CHAPTER 25

Africa and the Middle East, 1800–1914
In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the countries of Africa and the Middle East underwent a radical restructuring; they faced internal political struggles, the transformation of the world economy, and the military, commercial, and cultural incursions of the Europeans. The economic, technological, and military superiority of certain European states challenged the diverse, complex civilizations of Africa, the Middle East, and Asia and made them targets in the competition for empire.

In sub-Saharan Africa, the diversity of kingdoms and societies made a unified political response to the Europeans impossible. By the beginning of the twentieth century, Africans found themselves living within political boundaries imposed by the Europeans, without regard for the existing ethnic distribution of peoples. They began the painful process of altering their lifestyles to survive in the industrialized world.

In the Middle East, politicians and intellectuals discussed ways to keep their empires strong and proposed reforms to enable them to meet the challenges of modernity. The Ottoman Empire at the beginning of the nineteenth century was still large and powerful, but by the end of the century, it had faced bankruptcy, territorial losses, and national separatist movements. The Qajar Empire in Persia was similarly weakened by foreign loans and by the military ambitions of Britain and Russia. From North Africa to central Asia, the citizens of these traditional, polyglot, multiethnic empires found themselves caught up in the great power rivalries of the new imperialists in Europe.
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the slaves exported from Africa, had abolished the slave trade in 1807. Other European nations followed suit in subsequent decades. A British antislavery squadron patrolled the West and East African coasts, intercepting slave ships. Although the antislavery squadron managed to free about 160,000 slaves, it was a fraction of the overall slave trade. Between 1807 and 1888, close to 3 million more Africans were enslaved and shipped overseas, largely to sugar, coffee, and cotton plantations in Cuba and Brazil.

Britain and France established colonies in Sierra Leone and Gabon for freed slaves, while the American Colonization Society (ACS) created a settlement for free African Americans who wished to return voluntarily to Africa and for blacks captured on slave ships by the American antislavery squadron. The ACS selected a strip of territory in the Cape Mesurado area and pressured local Africans into ceding them the land. However, the black settlers who landed after 1821 had a difficult time adjusting. They were susceptible to diseases and looked down their noses at agriculture. When they declared themselves independent from the ACS and founded Liberia (from the Latin word, liber, for “free”) in 1847, their population numbered only a few thousand.

The Americo-Liberians (as the settlers came to be called) patterned themselves on the United States, adopting the English language and a constitution based on the American States model and naming their capital Monrovia (after President James Monroe). Although their official motto was “Love of Liberty Brought Us Here,” they did not extend freedom to indigenous Africans, who were regarded as uncivilized and backward. A caste system developed in which Americo-Liberians dominated politics and exploited the labor of indigenous Africans, who were not allowed to qualify for citizenship until 1904. Although Liberia’s economy sputtered in the face of intense competition with European traders and the civil service was riddled with corruption, Liberia managed to survive the European scramble for Africa and to remain an independent republic through the colonial period.

African societies involved in the transatlantic slave trade adjusted to its winding down in various ways. Some societies were so dependent on slave exports that they found it difficult to cope. Other societies shifted from exporting slaves to trading for more domestic slaves. The Asante kingdom in the Gold Coast acquired more domestic slaves to increase gold and kola nut production for trading with Europeans and the West African interior.

For many societies, the slave trade had been a negligible part of their overall trade, and African entrepreneurs and European merchants expanded their trading links. One African export sought in Europe was gum arabic, extracted from acacia trees and used

STATE FORMATION AND THE END OF THE SLAVE TRADE IN AFRICA

West Africa

In West Africa the political map of the interior savanna dramatically changed in the eighteenth century as Fulani Muslim holy men in the western Sudan launched a series of jihads. Their efforts inspired Fulani Muslims in the eastern Sudan—the most notable being Usman dan Fodio (1754–1817), son of a Muslim teacher and himself a scholar of some repute. He criticized Muslim Hausa leaders for ignoring Sharia law and for their lax morality. When a Hausa ruler lifted the exemption of Muslims from taxes, Usman mobilized his students, Fulani pastoralists, and Hausa peasants and declared a holy war against Hausa rulers in 1804. Usman’s movement succeeded in uniting most of the Hausa states into the central-ized Sokoto Caliphate, with a capital at Sokoto on the lower Niger, that encompassed several hundred thousand square miles.

Usman remained a religious leader while his brother Abdullahi and son Muhammad Bello (1781–1837) consolidated the caliphate. Although a Hausa aristocracy was replaced by a Fulani nobility, the latter allowed Hausa political and religious elites in the emirates a measure of local autonomy as long as they paid an annual tribute and recognized the caliph’s political and religious authority.

Usman dan Fodio’s revolution brought mixed results for women. He encouraged education among elite women and supported women who disobeyed husbands who did not educate them. His wives and daughters were educated and became noted for their writings. However, women were expected to remain in seclusion and were excluded from meaningful roles in elite decision making. The queen mother (magajiya) lost her power to veto decisions by male rulers and found her influence restricted to ritual matters.

The creation of the Sokoto Caliphate made little difference to the Hausa peasantry and slaves who served in households and tilled the fields. Although elite women were freed up from agricultural production and expanded their production of indigo-dyed cloth, they were replaced in the fields by female slaves imported into the Caliphate. On the other hand, Hausa traders maintained their prosperous links with Tripoli to the north and the Atlantic coast. Their trade items included kola nuts, grain, salt, slaves, cattle, and cloth, which made their way to countries as far away as Egypt and Brazil.

On the West African coast, African societies were adapting to the tapering off of the Atlantic slave trade. Britain, which was responsible for more than half of
for dyes in European textile factories. Another was palm oil, a key ingredient in candles and soap and the main lubricant for Europe’s industrial machinery before the discovery of petroleum oil.

Along the coast east of the Niger delta, where palm oil was a major export, palm oil production was organized on gender lines: men cut down the nuts from trees, and women extracted the oil. Although the male heads of households were the main beneficiaries of palm oil production, they gave women the proceeds from palm kernels. The demand for palm kernel oil escalated in the 1880s when William Lever began selling Sunlight, a sweet-smelling soap made from palm kernel oil and coconut oil, to a mass market in England.

However, the most important beneficiaries of the trade were not the producers but the rulers and merchants. In the Niger River delta, states vying for control of the trade fought a series of wars.

**East and Central Africa**

East and central Africa were also increasingly drawn into the world economy through long-distance trade. Gold and ivory had long been exported to China and India, but now it was in demand by European middle classes for luxury items such as billiard balls, piano keys, and cutlery handles. Elephant herds paid an enormous price; 33 elephants were slaughtered for every ton of ivory exported. The scourge of slavery also ravaged the region. During the nineteenth century, several million people were enslaved. Half of them were sent to southern Arabia, Sudan, and Ethiopia, while the rest ended up on French sugar plantations on the Indian Ocean islands of Mauritius and Réunion; on Brazilian sugar plantations, whose owners found West African slaves too highly priced; and on Arab-run clove plantations on Zanzibar and nearby islands. Zanzibar had become so important to Omani Arabs on the southeastern coast of the Arabian peninsula that Sultan Sayyid Saïd (1791–1856) transferred most of his court and government there in 1840.

