilities. Nowhere was this problem more evident than in Nigeria.

Nigeria is home to more than 250 separate ethnic groups. The three largest are the Hausa, the Yoruba, and the Ibo. In the days before colonial rule, each group controlled its own territory. When the British united the region in 1914, Hausa, Yoruba, and Ibo peoples were part of the same country for the first time. They eyed each other with suspicion.

After independence arrived in 1960, the struggle for unity continued in Nigeria. However, hostilities flared into warfare in 1967. Eastern Nigeria seceded and established the independent state of Biafra. The Nigerian government eventually won the war and reclaimed Biafra, but the country remains haunted by the prophetic words that nationalist leader Obafemi Awolowo spoke in 1947: “Nigeria is not a nation. It is a mere geographical expression.”

Nigerian nationalist Nnamdi Azikiwe

Explain the statement: “Nigeria is not a nation. It is a mere geographical expression.” Why have Nigerians been reluctant to unite?
protest movement in 1921 led by Harry Thuku (THOO•koo). The protesters complained about high colonial taxes and strict British labor laws. Colonial officials promptly arrested Thuku, and in the riot that followed, British troops killed about 25 Kenyans. The British then exiled Thuku.

In Thuku’s absence, Jomo Kenyatta took over the growing nationalist movement. Instead of fighting the British in Kenya for independence, Kenyatta took his struggle to the center of British power in London. By meeting with government officials in the 1920s and 1930s, he made progress—but very slowly. He later recalled his frustrations:

“By driving [the African] off his ancestral lands, the Europeans have robbed him of the material foundations of his culture, and reduced him to a state of servitude incompatible with human happiness…. It is not in his nature to accept servitude forever. He realizes that he must fight unceasingly for his own complete emancipation; for without this he is doomed to remain the prey of rival imperialisms.”

—Jomo Kenyatta, Facing Mount Kenya, 1938

In spite of Kenyatta’s efforts, when World War II began, Kenya remained firmly in British hands.

Nigeria

Across the continent from Kenya, on the west coast, lies Nigeria. The British controlled this region as well, and they made large fortunes from its rubber, oil, and tin. As in Kenya, the British imposed heavy taxes on men and strict labor laws.

In 1929 Nigerian women learned that they too would be taxed. When a group of unarmed women protested by attacking British goods and property, police fired on them, killing 50.

The violent end of the women’s uprising drove many Nigerians to adopt nonviolent methods in their struggle. Nnamdi Azikiwe (eh •nahm•dee ah•zee•KEE•WEE), started the newspaper The West African Pilot in 1937. He wrote many articles in favor of independence for all of Africa. “Africa needs a pilot,” he wrote once. “Those who follow the true pilot, believing they are on the right track, will find their way to their destination.”

SECTION 1 ASSESSMENT

Main Idea
1. Use a diagram like the one below to identify effects of nationalism on Africa after World War I.

![Diagram of Effects of Nationalism on Africa]

Recall
3. Identify Kemal Atatürk, Reza Shah Pahlavi, Theodor Herzl, Saad Zaghlul, the Balfour Declaration, Harry Thuku, Jomo Kenyatta, Nnamdi Azikiwe.

Critical Thinking
4. Evaluating Information
The British in Kenya said they were “exercising a trust on behalf of the African population.” What does this imply about Great Britain’s attitude toward Africans?

Understanding Themes
5. Nationalism What factors contributed to the rise of nationalist feeling in the Middle East and Africa at the end of World War I?
When World War I began, the most important territory in the British Empire was India. As in the Middle East and Africa, nationalism was spreading in India. Some Indians wanted independence. Many were willing to remain in the British Empire but demanded home rule. Two of the largest nationalist organizations were the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League.

During World War I, Indian nationalists supported Great Britain and its allies. More than a million Indian soldiers fought on the battlefields of the Middle East and Africa. Indian wheat fed the Allied troops, and Indian cotton kept them clothed. In return for this aid, Great Britain promised in 1917 to support eventual self-rule for India.

Independence did not come easily to India. After the war, the Indian National Congress staged demonstrations to protest British rule. The nationalist movement, however, was divided by religion. The Hindu majority and the Muslim minority did not trust each other. The British authorities in India encouraged that distrust.

A second difficulty was British opposition. Many Britons were unwilling to see their empire’s power reduced and staunchly opposed freeing India. In 1919 Great Britain imposed on India harsh laws intended to stifle opposition to British rule. British officials could arrest nationalists without cause and jail them without trial.

British repression reached an extreme in the Punjabi city of Amritsar in April 1919. The British had outlawed all large gatherings and declared that they would respond to any violation with force. When 10,000 unarmed Indians assembled in a
walled garden in Amritsar for a political meeting, the local commander decided that the British needed to demonstrate their authority. Without warning, British troops blocked the only entrance to the garden and began firing into the trapped crowd. When the firing ceased, nearly 400 people, including many children, lay dead. Another 1,200 people were wounded. Criticized for his action, the British commander declared:

I fired and continued to fire until the crowd dispersed, and I consider this is the least amount of firing which would produce the necessary moral effect…. If more troops had been at hand, the casualties would have been greater.

Indians across the country were shocked by the brutal massacre and the general’s justification of it. In large numbers, they came together in meeting after meeting, more determined than ever to drive the British out of their land. However, they needed a strong leader to spearhead their struggle.

Gandhi’s Campaign

In the months following the Amritsar Massacre, Mohandas K. Gandhi became the leading Indian nationalist. Born in India of middle-class parents in 1869, Gandhi had been educated in England. He later practiced law in South Africa, where he and other Indians experienced mistreatment because of their dark skin.

Until 1914 Gandhi lived in South Africa and led protests against racial discrimination. He was a pacifist, a person opposed to using war and other violence to settle disputes. In keeping with his beliefs, Gandhi used protest methods based on civil disobedience, or the refusal to obey laws that are considered unjust.

When Gandhi returned to India, he began working with the Indian National Congress and led a nonviolent movement for self-government and for greater tolerance among the country’s many social and religious groups. Gandhi urged Indians to reject much of Western civilization for its use of brute force, its worship of money, and its prejudicial attitudes toward non-Western peoples. Gandhi’s understanding of India’s problems made him popular throughout the country. The Indian people called Gandhi Mahatma, meaning “great soul.”

Gandhi’s doctrine of moral nonviolent protest won him international attention. He believed that one could force an evil person or government to change by challenging it directly, but without violence. Gandhi used the term satyagraha (suh-TYAH-gruh-huh), which means “truth force,” to describe the nonviolent protests he led after the Amritsar Massacre. One effective form of protest was the boycott, in which Indians refused to buy British cloth and other manufactured goods. As a step toward independence, Gandhi urged Indians to begin spinning their own cloth.

Gandhi practiced what he preached by spinning cloth for a half hour every day. He made the spinning wheel the symbol of the National Congress, and he wore nothing but simple homespun clothes for the rest of his life.

Footnotes to History

Mohandas K. Gandhi has had a profound influence on people in the West. He served as a model for Martin Luther King, Jr. King led the African American civil rights struggle until his assassination in 1968. Like Gandhi, King protested injustice with nonviolent boycotts and marches.
Gandhi’s courage inspired millions of Indians to protest. In 1922, however, the British arrested Gandhi, and he disappeared from active protest for the rest of the decade. Undaunted, the Indian National Congress continued to protest, but it achieved little success until Gandhi’s return in 1930.

Toward Independence

Gandhi planned his next major protest around salt. In India’s hot climate, the millions of people who worked in fields and factories needed salt to replace what they lost daily in sweat. The British controlled the salt mines and the ocean salt fields. They taxed every grain of salt they sold and jailed Indians who gathered salt on their own.

In 1930 Gandhi protested the salt tax. First he led thousands of his followers on a 200-mile (322-km) march from Ahmadabad to the sea, where they made salt from sea water. One month later, Gandhi openly defied British authority by wading into the sea and picking up a lump of salt. The British did not dare arrest him, but they did arrest thousands who followed his example. To quell the mounting protests, they arrested him a month later, but the protests only increased. Webb Miller, a British journalist, described one such protest, in which a group marched on a heavily guarded salt mine: “Although every one knew that within a few minutes he would be beaten down, perhaps killed, I could detect no signs of wavering or fear.… [T]he marchers simply walked forward until struck down.”

This pattern continued throughout the 1930s. As Indians protested, the British responded with guns and clubs. Their violence could not stop the millions of people motivated by nationalism.

Limited Self-Rule

Under pressure from the nationalist movement, the British began to give Indians more political power. In 1935 the British Parliament passed the Government of India Act, which created a constitution for India. This measure gave provincial legislatures control over the making of law in the provinces. Areas such as agriculture, education, public health, and public works came under the control of the provincial governments. The British government retained control of national lawmaking, finance, defense, and foreign affairs.

The majority of Indian nationalists rejected the act, wanting complete independence. However, the Indian National Congress, at the insistence of Gandhi, finally accepted it as the first step toward self-rule. The Indian historian K.M. Panikkar states that with this act, “British authority in India was in full retreat, in the administrative field no less than in the political and economic fields.” Nevertheless, independence was not yet won.

Hindu-Muslim Relations

Even as India moved toward independence in the 1930s, conflicts among Indians increased. For every Muslim, India had three Hindus. As independence approached, the Muslims began worrying about their future treatment by the Hindus, and many joined the Muslim League.

In 1937 the Indian National Congress, controlled by Hindus, won election majorities in 7 out of 11 provinces. Muslims came to power in the others. This heightened bitter feelings. The Muslim League, headed by Mohammed Ali Jinnah, split with the Congress party. It demanded a separate Muslim nation for the millions of Muslims in India. The Hindus, led by Jawaharlal Nehru, a follower of Gandhi, wanted a united India.

Although a Hindu, Gandhi was concerned about the deepening rift between Hindus and Muslims. His pleas for toleration were largely ignored by both groups. As 1939 ended, the nationalist movement had split in two, and not even Gandhi could put it together again.
Unlike India, China was never entirely controlled by a European country. However, despite its independence and population size, China did not have the military power to command respect. That they lacked the respect of Europeans was shown by the final terms of the Versailles peace conference that followed World War I. The Versailles Treaty had a provision granting Japan economic control of the Shandong Peninsula of northeastern China. This provision was a humiliating and surprising blow to the Chinese. During and after World War I, China was torn apart by internal divisions, and the foreign powers took advantage of China’s weakness.

### The Chinese Republic

As you read in Chapter 16, the Chinese revolutionary leader Sun Yat-sen formally declared China a republic in January 1912. Sun dreamed of a free, democratic society. However, just two months after taking office, he was ousted by Yuan Shigai (YOO•AHN•SHUR•GIE). Yuan quickly turned the new republic into a dictatorship. Meanwhile, Sun organized and formed the nationalist Guomindang (KWOH•MIHN•DAHNG) party, tried and failed to overthrow Yuan, and then fled to Japan.

When Yuan died in 1916, China slipped into chaos. Local military leaders called warlords divided the vast country among themselves. An almost continual state of civil war followed.

Sun Yat-sen returned to China in 1917 and tried in vain to restore strong central government and rebuild the Guomindang party. Then in 1923, with aid from the Soviet Union and an officer named Chiang Kai-shek (JEE•AHNG•KY•SHEHK), the Guomindang army grew rapidly in strength. Sun Yat-sen died in 1925.

---

**Terms to Define**
- warlord

**People to Meet**
- Sun Yat-sen
- Yuan Shigai
- Chiang Kai-shek
- Mao Zedong

**Places to Locate**
- Nanjing
- Guangzhou
- Manchuria

---

**Read to Find Out**

**Main Idea** Nationalist forces in China were both divided and united.

---

**The Storyteller**

Wai Zhou watched a small man addressing a group in the square. “China has become a colony of all the Powers,” he proclaimed. This was nothing new, Wai Zhou thought, just another agitator seeking an audience. But the man continued, “Foreigners often refer to the Chinese nation as a bowl of loose sand. To revive nationalism we must expand our small group loyalty to a very large group. The people must learn to read and write. China must become a democracy. Those who till the soil should own it.” The speaker outlined a plan for Chinese independence. Completely won over, Wai Zhou asked a bystander who the speaker was. “I heard him called Sun Yat-sen,” the man replied.