The long-distance trade opened up opportunities for middlemen trading groups. The Yao, Nyamwezi, Afro-Portuguese, Kamba, and Swahili Arabs controlled routes in different parts of the region and recruited thousands of porters for their caravans. The Swahili language increasingly became the lingua franca along trading routes. With imported firearms and slave armies, some of the leading warlords established conquest states based on their control over the slave trade. Mirambo (1840–1884), a Nyamwezi chief, and Tipu Sendi (c. 1830–1905), who was of Arab and Nyamwezi parentage, carved out domains east and west of Lake Tanganyika, respectively.

Many African kingdoms such as Rwanda were not dependent on the long-distance trade for their survival. Rwanda was composed of three main groups: the Twa, who were hunter-gatherers; the Hutu, Bantu-speaking farmers; and the Tutsi, a pastoral Nilotic people who were the latest to immigrate into the area. Over the centuries Tutsi clans had established a patron-client relationship with Twa and Hutu clans, but the lines between the groups were not clearly drawn. Hutu and Tutsi intermarried and shared a common language, religious beliefs, and cultural institutions, and the distinctions between Tutsi patrons and Hutu clients were often blurred.

However, in the late nineteenth century the Nyanza, a Tutsi clan led by King Rwabugiri, conquered other Tutsi and Hutu clans. Rwabugiri’s state was highly centralized and favored the Tutsi minority, who served as administrators, tax collectors, and army commanders and controlled grazing land. Hutu chiefs were in charge of agricultural lands but tended Tutsi cattle and paid tribute to their Tutsi overlords.
Southern Africa

In the first decades of the nineteenth century, African societies in southeastern Africa were swept up in a period of political transformation known as the Mfecane (“the scattering”). Its origins can be traced to increased competition by chiefdoms for grazing land following a series of severe droughts and for control of first the ivory and then the cattle trade with the Portuguese at Delagoa Bay. However, it was the Zulu clan, a minor actor when the Mfecane began, that became the region’s most formidable military power.

The Zulu owed their rise in prominence to their king, Shaka (c. 1786–1828). When he was born about 1786, his father was chief of the Zulu clan, which was later part of the Mthethwa confederacy ruled by Dingiswayo (c. 1770s–1816). When Shaka’s father rejected his mother, Shaka was forced to spend his childhood among his mother’s people. As a young man, he enrolled in one of Dingiswayo’s fighting regiments. Young men of about 16 to 18 traditionally went to circumcision schools for a number of months to prepare themselves for manhood. Because Dingiswayo needed soldiers who could be called into battle on short notice, he abolished the circumcision schools and enrolled his young men directly into regiments.

Shaka soon distinguished himself as a warrior, and he rose rapidly in Dingiswayo’s army. On his father’s death in 1815, Shaka assumed the chieftaincy of the Zulu. Several years later, when Dingiswayo’s enemies lured him into a trap and killed him, Shaka asserted his leadership of the confederacy. He regrouped his followers and won over others; eventually, he vanquished his opponents. He then began constructing, primarily by cattle-raiding, a major kingdom between the Phongolo and Tugela Rivers that dominated southeastern Africa.

Shaka was best known for adopting new weapons and battle strategies that revolutionized warfare. He armed the Zulu army with a stabbing spear that was not thrown but used in close fighting. He introduced the buffalo horn formation, which allowed his soldiers to engage an opponent while the horns or flanks sur-
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**African Societies and European Imperialism**

1816 Shaka becomes king of Zulu
1824 Basotho king Moshoeshoe moves to mountain fortress Thaba Bosiu
1840 Omani Sultan Said establishes rule in Zanzibar
1876 King Leopold II of Belgium founds International African Association
1879 Zulu army defeats British force at battle of Isandhlwana
1881 Muhammad Ahmad proclaims himself Mahdi in Sudan
1886 Opening of Witwatersrand gold fields
1888 Cecil Rhodes and Barney Barnato found De Beers Diamond Company
1895 Cecil Rhodes launches Jameson raid to overthrow Transvaal government
1898 Confrontation of British and French forces at Fashoda in southern Sudan
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Print of Shaka, King of the Zulus. Shaka established a major kingdom based on innovations in battle tactics and weaponry.
rounded them. He drilled his soldiers so that they could march long distances on short notice. He also transformed his clan into a major kingdom of about 25,000 people by assimilating large numbers of war captives. He created a new hierarchy in which power was centered in his kingship and status was based not on descent but on achievement in the military regiments.

Shaka’s repeated raids for cattle and captives throughout the area proved to be his downfall, as his regiments tired of constant campaigns. Several of his half-brothers and one of his generals conspired against him and assassinated him in 1828.

During the Mfecane, refugee groups escaped Shaka’s domination by migrating to other parts of the region. Some headed much farther north, adopting Shaka’s fighting methods and establishing kingdoms on the Shakan model in Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Malawi, and Tanzania. Still other peoples survived by creating new kingdoms that knit together clans and refugees. One kingdom forged in this way was Moshoeshoe’s Basotho kingdom.

The son of a minor chief, Moshoeshoe (c. 1786–1870) gained a reputation as a cattle raider as a young man. Moshoeshoe succeeded his father as refugee groups began streaming into his area. To escape their raids, in 1824 Moshoeshoe moved his small following to an impregnable, flat-topped mountain called Thaba Bosiu. Over the next several decades, he creatively built a kingdom that became one of the most powerful in the region. Moshoeshoe accumulated vast cattle herds through raiding, and he won the loyalty of many destitute men by lending them cattle to reestablish their homesteads. Moshoeshoe married many times to build up political alliances with neighboring chiefs. He also armed his warriors with battle-axes and formed a cavalry using ponies bred for the rugged mountain terrain.

Moshoeshoe is best remembered for his diplomatic skills. He was prepared to fight if necessary, but he preferred to negotiate whenever possible. On many occasions he managed to salvage difficult situations by engaging in diplomacy and exploiting divisions among opponents, especially the rivalry between the Boers and the British. In 1868, toward the end of his life, as Boers were on the verge of destroying his kingdom, Moshoeshoe successfully appealed to the British government for protection.

The Great Trek and British-Afrikaner Relations

As African kingdoms in southern Africa were undergoing a period of transformation, groups of Boers were preparing to escape British control by migrating into the interior of southern Africa. Prompted by the Napoleonic wars, Britain had resumed control over the Cape Colony in 1806 to protect the sea lanes around the Cape of Good Hope. The British were intent on expanding commercial opportunities through wine and wool production; the Boers resented any interference with their pastoral way of life.

Relations between the two groups deteriorated in the next decades. At first the British won Boer approval for a law that tied Khoikhoi servants to white farmers, but after a humanitarian outcry from missionaries over abuses of servants, the British instituted an ordinance giving Khoikhoi farm laborers equal rights. Britain also abolished the slave trade in 1807, driving up the price of slaves, and in 1834 it emancipated the slaves. However, this action did not improve the conditions of former slaves as most of them, unskilled and uneducated, ended up as free but servile labor on white farms. The last straw for the Boers came in 1836 when the British handed back land to Xhosa groups whose land had been conquered in a recently completed war.
Seeing their way of life threatened, many Boers decided to escape further British interference by heading for the interior. In the mid-1830s bands of migrants, known as voortrekkers (numbering about 15,000 in all) undertook an epic journey in their ox-drawn wagons to a new country where they could restore their way of life. This Great Trek was comparable to the covered-wagon epic of the American West.

On the high plateau, or veld, the Boers established two republics: the Orange Free State and the Transvaal. For the rest of the century they solidified their control by engaging in wars of land conquest against African kingdoms. In the meantime, the British prevented the Boers from having direct access to the Indian Ocean by extending their own settlement along the eastern coast north of the Cape and founding the colony of Natal.
The Great Trek did little to resolve the Boers’ difficulties. In 1877 Britain created a confederation of the white-ruled states in the region and took over the Transvaal with little resistance from the Afrikaners (the name taken by the Boers about this time). The British attempted to win Afrikaner acceptance by launching offensives against their main African rivals, the Pedi and Zulu kingdoms. Although the Zulus had coexisted peacefully with British and Afrikaners for many decades, the British now perceived them as an obstacle to white control and manufactured a war against the Zulu kingdom. The war started disastrously for the British when, in January 1879, the army of King Cetshwayo (c. 1832–1884) caught a British column by surprise at Isandhlwana and overwhelmed them. A handful of British soldiers survived the battle. Cetshwayo hoped the British would end their aggression following the disaster, but they renewed their efforts and, six months later, put an end to the Zulu kingdom by carving it into 13 small pieces and exiling Cetshwayo.

This victory did not improve British relations with Transvaal Afrikaners. In 1881 they rebelled against British rule and scored a series of military successes. The British agreed to pull out of the Transvaal, although they still claimed to have a voice in its foreign affairs.

The Mineral Revolution and the Anglo-Boer War

The discovery of diamonds in 1867 on the borders of the Cape Colony and the Orange Free State and of gold in 1886 in the Transvaal were to transform the whole of southern Africa economically and politically.

When the diamond fields were opened up, thousands of black and white fortune seekers flocked to the area. The mining town of Kimberley sprang up almost overnight. In the first years of the digs, there were no restrictions on who could stake claims. But in 1873, European diggers, resentful of competition from blacks, successfully lobbied British officials for a law prohibiting Africans from owning claims. This law set the tone for future laws governing who controlled mineral rights and ownership of the land.

Although Africans were excluded from owning claims, there were few restrictions on their movements and where they lived around the mines. Africans typically came to mine for three to six months and left at a time of their own choosing. This
European settlement in various parts of the world was usually accompanied by the conquest of land from indigenous peoples. Because the settlers did not have a historic claim to the land, they often constructed their own versions of the past to justify their right to be there. In South Africa, one myth that white settlers created was that Dutch settlers arrived in southern Africa about the same time as Bantu-speaking peoples, the ancestors of most present-day Africans—in the mid-seventeenth century. Hence, white settlers could claim that, as they migrated from the western Cape into the interior of South Africa, they were moving into an unpopulated land that was up for grabs. Europeans could lay claim to the land, and they had just as much right to it as Africans did.

A variation of the “myth of the empty land” was based on a late nineteenth century map drawn by George McCall Theal, a Canadian who settled in the Cape in 1861. Theal’s map shows the South African interior virtually depopulated because many Africans had been displaced by the wars of the Zulu king Shaka in the 1820s and 1830s. Thus, the Boers who trekked into the interior in the 1830s were settling on land no longer occupied by Africans. In a speech delivered to a Cape Town audience in 1909, Theal clearly revealed his motives for the way he drew his map. “We must... prove,” he declared, “to these people [Africans] that we were no more intruders than they were, and that they enjoyed as much as they were entitled to.” He added, “In reality this country was not the Bantu’s originally any more than it was the white man’s, because the Bantus were also immigrants...most of their ancestors migrated to South Africa in comparatively recent times.”

Theal’s “myth of the empty land” became an article of faith for many white South Africans until late in the twentieth century. His interpretation was a standard feature in South African history textbooks used in both white and black schools, and South African government propaganda relied on it to justify the apartheid system to the international community.

**Questions to Consider**

The ownership of disputed land has been a thorny issue in many countries.

1. Are there myths that settler groups have devised in other parts of the world to justify their conquests and domination of indigenous peoples and the land?

2. How accurate is the claim of Theal’s map that “Zulu Wars” had depopulated the interior of South Africa before Afrikaners set out on the Great Trek?

freedom changed as European mine owners sought to prevent diamond thefts and to control black workers by preventing desertion and holding down their wages. In 1885 the mine owners began erecting compounds to house black workers. Throughout their stay at a mine, black workers stayed in the compounds and were allowed out only to work in the mine. The compound system was so effective at controlling black labor that it became a fixture in other mining operations throughout southern Africa.

In the early years of the diamond diggings, several thousand people held claims, but by the 1880s, ownership of the mines was falling into the hands of fewer and fewer people. In 1888 the two leading magnates, Cecil Rhodes (1853–1902) and Barney Barnato (1852–1897), pooled their resources to found De Beers, a company that controlled 90 percent of diamond production. Over a century later De Beers continues to dominate the diamond industry not only in South Africa but also around the world.

In 1886, gold discoveries on the Witwatersrand ("ridge of the white waters") sparked off another rush. The Witwatersrand gold veins were distinctive because they sloped at sharp angles beneath the earth and required shafts to be sunk at depths of up to two miles. The exorbitant costs of deep-level mining as well as of importing skilled labor, mining engineers, and the latest technology required enormous infusions of foreign capital. Profits were hard to sustain, and the main mining houses targeted black wages for cutting costs. They restricted competition for black workers by imposing ceilings on their wages and creating recruiting organizations that eventually developed networks as far north as Zambia and Malawi. The result was a migrant labor system in which tens of thousands of black men came to the mines for six to nine months, while black women stayed home to raise families and look after crops. Another consequence of the mineral discoveries was the extension of railways into the interior of southern Africa.

From 1886 to the end of the century, South Africa's share of world gold production increased from less than 1 percent to over 25 percent. The center of power in the region shifted from Cape Town to Johannesburg, renewing British interest in controlling the Transvaal. Afrikaner leaders were resolute about protecting their independence, but they feared they would be outnumbered when tens of thousands of uitlanders (foreigners), mainly English immigrants, flocked to the gold mines. The Transvaal's president, Paul Kruger (1825–1904), was determined that the uitlanders would not gain control. As a boy he had joined in the Great Trek. As a young man, he led Boer commandos conquering African lands. As head of the Transvaal, he was passionately devoted to preserving its independence and the Afrikaners' agrarian way of life.

Kruger's main adversary was Cecil Rhodes, who in 1890 had become prime minister of the Cape Colony. An avowed imperialist, Rhodes now set his sights on bringing down Kruger's republic. He plotted with uitlanders in Johannesburg to stage an insurrection. In late 1895 Rhodes's private army, led by Leader Starr Jameson, invaded the Transvaal from neighboring Bechuanaland, but they were quickly captured by Afrikaner commandos. The Jameson raid had dire consequences. Rhodes was forced to resign as prime minister, Afrikaners in the Cape were alienated from the British, the Orange Free State formed an alliance with the Transvaal, and the Transvaal began modernizing its army by importing weapons from Europe.