—adapted from Lectures on Nationalism, Sun Yat-sen, reprinted in Lives and Times, James P. Holoka and Jiu-Hwa Lo Upshur, 1995

Sun Yat-sen
Three years later, Chiang led the army to victory over the warlords and established a government in the city of Nanjing.

Though undemocratic, government under the Guomindang promoted economic development by building schools, roads, and railways. However, the Guomindang did very little to raise the living standards of China’s many peasants.

Rivalry With the Communists

Many peasants, along with intellectuals and urban workers, supported another party that opposed the warlords: the Communists. During Chiang’s drive against the warlords, Communist soldiers provided him with crucial military support. But in 1927 the Communists attempted to take over the Guomindang party and failed. Chiang turned against the Communists and tried to wipe them out. In Shanghai, Guangzhou, and other cities, Guomindang soldiers killed tens of thousands of Communists.

As Chiang began his purge, tens of thousands of Communists fled to the mountains in the southern province of Jiangxi (jee•AHNG•SHEE). Here they gathered their strength and formed the Red Army, led by the son of a prosperous peasant family, Mao Zedong (MOW DZUH•DOONG). Mao believed that the Communists could still triumph with the help of China’s millions of peasants:

“In a very short time, in China’s central, southern, and northern provinces, several hundred million peasants will rise like a mighty storm, like a hurricane, a force so swift and violent that no power, however great, will be able to hold it back.”

—Mao Zedong, Report on an Investigation, 1926

Living conditions for China’s peasants had changed little over the centuries. They worked small plots of land and turned over most of their crops to wealthy landlords. The Red Army gained popular support by overthrowing local landlords and distributing their land to the peasants. Soon, the Red Army included nearly 30,000 peasant troops.

The success of the Red Army worried Chiang. In the early 1930s he ordered “extermination campaigns” to destroy this rival army. Mao fought back with his own strategies: “The enemy advances, we retreat; the enemy camps, we harass; the enemy tires, we attack; the enemy retreats, we pursue.”

Mao’s military plans worked at times, but by October 1934, the Guomindang had nearly surrounded the Communists with a million troops. Mao decided to retreat once again, leading about 100,000 followers out of Jiangxi Province.
The Long March

Mao’s retreat from Jiangxi lasted for one year and covered about 6,000 miles (9,600 km). The Red Army marched an average of 16 miles (26 km) a day, across rivers and mountains, and defeated 10 provincial armies while being chased by Guomindang military forces. The Chinese Communists called the arduous undertaking the Long March.

At times the line of marching Communist soldiers stretched out for nearly 50 miles (80 km). One of these soldiers later recalled the march:

“If it was a black night and the enemy far away, we made torches from pine branches or frayed bamboo, and then it was truly beautiful. At the foot of a mountain, we could look up and see a long column of lights coiling like a fiery dragon up the mountainside. From the summit we could look in both directions and see miles of torches moving forward like a wave of fire. A rosy glow hung over the whole route of the march.”

Conditions on the Long March were far from rosy, however. Many soldiers froze or starved to death, and others died in battle. Of the original 100,000 troops, fewer than 8,000 survived.

Threat From Japan

While Chiang and Mao battled each other in 1931, the Japanese had conquered the large section of northeast China known as Manchuria. Now it appeared that Japan wanted even more land, and Chiang’s advisers urged him to confront the Japanese. Mao offered assistance but was rejected by Chiang. Manchurian forces then kidnapped Chiang and held him prisoner until he finally agreed to end his war with the Communists.

However, unity between Chiang and Mao could not stop the Japanese invasion that came eight months later. By 1939 Japan controlled most of eastern China. Chiang withdrew to the interior of the country, where Mao was awaiting the proper moment to strike back. Before that moment arrived, the entire world was at war.

Main Idea

1. Use a chart like the one below to identify factors that divided and united nationalist forces in China.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationalist Forces</th>
<th>Divided By:</th>
<th>United By:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Recall

2. Define warlord.

3. Identify Sun Yat-sen, Yuan Shigai, Chiang Kai-shek, Mao Zedong.

Critical Thinking

4. Analyzing Information Why do you think Mao Zedong and the Communists decided to undertake the Long March? What other choices did they have?

Understanding Themes

5. Conflict What conflicts kept China in turmoil after World War I?
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Section 4  Militarism in Japan

Like China, Japan, an independent country, had fought on the side of the Allies in World War I. During the conflict, the Japanese supplied weapons to their European partners, particularly to Russia. At the same time, they took advantage of the war to expand their economic and political influence in East Asia. In addition to ruling Korea and Taiwan, Japan pressed for an enlargement of its role in China. In 1915 Japanese diplomats forced the Chinese government to accept a list of terms known as the Twenty-One Demands. The Twenty-One Demands, in effect, made China a Japanese protectorate.

Japan and the West

When World War I ended, Japan received Germany’s Pacific islands north of the Equator as mandates from the League of Nations. The Japanese also entered into a series of military and commercial agreements with the Western powers. A disarmament conference held in Washington, D.C., in 1922 led to a five-power agreement among Japan, Great Britain, the United States, Italy, and France that allowed Japan to become the world’s third-largest naval power after Great Britain and the United States. Yet, in spite of this and other gains, the Japanese were bitter toward the West.

First, Japan felt that the West did not accept it as an equal. In 1919 the League of Nations, dominated by Western powers, refused to accept Japan’s demand for a statement on racial equality in the League’s charter. The Japanese regarded this rejection as a humiliation. In 1924 the United States banned further Japanese immigration to its shores. In response, the Japanese staged demonstrations and boycotted American goods.

The Japanese were angered further by the West’s refusal to support Japanese policy in China. Japan wanted to tie China closer to itself; the West wanted to retain the Open Door policy. As a result
of Western pressure, Japan had to abandon the Twenty-One Demands and recognize Western interests in China.

Social and Political Tensions

After World War I, Japan faced social and economic challenges at home. Of major concern was a population explosion, or dramatic increase in population. Japan’s population had increased from nearly 35 million in 1872 to about 60 million in 1925. This rate of increase was a challenge because of the already high density of population on the Japanese islands.