Transvaal leaders were deeply suspicious that the British had been behind Rhodes's reckless actions. Their fears were heightened when in 1897 the British selected Alfred Milner (1854–1925) as the high commissioner for South Africa. He shared Rhodes's
imperialist convictions with a passion. He pressured Kruger to reduce the length of time for uitlanders to qualify for citizenship in the Transvaal. Although Milner thought Kruger would make significant concessions under pressure, Kruger was unwilling to meet all of Milner’s demands.

War broke out in late 1899. Most observers expected the British army to roll over the heavily outnumbered Afrikaner forces. But Afrikaner soldiers were crack shots and expert horsemen. Knowing every inch of ground on which they fought, they frequently outmaneuvered the British troops by resorting to guerrilla tactics. The British countered by conducting a scorched-earth campaign, burning Afrikaner farms and placing Afrikaner women and children and Africans who worked on their farms in unsanitary concentration camps. About 30,000 Afrikaners (half of them children) and 15,000 blacks perished in the camps from disease and starvation. Among Afrikaners the memory of the deaths fueled animosity against the British for generations.

**EUROPEAN CONQUEST OF AFRICA**

In 1870 the European nations controlled only 10 percent of the continent. The two most important holdings were at Africa’s geographical extremes: French-administered Algeria in the north and the Boer republics and British colonies in the south. Most of the other European holdings were small commercial ones along the West African coast.

One of the first European leaders to acquire new African territory was King Leopold II of Belgium,
who had long dreamed of creating an empire modeled on Dutch holdings in Asia and the Pacific. When the Belgian government was reluctant to acquire colonies, Leopold took the initiative. In 1876 he organized the International African Association (IAA) and brought the explorer Henry Stanley (1841–1904) into his service. The association, composed of scientists and explorers from many nations, was ostensibly intended to serve humanitarian purposes. But the crafty king had less noble motives. As he put it, he did not want to lose a golden opportunity “to secure... a slice of this magnificent African cake.” He sent Stanley to central Africa on behalf of the association. Stanley brought along hundreds of blank treaty forms and concluded agreements with various African chiefs, few of whom understood the implications of granting sovereignty to the IAA. By 1882 the organization had laid claim to over 900,000 square miles of territory along the Congo River, an area 75 times the size of Belgium.

Britain’s occupation of Egypt and Leopold’s acquisition of the Congo moved Chancellor Otto von Bismarck to overcome his indifference to colonies and acquire an African empire for Germany. Beginning in February 1884, Bismarck took just a year to annex four colonies: South-West Africa, Togoland, Cameroon, and German East Africa. However, Bismarck’s imperial grab was still firmly rooted in his reading of European power politics. He wanted to deflect French hostility to Germany by sparking French interest in acquiring colonies and to put Germany in a position to mediate potential disputes between France and Britain.

While Bismarck was busy acquiring territory, he was also concerned about preventing clashes between colonizers. In 1884 he called the major European powers to a conference at Berlin. The result was the Berlin Conference of 1884–1885, which established rules for the division of Africa among the European powers.

Questions to Consider
You are a journalist covering the skirmish and you are relying on the accounts of Mojimba and Stanley for your story.

1. What are the strengths and weaknesses of each source?
2. What would your account be? How would it differ from either source?
Representatives of 14 nations, including the United States, met in Berlin in 1884 to set new rules to govern their “scramble for Africa.” No representative from Africa was invited to participate.
been established for freed American slaves, and Ethiopia, which fended off Italian invaders. The colonizers were woefully ignorant about the geography of the areas they colonized. Europeans had knowledge of coastal areas, but nineteenth-century explorers had largely concentrated on river explorations and knew little beyond that. Thus, when European statesmen drew boundaries, they were more concerned with strategic interests and potential economic development than with existing kingdoms, ethnic identities, topography, or demography. About half the boundaries were straight lines drawn for simple convenience. As Lord Salisbury, the British prime minister, admitted: “[W]e have been engaged in drawing lines upon maps where no white man’s foot ever trod, we have been giving away mountains and rivers and lakes to each other, only hindered by the small impediment that we never knew exactly where the mountains and rivers and lakes were.”

France and Britain were by far the two leading competitors for African territory. The French vision was to create an empire linking Algeria, West Africa, and the region north of the lower Congo River. To achieve their goal, the French relied on their military to drive eastward from Senegal and northward from the lower Congo. In West Africa the British concentrated on their coastal trading interests and carved out colonies in Gambia, Sierra Leone, the Gold Coast (Ghana), and Nigeria. But they also scooped up possessions elsewhere. In East Africa they laid claim to Kenya and Uganda, and by 1884, they gained control over a stretch of African coast fronting on the Gulf of Aden. Because it guarded the lower approach to the Suez Canal, this protectorate (British Somaliland) was of great strategic value.

Equally important to British control of Egypt were the headwaters of the Nile, situated in the area known as the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. The French also had their designs on the area as a bargaining chip to force the British to reconsider their exclusive control over Egypt. The French commissioned Captain Jean-Baptiste Marchand to march a force 3000 miles from...
central Africa to Fashoda on the White Nile south of Khartoum. In July 1898, several months after Marchand planted a French flag at Fashoda, General H. H. Kitchener successfully led an Anglo-Egyptian force against Muslim forces in control of the Sudan. Then Kitchener turned his attention to Marchand, and their forces faced off nervously at Fashoda. The showdown nearly ended in war. To the British, control of the Nile was a strategic necessity. To the French, it was a matter of national prestige, but they were not prepared to go to war over it, and they withdrew Marchand.

Britain was the principal colonizer in southern Africa. British influence expanded northward from the Cape Colony largely through the personal efforts of the diamond magnate Cecil Rhodes, who dreamed of an uninterrupted corridor of British territory from the Cape of Good Hope to Cairo. When the British government hesitated to claim territory north of the Limpopo River, Rhodes took the initiative. Rhodes had heard the stories that King Solomon’s mines were located there, and he thought the area had even more potential than the Witwatersrand goldfields. Lured by a mirage of gold, he poured his personal fortune into founding the British South Africa Company. In 1890 he dispatched a column to settle and, if need be, conquer the area that eventually bore his name, Rhodesia.

Both Portugal and Italy had grandiose visions of empire, but they had to settle for territories the major European powers did not covet. Although the Portuguese had been involved in Africa longer than any of the other European colonizers, their ambition to unite Mozambique and Angola through a central African corridor was thwarted by Rhodes and British interests. Italy emerged from the scramble for colonies with very little territory. The Italians gained a piece of the Red Sea coast and a slice of barren and desolate land on the Indian Ocean. But these areas were of little value without the rich plateau of Ethiopia in the hinterland. However, their bid to conquer the interior was soundly rebuffed by the Ethiopian army.

EUROPEAN TECHNOLOGY AND THE AFRICAN RESPONSE TO CONQUEST

The European conquest of most of Africa was facilitated because of advances in technology and medicine. Until quinine was perfected, Europeans setting foot in Africa died in droves from illnesses such as malaria. Advances in military technology gave European armies a decisive advantage in their encounters with African forces. The gunboat allowed European armies to dominate lake and river regions, while the introduction of breechloading rifles and machine guns made it possible for European soldiers to defeat much larger African armies that possessed outmoded muskets. However, technology was not the sole reason Europeans succeeded. Because European soldiers were still susceptible to African diseases and expensive to maintain, European armies recruited Africans to fight on their behalf. And Africans, who typically made up the vast majority of European-led units, did the bulk of the fighting.

African states were also at a disadvantage because they did not rethink outmoded battle tactics and because they did not put up a united front. In the face of European expansion, African states sought to preserve as much of their own autonomy and sovereignty as possible. This response usually prevented them from entering into alliances with other African states to confront a common enemy.

Most African societies resisted European conquest at some point, but they first weighed the costs and benefits of European rule and considered whether they should resist, make accommodations, or negotiate with Europeans. They queried European missionaries in their midst for information on the colonizers. They watched developments in neighboring states to see the results of resistance, and they sought advice on the implications of European protection. They assessed their rivalries with neighboring states and the possibility of profit from an alliance with Europeans. They also calculated whether they had the support of their own people. In the East African kingdom of Buganda, a Protestant ruling faction sought British allies to maintain an advantage over Muslim, Catholic, and traditionalist rivals.

African states often changed tactics over the course of time. Moshoeshoe’s Basotho kingdom fought the Boers in the Orange Free State on two occasions, appealed for British protection in 1868 to shield it from Afrikaner rule, fought a war against the Cape government in 1880 after the Cape tried to disarm Sotho warriors, and then invited the British to reestablish colonial rule in 1884.

Despite the disparity in firearms, African states valiantly sustained resistance to European colonizers until World War I. One of the most durable and innovative resistance leaders was Samori Touré (c. 1830–1900), who came from a Dyula trading family in the region of the upper Niger River in West Africa. He built up an army to protect his family’s trading interests and then, between 1865 and 1875, created a powerful Islamic kingdom among the Mandinke people that stretched from Sierra Leone to the Ivory Coast. Samori’s army could field over 30,000 soldiers and cavalry armed with muskets and rifles, some homemade and some imported from Freetown on the Sierra Leonean coast.
Samori’s forces were a formidable opponent when they first clashed with French soldiers probing west from Senegal in 1881. However, the French superiority in weaponry eventually forced Samori to wage a scorched-earth campaign as he moved his kingdom eastward. He then had to deal with internal revolts from his new subjects and also with the British, who refused to declare a protectorate over his kingdom. Squeezed between the French and the British, he fought as long as he could before he was captured and exiled by the French in 1898.

Because of their ability to inspire and unite followers, religious leaders often led the resistance to European invaders. In Sudan, Muhammad Ahmad (1844–1885), a Muslim shaykh from a village north of Khartoum, proclaimed himself a Mahdi (“guided one”) in 1881. Muslims believe that in times of crisis a redeemer appears whose mission it is to overthrow tyrannical and oppressive rulers and install just governments in their place. Declaring himself a successor to the prophet Muhammad, Muhammad Ahmad called on people to join him in a jihad against the unbelievers, the Egyptian-appointed administrators who were levying taxes and suppressing a profitable slave trade.

From a base 300 miles southwest of Khartoum, Mahdist forces scored numerous successes against Egyptian forces and laid siege to Khartoum in 1884. Despite last-ditch efforts by British officer Charles Gordon to negotiate with the Mahdi, the Mahdists swept into Khartoum in early 1885, killing Gordon and setting up an administration at Omdurman, across the Nile from Khartoum. The Mahdi died a short time later, but his successors founded a Muslim state that lasted until an Anglo-Egyptian force invaded the Sudan in 1898.

A Shona spirit medium by the name of Charwe also inspired resistance against the British South Africa Company’s (BSA) colonization of Rhodesia in the 1890s. Shona peoples believed that a person could communicate with God through a dead person’s spirit. This spirit can possess a living person who becomes a spirit medium. People especially consulted mediums who were possessed by important figures of the past. These mediums were thought to be guardians of the people and able to ensure good luck in hunting, producing rainfall, and controlling diseases. In the case of Charwe, she claimed to have been possessed by the spirit of Nehanda, a woman who had lived four centuries before.

In 1896, many Shona and Ndebele rose up against the BSA’s exploitative policies. Company officials were expropriating African land, seizing their cattle, levying taxes, and forcing Africans to work on the mines. Some Shona chieftoms were inspired to revolt by prominent spirit mediums such as Ambuya Nehanda and Kagubi, who secretly spread the message of revolt and urged people to take up arms. Their inspirational leadership sustained the Shona Chimurenga (uprising) for a year. Although the whites were nearly expelled, they eventually defeated the rebels. Nehanda and Kagubi were captured and sentenced to hang in March 1898. But Nehanda was defiant to the end. She refused to be converted to Christianity at the last minute and denounced the whites until the moment she was executed. Her prophecy that “my bones will rise” to recapture freedom was remembered by guerrillas fighting in the struggle against white domination in the 1970s. They, too, consulted spirit mediums, including an elderly woman who claimed she had been possessed by Nehanda’s spirit.
Although African armies scored some victories against European forces, only one African state, Ethiopia, successfully repulsed European invaders. In the second half of the nineteenth century, several kings had revived a unified kingdom of Ethiopia, but none was as impressive as Menelik II (1844–1913), the king of Shewa, who was crowned emperor of Ethiopia in 1889. He moved the capital to Addis Ababa and modernized his kingdom by constructing the first railway line and laying telephone lines for communication with provinces. He aggressively expanded Ethiopia’s boundaries, more than doubling the size of his kingdom.

At the same time, he kept a wary eye on British, French, and Italian intrigues in the region. “I have no intention,” he wrote Queen Victoria, “of being an indifferent spectator if the distant Powers hold the idea of dividing up Africa.” In 1889 Italy and Ethiopia signed the Treaty of Wuchale, in which Italy recognized Menelik as emperor of Ethiopia in return for giving the Italians a free hand in a region controlled by one of his rivals. However, the treaty’s Italian version stated that Ethiopia had to conduct foreign relations through the Italians, while the Amharic version merely stated that Ethiopia could consult with Italy on foreign matters. When Menelik learned through diplomatic exchanges with Britain and France that Italy was claiming a protectorate over Ethiopia, he denounced the treaty and prepared for an eventual showdown with Italy by importing massive quantities of weapons, many of them from Italy.

When the Italians mounted an offensive in Tigré province in 1896, Menelik called on his nation to resist them: “Enemies have come who would ruin our country....With God’s help I will get rid of them.” Menelik’s army of 100,000 soldiers was more than a match for the 20,000-strong Italian army. At the battle of Aduwa, the Italians suffered a humiliating defeat. The Italians were forced to recognize Ethiopia’s independence and content themselves with their enclave on the Red Sea coast, Eritrea.