Japan’s Industrial Growth

Since emigration was cut off to such places as the United States, the Japanese looked for other ways to cope. They placed new emphasis on manufacturing and foreign trade. It was hoped that new factories and markets would provide employment for large numbers of people.

Government-controlled banks provided the needed capital to encourage the expansion of heavy industry, or the manufacture of machinery and equipment needed for factories and mines. Industries important to national defense, especially steel and the railroads, were owned by the government, but most of the Japanese economy was in the hands of large privately owned businesses known together as the zaibatsu (zy•BAHT•soo).

During the 1920s and 1930s Japan’s industry grew rapidly, and Japanese manufactured goods began to flood world markets. Increased manufacturing, however, stimulated the desire for raw materials. Since Japan had few mineral resources of its own, it was forced to look overseas for them.

Social and Political Changes

Meanwhile, Japan’s working class increased in importance. Because of overpopulation in the countryside, land already scarce was continually subdivided among farmers. Rural economic woes enabled farm villages to provide the bulk of labor for the new urban industries. Along with male workers, many young women from rural areas found jobs in the factories.

Labor unions became more powerful and increased their membership to more than 300,000 members by the end of the 1920s. The growth of the urban, working-class population produced movements demanding social changes. Several efforts by intellectuals to organize Socialist groups, however, were speedily met with police repression.

During this period, the urban middle class expanded as well. Japanese cities became great metropolitan areas and centers of middle-class culture. The Tokyo-Yokohama area, devastated by a terrible earthquake in 1923, took on a new appearance as Western influences increasingly shaped the tempo of urban life. American music, dancing, and sports especially became popular, and rising standards of living and expectations produced the need for more and better higher education.

With the growth of the working and middle classes, steps were taken toward greater political democracy. In 1925 the Japanese parliament granted universal male suffrage; voters increased from 3 million to 14 million. Japanese women, however, did not receive the right to vote until 1947.

Political Weaknesses

In spite of these gains, democracy remained very limited in Japan. Political power was actually in the hands of nobles and urban industrialists. The emperor, Hirohito, was a constitutional monarch. However, he was a powerful symbol of traditional authority. Behind the emperor was an influential group of military leaders, who were opposed to democratic reforms.

The appeal of antidemocratic nationalist groups increased as the economy deteriorated in
the 1930s. A worldwide fall in prices caused by the Great Depression devastated Japan’s silk factories and other industries. Millions of workers lost their jobs and could not find new ones. Some began to starve, and children went begging in the streets. In November 1930 an assassin from a secret society shot Prime Minister Osachi Hamaguchi (oh•SAH•chee hah•mah•GOO•chee). Teetering on the brink of economic chaos, many impoverished farmers and workers in Japan looked to strong-minded military leaders such as Hashimoto Kingoro (hah•shee•MOH•toh keen•GOH•roh) for answers:

“We are like a great crowd of people packed into a small and narrow room, and there are only three doors through which we might escape, namely emigration, advance into world markets, and expansion of territory. The first door … has been barred to us by the anti-Japanese immigration policies of other countries. The second door … is being pushed shut by tariff barriers…. Japan should rush upon the last door [expansion of territory].”

—Hashimoto Kingoro, Addresses to Young Men

**Militarism and Daily Life**

During the 1930s, militarism began to influence all aspects of Japanese life. Supporters of the military program opposed the spread of Western lifestyles in Japan and favored traditional Japanese ways. Military dress, including items such as the samurai swords, appealed to nationalist sentiments. Young children even carried out military drills in schools and participated in parades.

**Military Expansion**

In September 1931 the Japanese military demonstrated just how powerful it had become.

Without seeking approval from the government, army leaders invaded the northeastern region of China known as Manchuria. It was clear that the Japanese government could no longer control its own army. In five months the powerful Japanese army had conquered Manchuria.

The conquest of Manchuria was a clear sign of the plans of the military to dominate the Japanese government at home and expand Japanese influence abroad. The principal opposition to democratic government came from young military officers. Largely from rural backgrounds, they opposed the urban luxuries of the politicians and readily accepted extremist ideas.

By the early 1930s extremist groups in the military were ready to use violence to bend the government to their will. In 1932 army officers assassinated a prime minister who dared to oppose their views. Then, in 1936, another group of officers led an armed revolt against the government. Although the revolt collapsed, it did not halt the steady takeover of government policy making by the military. By early 1937 the army and the government had become one and the same.

Many democratically minded Japanese hoped that Emperor Hirohito would thwart the spread of militarism. As a crown prince, the emperor had traveled in the West and had a keen appreciation of Western ways. Palace advisers, however, feared that a strong stand by the emperor would increase the military leaders’ extremism. They feared that the emperor would be removed from office and that the Japanese monarchy would be abolished.

As international criticism of Japan’s expansion grew, many Japanese rallied to the support of their soldiers and the military leaders. With no powerful political opposition at home, Japan’s military leaders looked forward to conquering all of Asia. Their dreams of a mighty Japanese empire—like the dreams of German and Italian rulers—brought the world to war.

---

**SECTION 4 ASSESSMENT**

**Main Idea**

1. Use a diagram like the one below to list militarism’s influences on Japanese society after World War I.

**Recall**

2. Define population explosion, heavy industry, zaibatsu.

3. Identify Hirohito.

**Critical Thinking**

4. Synthesizing Information

Imagine you are an unemployed worker in Japan during the depression of the 1930s.

Would you support the new military policies of Japan’s government? Why or why not?

**Understanding Themes**

5. Conflict

What steps did the military take to increase its hold on the Japanese government?
Have you ever argued with someone about a political or social issue? In everyday conversation, the word *argument* refers to a conflict involving two or more opinions. However, in writing and in formal debate, an argument is the full presentation of a single opinion. It is important to learn how to identify an argument to fully evaluate the position.

**Learning the Skill**

The main idea of an argument is its thesis, or the writer’s basic position or viewpoint on the subject. In some arguments the thesis is stated explicitly. In others, you must read carefully to determine the writer’s position.

The writer supports the thesis with reasons and supports the reasons with examples or facts. For instance, suppose your parents have said that it would be better if you did not have a car to drive until after your 18th birthday. They support their thesis with these reasons: 1) other forms of transportation are available; and 2) you will be a more mature and better driver by that age. They support the first reason with these facts: you live in a city with good public transportation; your best friend has a car and frequently drives you to school. They support the second reason with accident statistics of younger and older drivers.

Before accepting or rejecting an argument, evaluate its strengths and weaknesses. How well is each reason supported by facts and examples? Does the author’s bias invalidate the argument? In our example, your parents may be biased; they may want to protect your safety and keep their car insurance rates low for another year. Despite this bias, they still may have a strong argument if the supporting facts are true.

**Practicing the Skill**

Read the following quotation from Jomo Kenyatta, and review the discussion of Kenya in Section 1, pages 575–576. Then answer the following questions.

1. What is Kenyatta’s thesis?
2. What reasons does Kenyatta give to support this thesis?
3. What facts support Kenyatta’s statement that Europeans have robbed Africans of their birthright?
4. What bias does Kenyatta show in his statement? Do the facts outweigh his bias? Why or why not?

> By driving [the African] off his ancestral lands, the Europeans have robbed him of the material foundations of his culture, and reduced him to a state of serfdom incompatible with human happiness.... It is not in his nature to accept serfdom forever. He realizes that he must fight unceasingly for his own complete emancipation; for without this he is doomed to remain the prey of rival imperialisms.


**Applying the Skill**

Find a recent article that states an argument about a political or historical issue. Identify the thesis of the argument and major reasons and evidence supporting it. Decide whether you accept or reject this argument and explain why.

**For More Practice**

Turn to the Skill Practice in the Chapter Assessment on page 599.

The Glencoe Skillbuilder Interactive Workbook, Level 2 provides instruction and practice in key social studies skills.
After World War I, economic change and nationalism swept Latin America. Although the region’s economy remained basically agricultural, the oil and mineral industries became increasingly important. Much of the investment that developed these resources was from the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, and Italy. Anger at foreign influence led to growing nationalism among Latin Americans of all backgrounds. Rubén Darío, a noted Nicaraguan writer, had expressed the view of many Latin Americans:

“The United States is grand and powerful. Whenever it trembles, a profound shudder runs down the enormous backbone of the Andes. If it shouts, the sound is like the roar of a lion….

But our own America, which has had poets since the ancient times… and has lived, since the earliest moments of its life, in light, in fire, in fragrance, and in love—the America of Moctezuma and Atahualpa, the aromatic America of Columbus, Catholic America, Spanish America… our America lives. And dreams. And loves. And it is the daughter of the Sun. Be careful.

Long live Spanish America!”

—Rubén Darío, “To Roosevelt,” 1903

**Economic Changes**

In the 20 years following World War I, Latin Americans continued to grow coffee, bananas,
wheat, corn, beans, sugarcane, and other crops in large amounts. However, industrial growth—particularly in the United States and western Europe—increased the demand for tin, copper, silver, oil, and other raw materials from Latin America. As mineral exports increased, Latin Americans had more cash with which to buy imports. More and more of the Latin American economy became tied to global markets.

When world prices for raw materials increased, Latin American economies improved. However, in the 1920s, prices for coffee, sugar, and other raw materials plunged. The price declines foretold the global economic depression that was soon to occur. Like much of the world, Latin America suffered high unemployment and low prices for its products in the decade of the Great Depression, 1929–1939.

**Mexico’s Oil Economy**

Oil was one of the vital resources for growing industries, and Mexico was an important source of oil. Mexico entered the postwar era, still reeling from its own bloody and divisive revolution that had begun in 1910. However, a stable, one-party system was evolving that seemed able to maintain order and unity. Mexico’s constitution, ratified in 1917, authorized the government to protect workers from exploitation and to require private property owners to act in the public interest.

Despite the constitution, reforms came slowly until 1934. In that year, Lázaro Cárdenas (KAHR•duhn•AHS) was elected to the presidency. Over the next six years, his government carried out other reforms in the spirit of the 1910 revolution. First, Cárdenas directed the redistribution of vast tracts of land to landless peasants. To increase agricultural production, the Mexican government also encouraged the formation of cooperatives, farm organizations operated by and for the peasants. By 1940 more than half of all Mexicans farmed land they could finally call their own.

Cárdenas’s main goal, however, was to make Mexico economically independent of foreign countries. His government especially wanted to bring
the industrial economy under Mexican control. In 1937 Cárdenas supported an oil workers’ strike. At the time, many Mexican workers had gone on strike against their British and American employers, demanding higher wages and better working conditions. Cárdenas urged the oil companies to meet their demands, but the companies refused. After a year of futile negotiations, Cárdenas carried out a policy of nationalization of foreign-owned oil wells on March 18, 1938, declaring them the property of the government. He explained his actions by reaching all the way back to a colonial law written by the Spanish king in 1783, which had been retained in the new constitution: “The Mines are the property of My Royal Crown, [including] all bitumens [minerals] and juices of the earth.”

The British and American companies were furious, but the Mexican people were ecstatic. They celebrated March 18 as the day of their “Declaration of Economic Independence.” Cárdenas, meanwhile, defused the crisis by offering to pay a fair price for the oil wells. With World War II looming on the horizon, Great Britain and the United States soon accepted this offer. They did not want an angry Mexico to sell its oil to Japan and Germany.

The nationalization of Mexico’s oil fields signaled the arrival of economic nationalism in Latin America. For Mexico it was a clean break from the economic dependence of the past.

**Changes in Venezuela**

Another oil-rich country, **Venezuela**, followed a course unlike that of Mexico, but more like that of other Latin American countries that had a single source of wealth. Between 1908 and 1935, President **Juan Vicente Gómez** ruled Venezuela as a dictator. During this period, engineers discovered oil along Venezuela’s Caribbean coast. By the late 1930s Venezuela was the third-largest oil-producing country in the world. However, British, Dutch, and American oil companies controlled the Venezuelan oil industry. Gómez, instead of nationalizing the oil companies, worked closely with them. He, his

---

**REFLECTING ON THE TIMES**

1. What three leading Mexican artists painted murals during the 1930s?
2. Based on the murals, what do you think are some major themes in Mexican history?