The Ottoman Empire Refashioned

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Middle East consisted primarily of two large and loosely structured empires, the Qajar Empire in Persia and the Ottoman Empire, which included Anatolia, the Arab provinces, and most of North Africa. The Ottoman Empire stretched from the Balkans to Sudan and from the Maghreb to Arabia; and the Ottoman sultan could still claim a certain preeminence in the Islamic world based on his position as Protector of the Holy Cities. For centuries the Islamic world had extended well beyond the Middle Eastern heartlands. United by their worship of one god, devotion to the Prophet Muhammad, and adherence to the Sharia Islamic law, Muslims looked to Mecca as the sacred site of pilgrimage. Every year the number of believers traveling to Mecca grew, and by 1900 it is estimated that more than 50,000 Indians and 20,000 Malays were making the hajj each year. But the Islamic world had been politically divided since the early centuries of Islam, and Muslim states from Southeast Asia to Morocco pursued their own political agendas with little or no reference to the sovereign who controlled the Islamic heartlands.

Challenges to Ottoman Power

In the sixteenth century, the Ottoman administration had been a model of effectiveness. The Ottoman navy
dominated the eastern Mediterranean, and Ottoman armies continued to expand the territories of the sultan. The balance of trade was markedly in favor of Asia, with European merchants sending precious coin to procure the goods they wanted from the Ottoman Empire, Persia, and South and Southeast Asia. By the eighteenth century, however, that balance of military and economic power had begun to shift in favor of Europe, where some states were benefiting from industrialization and new military technologies. In this era the Ottoman Empire faced the challenges of decentralizing forces within and vigorous pressure from rivals beyond its boundaries.

Internally, central government power had been weakened by the increasing autonomy of regional governors (ayan) in the provinces. These notables mobilized their own provincial forces and resisted or evaded the authority of the central government in Istanbul. They gathered bands of men armed as irregular soldiers in Ottoman military campaigns to serve as their own personal armies. In North Africa the local lords had long enjoyed relative autonomy, and by the end of the eighteenth century, the Ottomans had little real power in the Maghreb.

The ranks of the janissary corps, the premier Ottoman fighting force, had also become grossly inflated. Thousands possessed papers which entitled them to collect military pay and rations but performed no military service; others were forced to take second jobs because inflation had drastically reduced the value of their pay. So the janissaries, once the front line of Ottoman defense, became a source of rebellion and a drain on the government treasury.

Indeed, the most evident signs of Ottoman weakness were military. The Russians defeated the Ottoman armies, and the empire had to sign the humiliating treaty of Kuchuk Kaynarca in 1774. Not only did the empire lose territory, but the Russians demanded the right to intervene in the affairs of the Orthodox Christian community in the empire. This concession for the first time granted a foreign state the power to meddle directly in Ottoman affairs. In 1798 Napoleon invaded Ottoman Egypt, and although his stay there was short, his easy victory illustrated the tenuousness of Ottoman control over the North African provinces.

The capitulations, treaties that granted special trade privileges to European states, also weakened both Ottoman and Qajar Empires. In the sixteenth century the Ottoman and Persian sovereigns had dictated the terms of foreign trade. But as their economies weakened, they granted more and more extensive privileges to European traders, which gave states like Britain and France increasing leverage in commercial affairs. These concessions harmed the businesses of local Ottoman traders who could not compete. As the nineteenth century progressed, European states would extend their influence by granting large loans to Middle Eastern rulers.

### Ottoman Reform

To counter these challenges, Sultan Selim III (1789–1806) launched a series of reforms, focusing on the military. He created a new infantry corps composed of Turkish peasants. Selim also opened channels of communication with the European capitals by setting up embassies in London, Paris, Berlin, and Vienna. The janissaries, however, were hostile to Selim’s reforms and unwilling to relinquish their centuries-long position of prominence. They deposed the sultan. Still, Selim’s reign marks the start of an era of Ottoman reform that would last into the early twentieth century (see Chapter 20).

A much more successful reformer was Sultan Mahmud II (1808–1839). Mahmud restored central authority in the provinces to some degree and cleared the way for military reform by annihilating the janissary corps. He then established a new army, modeled on successful European armies and trained by Prussian and French officers. Mahmud also reformed professional education by opening medical and military schools. The language of instruction was French; this, of course, gave an advantage to a new class of young men who were educated in French. Beyond the military sphere, Mahmud’s reforms included a restructuring of the bureaucracy, the launching of an official newspaper, and the opening of a translation bureau.

Men trained in the new professional schools and translation bureau would form a new nineteenth-century elite, sometimes called the “French knowers.” Able to deal with the European powers on their own terms, these men would both challenge and reform the old Ottoman institutional order. Whereas French-style uniforms were the symbol of the new military, the frock coat was a symbol of the Europeanization of the civil bureaucracy. Mahmud II’s reforms were not designed to cast off Ottoman culture and ideology but rather to
create systems that would enable the empire to compete with Europe and recoup its status as a world power. Some people resented these changes, preferring the status-quo; others saw the new schools and new positions as an opportunity for upward mobility that had been denied them under the old system of elites.

**Challenging Ottoman Sovereignty in Europe**

Ottoman territorial integrity was challenged in the nineteenth century by a series of separatist movements in the Balkans. The rise of nationalism in Europe and Great Power meddling in Ottoman affairs were both factors in the emergence and evolution of these movements. The Serbs rose in revolt in 1804, followed by the Greeks in 1821, the Romanians in the 1850s, and the Bulgarians in the 1870s.

The Serbs achieved autonomy in 1830 after a long struggle. The Greek Revolt, however, more directly engaged the energies of the Great Powers, who intervened to ensure its success. The Ottomans had crushed the Greek insurrection in its early stages. But Britain, Russia, and France all viewed the rebellion as a focal point in what came to be called the “Eastern Question”—whether the Ottoman Empire would be dismembered, and if so, who would get what (see Chapter 27).

The Greek Revolt captured the imaginations of European intellectuals who were enamored of the Greek classical tradition and saw the revolt as a romantic instance of the forces of freedom triumphing over the forces of despotism. Although that romanticism had little to do with the ground-level realities of the revolt, it did fuel support for the Greeks in the cities of western Europe. Educated Europeans saw themselves as inheritors of the classical Greek traditions and ideals of liberty; conversely, they portrayed the Ottomans as barbarians. In the end a predominantly British fleet sank the Ottoman navy at Navarino in 1827, and Britain, Russia, and France engineered a treaty to establish an independent Greece.

Russia and Britain would encounter each other again over Ottoman territory, but on opposite sides, in the Crimean War (1854–1856). Britain saved Istanbul from Russian conquest, thereby preserving the balance of power. But by the end of the nineteenth century, Europeans were referring to the empire as the “sick man of Europe,” and the Ottomans had lost control over most of their Balkan provinces. The nation states carved out of the Balkans have had a complicated history since that time. Borders have been drawn and redrawn (such as those of Yugoslavia in the twentieth century) and ethnic and religious tensions have been exacerbated, as they were in Africa and India for example, by the demands of contending nations for independence.
Egypt and the Rule of Muhammad Ali

Egypt had been a province of the Ottoman Empire since its conquest by Sultan Selim the Grim in 1517. By the late eighteenth century, however, Ottoman rule was little more than nominal as Egypt was controlled in fact by local leaders, the heads of Mamluk households. In the nineteenth century Egypt was conclusively detached from Ottoman rule, first by a highly successful Ottoman military commander named Muhammad Ali and then by the British, who seized Egypt as a strategic link to their colonial empire in India.