---

*The Free Man* by José Clemente Orozco. Hospico Cabanas, Guadalajara, Mexico

*From Porfirio’s Dictatorship to the Revolution (detail with Martyrs)* by David Alfaro Siqueiros. Museo Nacional de Historia, Castillo de Chapultepec, Mexico City, Mexico
political allies, and oil companies prospered, but most Venezuelans did not.

Gómez used the oil profits to strengthen his government. He paid off his country’s huge national debt to European bankers and created a strong army. He also used some of the profits for his personal benefit.

After Gómez died in 1935, workers and students around the country rioted to protest the domination of their country by foreign oil companies and their Venezuelan partners. The army intervened to stop the protests and remained in charge of the country for the next several decades.

Democracy and the Military

Venezuela was one of many Latin American countries in which a small group of people prospered from the natural wealth found in the country. It was also typical in that the military intervened to put down protests that threatened business interests. Argentina and Brazil are two of the other countries in which democracy failed to take hold.

Argentina Becomes Fascist

In 1916 Argentina held its first open presidential election in which every male could vote. The winner, Hipólito Irigoyen (ee•PAW•lee•TOH ih•GOH•YEHN), obtained most of his support from urban workers and the middle class. They elected him because of his party’s success in achieving electoral reforms. During his first administration, Irigoyen carried through social reforms that improved factory conditions, boosted workers’ wages, and regulated working hours. He advocated other democratic reforms and efforts to help the poor. After serving six years as president, Irigoyen proudly claimed:

“We have held public office in obedience to the popular mandate and inspired by the duty to make reparation ... for all the injustices, moral and political, collective and individual, that have long dishonored the country.”

In 1928 Irigoyen was again elected president. His second term, however, aroused widespread opposition, and he did not complete his term in office. Although he was personally popular, his government had often been ineffective. He was slow to make decisions, so that official documents needing his attention piled up on his desk awaiting action. More important, corrupt aides stole money from the national treasury. In addition, few Argentinians believed any more in the democratic process by which Irigoyen had won office.

Angered by inefficiency and corruption and opposed to democracy, General José F. Uriburu led a successful coup against Irigoyen in 1930. With the coming of the Great Depression, Argentina was divided between Socialist and Fascist political
American marines in Nicaragua unload a cannon to help defend their military position. The United States has a history of military intervention in the Central American nation of Nicaragua. In the early years of the 1900s American interest in Nicaragua increased with the building of the Panama Canal, with growing pressure to defend the hemisphere against British and German threats, and with expanding United States involvement in Central American trade.

In 1912, U.S. Marines landed in Nicaragua to ensure the payment of its debts and remained there for the next 13 years. In 1927, American forces again intervened to put down an uprising by nationalist leader Augusto César Sandino (left, center figure). Sandino fought American involvement in his country’s domestic affairs—and failed. American forces remained in Nicaragua until 1933.

During the years between the two world wars the empires of Europe began to crumble. In the Western Hemisphere President Hoover pulled American troops out of Nicaragua, and President Franklin D. Roosevelt declared a Good Neighbor policy with Latin America. Nevertheless, imperialism endured until after World War II.
movements. To maintain social order, the army began to assume an important role in the Argentine government.

Uriburu, like Italy’s Mussolini, believed in fascism. He cancelled elections and tried to abolish the congress. For the remainder of the 1930s, military men and their sympathizers ruled Argentina. They faked elections, suppressed their opponents, and consolidated their power. Democracy was dead in Argentina, destroyed by the military.

Brazil’s Popular Dictator

Brazil, like Argentina, fell under an authoritarian government. In 1930 President Getúlio Vargas took power. Seven years later, Vargas proclaimed a new constitution that made him a virtual dictator. He strengthened the government by transferring powers from the cities and states to the national government. He won support from many Brazilians for his willingness to oppose the interests of large businesses. To gain working-class support, Vargas’s administration increased wages, shortened working hours, and gave unions the right to organize. Vargas’s supporters called him “father of the poor” for these efforts.

Vargas, with the support of the military, was able to keep Brazil united and stable until 1945. In that year, a democratic revolt threw him out of power. When Vargas refused to leave office, military leaders stepped in and forced Vargas out of office. Although the military did not actually rule in Brazil, their support was crucial in deciding who did.

Ties With the United States

During the 1920s and 1930s, the mineral wealth of Latin America attracted American investment. To protect its economic interests, the United States intervened militarily in Central America and the Caribbean countries.

Increased American Intervention

In 1912 United States Marines had invaded Nicaragua when the country failed to pay its debts. American forces landed again during the 1920s to protect United States interests. Rebel forces led by General Augusto César Sandino tried to force a United States withdrawal. To help the American soldiers, the United States government trained a loyal Nicaraguan army called the National Guard. By the mid-1930s the National Guard was able to defeat the rebels. Its leader, Anastasio Somoza, seized power in 1936. The Somoza family ruled Nicaragua with American support until 1979.

During the early 1900s, American troops also occupied Haiti and the Dominican Republic. This military intervention, as well as the growth of American economic influence, was deeply resented by many Latin Americans. Latin American nationalists particularly opposed the Roosevelt Corollary. They stated that no country had the right to intervene in the affairs of another. They also claimed that, while the United States was exploiting their raw materials, Latin America was getting few economic benefits in return. Anti-Americanism was especially strong during the Great Depression. At this time, prices for raw materials fell sharply. This decline increased hardships among Latin Americans dependent on trade with North America and Europe.

Good Neighbor Policy

Aware of growing resentment, the United States tried to improve relations with its southern neighbors. Following his election in 1928, United States President Herbert Hoover went on a goodwill tour of Latin America. He hoped to show that the United States regarded its Latin American neighbors as equals. At the same time, Undersecretary of State Joshua Reuben Clark began to restate the meaning of the Monroe Doctrine. In a memorandum issued in December 1928, Clark held that the Monroe Doctrine’s warning that European powers could not interfere in Latin America did not mean that the United States had the right to interfere.