Muhammad Ali came to power in Egypt in the aftermath of Napoleon’s invasion. The French occupation of Egypt was short-lived, although it served to stimulate European interest in Egyptian civilization. When a joint British-Ottoman expedition arrived in Egypt in 1801 to end the French occupation, Muhammad Ali was one of the Ottoman commanders. He established himself as the dominant military leader, filling the power vacuum left by the French departure.

Muhammad Ali destroyed the Mamluks (as Mahmoud II had destroyed the janissaries), organized his military along European lines, and built up a new, conscripted peasant army. This was a radical change for the rural peoples since, traditionally, peasants had not been employed in the military. Muhammad Ali founded new professional schools and a government printing press, reorganized the agricultural and taxation systems of Egypt, sent men to study in France, and launched an ambitious program of industrialization. He also undermined the power of the religious establishment, the ulama.

Unlike religious leaders (like the Mahdi) elsewhere in Africa, the ulama in Egypt (and in the Ottoman empire in general) were generally subordinated to the state and did not lead jihads or religious revolts.

Muhammad Ali’s reforms were more extensive than those of Sultan Mahmoud II, but these two contemporaries were both major symbols of Middle Eastern reform. Once Muhammad Ali consolidated his power, he moved to challenge the Ottoman state directly. Initially, he had defended Ottoman interests by defeating the Wahhabis (a puritanical movement in Arabia that aimed to cleanse Islam of innovations like Sufism) and helping put down the Greek Revolt. But in 1831 he sent his son Ibrahim to invade Syria and Anatolia; Ibrahim marched his armies to within 150 miles of Istanbul.

Here again, Russia, Britain, and France intervened to preserve the Ottoman Empire. Muhammad Ali ultimately established an autonomous dynastic state in Egypt where his descendants occupied the throne until the 1950s. His career illustrates the weakness of the Ottoman Empire and its tenuous control over its more distant provinces. European states capitalized on the disruptions caused by Muhammad Ali to negotiate more advantageous commercial agreements with the beleaguered Ottoman sultan, thus undermining the economic foundations of the empire even further.
The Suez Canal

Muhammad Ali’s successors pursued parts of his reform programs, with little military or economic success. Egypt benefited from the American Civil War when Egyptian cotton was used to replace the South’s cotton exports, which were cut off when the Union blockaded southern ports. But foreign loans and the uncontrolled spending of its rulers left Egypt bankrupt by the 1870s.

The idea of a canal linking the Mediterranean to the Red Sea was not new. The Mamluks, rulers of medieval Egypt, had planned such a canal but lacked the technology to accomplish it. In 1854 the Egyptian ruler, Said, granted a Frenchman, Ferdinand de Lesseps, a concession to build a canal. De Lesseps was only one among many European entrepreneurs and concessionaires pouring into Egypt at this time to take advantage of building opportunities and commercial privileges. Some Middle Eastern people gained employment from these concessionaires but others lost out as more advanced European transport and communication technologies (telegraph, steamship, railroads) began to replace more traditional modes and those who provided them. The building and completion of the Canal itself radically disrupted patterns of labor as peasants were forcibly seized from their villages and forced to provide unpaid labor digging the canal. Families were torn apart, women left their farm-plots to follow and care for their drafted husbands, and thousands died in the course of the digging.

The Suez Canal was completed in 1869 during the reign of Khedive Ismail (1863–1879). Ismail was committed to the European-style transformation of his realm. But his lavish spending, particularly on his opening ceremonies for the canal, threw Egypt into a financial crisis. The opening ceremonies were a world event attended by numerous heads of state. Lavish spending for this event helped bankrupt Egypt.
event. Ismail commissioned the opera Aïda (which was not completed in time) and built special pavilions to house visiting dignitaries. His extravagance dazzled even the jaded aristocrats of Europe. The empress Eugénie of France, a notorious “clothes horse,” was said to have taken 250 dresses with her to the affair.

Plagued by financial troubles, Ismail sold Egypt’s shares in the canal to Britain for 4 million pounds sterling in 1875. The stock shares were snapped up by Disraeli, the astute prime minister of Great Britain, while the French dithered over whether to buy them. This sale gave Britain virtual control of this essential water link to its South Asian empire. The following year (the same year the Ottoman Empire defaulted on its loans), Egypt was unable to pay the interest on its foreign loans. Britain and France then forced Egypt to accept European control over its debts and hence its economy.

This assertion of foreign control paved the way for a British invasion of Egypt. The British and French forced Ismail to abdicate in 1879; in 1881 an army officer named Colonel Urabi, of peasant origins, led a military and populist revolt against foreign control in Egypt. He aimed to limit the power of the khedive and to form a national assembly. There was antiforeign rioting in Alexandria, where many Europeans lost their lives. The British, claiming they were acting in the best interests of the Egyptian people, then shelled Alexandria and took Cairo in 1882. Although their occupation was supposedly temporary, they remained until the Egyptian Revolt of 1952 and kept control of the Suez Canal until 1956. Thus, as elsewhere in Africa, the European imperial states used a combination of economic incentive, military force, and treachery to seize control of African empires.

**Lord Cromer and the Dinshaway Incident**

When the British conquered Egypt, they appointed Sir Evelyn Baring, later named Lord Cromer, to reorganize Egyptian finances, eliminate corruption, improve the cotton industry, and oversee the country’s affairs from 1883 to 1907. Cromer was an able administrator who stabilized the Egyptian economy, but his harsh policies and contempt for the Egyptian people earned him the hatred of many and helped galvanize the Egyptian nationalist movement.

Those sentiments are symbolized by an episode in 1906 that came to be called the Dinshaway Incident. The affair began simply with British officers on a pigeon shoot in the countryside. The officers, heedless of the fact that Egyptian villagers kept pigeons for food, pursued their hunt and wounded a villager in Dinshaway, in the Nile delta. In the ensuing scuffle, two officers were wounded, and one subsequently died.

What made this episode famous was the British response. Determined to make an example of Dinshaway, the British punished the whole village. They tried dozens of villagers and publicly hanged four. This incident provoked anger throughout Egypt, prompted...
the penning of patriotic songs, and gave force to the nationalist movement. The Dinshaway Incident showed that the people in the Middle East, and not just the elites, could be mobilized to protect their own economic security and to resist the inroads of European states.

**North Africa West of Egypt**

The appellation “North Africa” suggests a radical separation between Mediterranean and sub-Saharan Africa. But these two areas have long been linked by networks of trade. North Africa is grouped here with the Middle East because it was Islamized during the early Arab conquests and because it was loosely controlled by the Ottoman Empire during the premodern era. West of Egypt, North Africa contained the state of Morocco, ruled by the Filali dynasty since 1631, and three coastal states based on Tunis, Algiers, and Tripoli that were established under Ottoman rule. These latter three dominated the western Mediterranean for three centuries, remaining nominally under Ottoman control. Semi-autonomous governors, however, exercised the real power in the coastal states, attempting, with limited success, to subordinate tribal leaders in their hinterlands.