In 1933 President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Hoover’s successor, announced the Good Neighbor policy toward Latin America. He declared, “I
would dedicate this nation to the policy of the good neighbor—the neighbor who resolutely respects himself, and because he does so, respects the rights of others.” This policy renounced past United States military intervention in the region. Roosevelt also ended American restrictions on Cuba’s sovereignty and ordered the withdrawal of American troops from Haiti and Nicaragua.

In 1933 the United States took another step toward improving its relationship with Latin America. Diplomats from the United States joined with their Latin American counterparts at the Pan American conference in Montevideo, Uruguay. After much discussion, all parties signed an agreement stating: “No state has the right to intervene in the internal or external affairs of another.”

**Map Study**

The United States intervened in the affairs of Latin American nations in the early 1900s. **Region** In which country did the United States intervene in 1914 and 1916? How did Latin Americans view United States intervention in their affairs?

**Main Idea**

1. Use a diagram like the one below to show the factors that caused conflict between Latin America and the United States.

**Recall**

2. Define cooperatives, nationalism.

3. Identify Lázaro Cárdenas, Juan Vicente Gómez, Hipólito Irigoyen, José F. Uriburu, Getúlio Vargas, Augusto César Sandino, the Good Neighbor policy.

**Critical Thinking**

4. Making Comparisons How did the governments of Mexico and Venezuela differ in their response to European and American control of their oil industries?

**Understanding Themes**

5. Change Does the United States government have the right to intervene in the domestic affairs of other countries? Explain, using recent examples.
Santha Rama Rau, born in Madras, India, in 1923, spent her childhood in India, England, and South Africa. In each place, she closely watched the way people from different backgrounds related with one another. Advances in transportation and communication have sharply increased the interactions of people from different cultures. Today these interactions shape the world more than ever before. In the following excerpt, Rau recalls her early experiences at a school for English and Indian children in India.

At the Anglo-Indian day school in Zorinabad to which my sister and I were sent when she was eight and I was five and a half, they changed our names. On the first day of school, a hot, windless morning of a north Indian September, we stood in the headmistress’s study and she said, “Now you’re the new girls. What are your names?”

My sister answered for us. “I am Premila, and she”—nodding in my direction—“is Santha.”

The headmistress had been in India, I suppose, fifteen years or so, but she still smiled her helpless inability to cope with Indian names. Her rimless half-glasses glittered, and the precarious bun on the top of her head trembled as she shook her head. “Oh, my dears, those are much too hard for me. Suppose we give you pretty English names. Wouldn’t that be more jolly? Let’s see, now—Pamela for you, I think.” She shrugged in a baffled way at my sister. “That’s as close as I can get. And for you,” she said to me, “how about Cynthia? Isn’t that nice?”

My sister was always less intimidated than I was, and while she kept a stubborn silence, I said “Thank you,” in a very tiny voice…

That first day at school is still, when I think of it, a remarkable one. At that age, if one’s name is changed, one develops a curious form of dual personality. I remember having a certain detached and disbelieving concern in the actions of “Cynthia,” but certainly no responsibility…
Accordingly, I followed the thin, erect back of the headmistress down the veranda [porch] to my classroom feeling, at most, a passing interest in what was going to happen to me in this strange, new atmosphere of School.…

I can’t remember too much about the proceedings in class that day, except for the beginning. The teacher pointed to me and asked me to stand up. “Now, dear, tell the class your name.”

I said nothing.

“Come along,” she said, frowning slightly. “What’s your name, dear?”

“I don’t know,” I said, finally.

The English children in the front of the class—there were about eight or ten of them—giggled and twisted around in their chairs to look at me. I sat down quickly and opened my eyes very wide, hoping in that way to dry them off. The little girl with the braids put out her hand and very lightly touched my arm. She still didn’t smile.

Most of the morning I was rather bored. I looked briefly at the children’s drawings pinned to the wall, and then concentrated on a lizard clinging to the ledge of the high, barred window behind the teacher’s head. Occasionally it would shoot out its long yellow tongue for a fly, and then it would rest, with its eyes closed and its belly palpitating, as though it were swallowing several times quickly. The lessons were mostly concerned with reading and writing and simple numbers—things that my mother had already taught me—and I paid very little attention. The teacher wrote on the easel blackboard words like

During the years of British rule, the Indian subcontinent had a wealthy upper class of princes and their families. This upper-class Indian family of the 1940s practiced traditional ways but was also familiar with the customs of the British aristocracy. What are the British teachers’ attitudes toward ordinary Indians in the story by Santha Rama Rau?
“bat” and “cat,” which seemed babyish to me; only “apple” was new and incomprehensible.

When it was time for the lunch recess, I followed the girl with braids out onto the veranda. There the children from the other classes were assembled. I saw Premila at once and ran over to her, as she had charge of our lunchbox. The children were all opening packages and sitting down to eat sandwiches. Premila and I were the only ones who had Indian food—thin wheat chapatties [a type of bread], some vegetable curry, and a bottle of buttermilk. Premila thrust half of it into my hand and whispered fiercely that I should go and sit with my class, because that was what the others seemed to be doing…

I had never really grasped the system of competitive games. At home, whenever we played tag or guessing games, I was always allowed to “win”—“because,” Mother used to tell Premila, “she is the youngest, and we have to allow for that.” I had often heard her say it, and it seemed quite reasonable to me, but the result was that I had no clear idea of what “winning” meant.

When we played twos-and-threes that afternoon at school, in accordance with my training, I let one of the small English boys catch me, but was naturally rather puzzled when the other children did not return the courtesy. I ran about for what seemed like hours without ever catching anyone, until it was time for school to close. Much later I learned that my attitude was called “not being a good sport,” and I stopped allowing myself to be caught, but it was not for years that I really learned the spirit of the thing…

It was a week later, the day of Premila’s first test, that our lives changed rather abruptly. I was sitting at the back of the class, in my usual inattentive way, only half listening to the teacher. I had started a rather guarded friendship with the girl with the braids, whose name turned out to be Nalini (Nancy, in school). The three other Indian children were already fast friends. Even at that age it was apparent to all of us that friendship with the English or Anglo-Indian children was out of the question. Occasionally, during the class, my new friend and I would draw pictures and show them to each other secretly.

The door opened sharply and Premila marched in. At first, the teacher smiled at her in a kindly and encouraging way and said, “Now, you’re little Cynthia’s sister?”

Premila didn’t even look at her. She stood with her feet planted firmly apart and her shoulders rigid, and addressed herself directly to me. “Get up,” she said. “We’re going home.”

I didn’t know what happened, but I was aware that it was a crisis of some sort. I rose obediently and started to walk toward my sister.

“Bring your pencils and your notebook,” she said.

I went back for them, and together we left the room. The teacher started to say something just as Premila closed the door, but we didn’t wait to hear what it was.

In complete silence we left the school grounds and started to walk home. Then I asked Premila what the matter was. All she would say was “We’re going home for good.”…

When we got to our house the ayah [maid] was just taking a tray of lunch into Mother’s room. She immediately started a long, worried questioning about what are you children doing back here at this hour of the day.

Mother looked very startled and very concerned, and asked Premila what had happened.

Premila said, “We had our test today, and she made me and the other Indians sit at the back of the room, with a desk between each one.”

Mother said, “Why was that, darling?”

“She said it was because Indians cheat,” Premila added. “So I don’t think we should go back to that school.”

Mother looked very distant, and was silent a long time. At last she said, “Of course not, darling.” She sounded displeased.

We all shared the curry she was having for lunch, and afterward I was sent off to the beautifully familiar bedroom for my siesta. I could hear Mother and Premila talking through the open door.

Mother said, “Do you suppose she understood all that?”
Premila said, “I shouldn’t think so. She’s a baby.”
Mother said, “Well, I hope it won’t bother her.”
Of course, they were both wrong. I understood it perfectly, and I remember it all very clearly. But I put it happily away, because it had all happened to a girl called Cynthia, and I never was really particularly interested in her.

1. Why did Santha and her sister leave school?
2. Explain why Santha was unable to tell the class her name.
3. When the headmistress gives Santha and her sister new names, what can you determine the headmistress thought of Indian culture?
4. Demonstrating Reasoned Judgment
   Explain why Santha’s mother would or would not keep her children home permanently from the Anglo-Indian school.

Visualizing History

These Indian women are dressed in the sari, a garment of several yards of material draped so that one end forms a skirt and the other a shoulder or head covering. How do you think the two Indian girls in the story dressed for their classes at the British school?
Reviewing Facts

1. **Culture** Use a diagram like the one below to identify social changes in Japan after World War I.

2. **History** Name the contributions that India made to the war effort in World War I. What did Great Britain promise India in return?

3. **Government** Identify three leaders who would agree with the statement “Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun.”

4. **History** Describe the influence of Gandhi on India’s struggle for freedom.

5. **History** List the reforms introduced by Kemal Atatürk in Turkey and Reza Shah in Iran.

6. **Culture** Discuss the role of women in the nationalist movement in Nigeria after World War I.

7. **History** Identify the major event in 1938 that marked the arrival of economic nationalism in the countries of Latin America.

Critical Thinking

1. **Apply** How does political control relate to economic control? Give examples from Egypt or India.

2. **Apply** How did religious differences hamper the Indian independence movement? Give examples to support your opinion.

Using Key Terms

Write the key term that completes each sentence. Then write a sentence for each term not chosen.

- a. warlords
- b. nationalization
- c. pacifist
- d. zaibatsu
- e. cooperatives
- f. heavy industry
- g. shah
- h. population explosion
- i. self-determination
- j. civil disobedience

1. After Yuan Shigai’s death in 1916, local military leaders called _______ divided China among themselves.

2. United States President Woodrow Wilson raised the hopes of colonial peoples by endorsing the principle of ____________.

3. In 1938 the Mexican government carried out a policy of __________ in which it took over the foreign-owned oil industries.

4. Mohandas K. Gandhi was a ________, a person opposed to using war and other means of violence to settle disputes.

5. The privately owned part of the Japanese economy in the 1920s and 1930s was largely in the hands of large companies known as _________.

Technology Activity

**Using a Computerized Card Catalog** Use a computerized card catalog to locate information about nationalism in Asia, Africa, and Latin America after World War I. Using your research, create a bulletin board focusing on the themes of “global nationalism.” Include time lines for each region, showing significant events related to nationalism. List similarities and differences you see among the nationalist movements.
3. Analyze In 1939 most of Africa and much of Asia were European colonies. What conditions needed to change before self-determination could be achieved by all countries? Give examples to support your answer.

4. Synthesize Name a 1930s Mexican mural and state its theme. Could artists of other cultures and eras have also used this theme? Explain.

5. Evaluate Did the global influence of the West become more or less widespread in the two decades after World War I? Give examples to support your opinion.

Geography in History

1. Location Refer to the map below. What is the relative location of the Sea of Japan?

2. Movement Approximately how many miles would the Japanese military have had to transport troops across the Sea of Japan to invade Manchuria (Northeast Plain) in 1931?

3. Region Along what major rivers might the Japanese have traveled to gain access to central China? What obstacles would they have faced?

Understanding Themes

1. Nationalism In what countries of Africa and the Middle East did nationalism lead to self-determination in the period 1919 to 1939?

2. Change How did the British respond to Gandhi’s campaign for Indian independence?

3. Conflict Do you think Mao Zedong and Chiang Kai-shek were wise to put aside their differences and unite against Japan? Explain.

4. Conflict What were the main areas of disagreement that resulted in conflict between Japan and the West after World War I?

5. Change How did nationalism change Latin America following World War I?

Skill Practice

Read the quotation below by Hashimoto Kingoro and review the discussion of Japan in Section 4, pages 583–585. Then answer the questions below.

“We are like a great crowd of people packed into a small and narrow room, and there are only three doors through which we might escape, namely emigration, advance into world markets, and expansion of territory. The first door … has been barred to us by the anti-Japanese immigration policies of other countries. The second door … is being pushed shut by tariff barriers … Japan should rush upon the last door [expansion of territory].”

—Hashimoto Kingoro, Addresses to Young Men

1. What is Kingoro’s thesis in this argument?

2. What reasons does he give to support this thesis?

3. What evidence in Section 4 supports Kingoro’s thesis?

4. Do you accept or reject Kingoro’s argument? Explain your answer.