Algiers, Tripoli, and, to a lesser extent, Tunis were corsairing states that collected revenues from pirate activity off their coasts. In the eighteenth century they benefited from treaties with various European states that were willing to pay tribute and gifts in exchange for security for their merchant shipping. That shipping was part of a vast web of seaborne trade that reached from Southeast Asia and China to the American colonies.

When the American colonies gained their independence from Britain, they, too, negotiated treaties with these “Barbary States” in order to protect the lucrative American trade with North Africa. Sidi Muhammad (1757–1790) of Morocco granted the fledgling United States its first official trading privileges in 1786. The U.S. Congress authorized $40,000 for a treaty and $25,000 annual tribute for Algiers in 1790 and, shortly thereafter, provided for the building of a navy to gain leverage against the corsair state.

In the nineteenth century, however, European powers began to look to North Africa as an area ripe for conquest. Like Egypt, the rest of North Africa experienced European economic penetration before it suffered actual invasion. That penetration took the form of capitulations, reflecting commercial concessions granted to European states by the Ottomans and the exploitation of North Africa as a market for European goods.

The first target was Algiers. In the 1820s the ruler of Algiers (called the Dey) sent ships to aid the Ottomans in putting down the Greek Revolt; he also dealt with internal revolt as Algiers’s Berber tribesmen fought against his janissary troops. Meanwhile, the French were enmeshed in conflicts with the Dey over fishing rights, piracy, and a debt the French owed Algiers.

In 1827, using the pretext that the Dey had insulted the French consul by publicly hitting him with a fly whisk, France blockaded Algiers. Pursuing France’s imperialist agenda, King Charles X then invaded Algiers in 1830. He sent a large army of occupation, but only after 17 years of fierce resistance could Algeria be directly incorporated as an integral part of the French state. (Over one hundred years later, the Algerians would fight just as long and fiercely to free themselves from French rule.)

Algiers then became a base for France to extend its influence in North Africa. Tunis remained singularly autonomous of Ottoman rule and in 1861 established its own constitution. An insurrection, which united tribal and urban elements in 1864, led to the bankrupting of Tunis in 1869. Its French, Italian, and British creditors then gained control of the Tunisian economy. Italy coveted the coastal state with its rich agricultural hinterland, but the French stayed those ambitions by invading in 1881 and making it a protectorate. After that time, much of the country’s wealth was siphoned off into French coffers, and most of the population lived in desperate poverty.

From the 1840s to the end of the century, French interests also dominated in Morocco. But Germany was emerging as a significant power in the late nineteenth century and also cast its eye on African territory, including Morocco. France, however, used its established bases in North Africa and its alliance with the British to win this particular standoff. They promised the Germans territory elsewhere in Africa and took over Morocco in 1912. The French left the Moroccan dynasty in place but did not relinquish their hold on the country until 1956.

The Italians were latecomers in the scramble for Africa. Frustrated by the Ethiopians in their ambitions for East Africa, they decided to seize a piece of the North African pie. Capitalizing on the disruptions caused by the Ottoman constitutional revolution, they declared war on the Ottoman Empire in 1911 and invaded the area around Tripoli, annexing it in the face of a failed Ottoman defense. The Sanusi order of sufis, which had great influence in the region, vigorously resisted Italian (and French) expansionism. This order, established in the area in 1843, worked as both an Islamic reform movement and a political force. It
The people of Paris, men and women alike, are tireless in their pursuit of wealth. They are never idle or lazy. The women are like the men in that regard, or perhaps even more so.... Even though they have all kinds of amusements and spectacles of the most marvelous kinds, they are not distracted from their work.... Nor do they excuse someone for being poor, for indeed death is easier for them than poverty, and the poor man there is seen as vile and contemptible.

Another of their characteristics is a hot-tempered and stubborn arrogance, and they challenge each other to a duel at the slightest provocation. If one of them slanders or insults another, the challenged one has no choice but to respond, lest he be branded a despicable coward for the rest of his life. Then they decide the conditions of the combat—what weapons they will fight with, how it will be done, and the place—and no one in authority interferes with them.

You should know that among the customs of these people is that they sit only in chairs and they know nothing of sitting directly on the floor.... Another of their customs is that they do not touch food with their hands, nor do they gather around a single platter.... Two people may share one pitcher but each has his own glass from which no one else may drink, for they regard that as the height of uncleanliness.... At the end of every course, the servant removes the dishes and other things, and brings fresh ones. The number of dishes piles up, because they change them at every course and no dish is ever eaten from twice. This is due to their excessive concern for cleanliness.... they linger at table for more than two hours, because it is their custom to stretch out the talk during the meal so they can overindulge in food. The Arabs say that perfect hospitality is friendliness at first sight and leisurely talk with one's table companions. But we detested the arrival of mealtimes because of the endless waiting, nor did we understand their conversation. Moreover, much of the food did not agree with us, and we got tired and irritated with the long sitting and waiting.

[At dinner as-Saffar noted the free mingling of the sexes and commented on the women's dress.] Their clothing covered their breasts, which were hidden from view, but the rest of their bosom, face and neck were bare and exposed. They cover their shoulders and upper arms in part with filmy, closefitting sleeves that do not reach the elbow. They bind their waists beneath their dresses with tight girdles which give them a very narrow middle. It is said they are trained into this [shape] from earliest childhood by means of a special mold.... In the lower part they drape their clothing in such a way that the backside is greatly exaggerated, but perhaps this is due to something they put underneath [bustles].

Questions to Consider

1. Why do you think as-Saffar commented on French eating habits? What do you think eating habits and dress styles reveal about a people and their culture?

2. What aspects of a diplomat's life might be enjoyable? What aspects might be unpleasant?

One type of European penetration into the Ottoman Empire was the opening of textile factories in western Anatolia. The young girls and women who worked in these factories often made relatively good wages, but their work in factories raised moral issues about “unsupervised” women, much as it did in the factories of Europe. These young women workers in a silk-thread factory pose for the camera in 1878.

had enormous support among the people both in the cities and in the rural areas. The order would later gain power in the new state of Libya when the colonial powers withdrew. For the time, however, the early twentieth century saw North Africa, like sub-Saharan Africa, divided among the European imperial powers and incorporated into European empires.

Young Ottomans and Constitutional Reform
The challenges to Ottoman sovereignty, combined with the prospect of a newly emerging “modern” world order, prompted a period of reform known as the Tanzimat (reorganization) from 1839 to 1876. New professional schools were opened in the empire, the class of “French knowers” expanded, and a more modern and secular civil bureaucracy was established. The power of the ulama was diminished by the legal and educational reforms. As new, more secular schools opened, the ulama lost their monopoly on education. The government also tried to ward off separatist sentiments by emphasizing the ideology of Ottomanism, the notion that all Ottoman subjects were equal and should be committed to the preservation of the empire, regardless of ethnicity or religion. Of course, not everyone accepted this ideology, but it did hold sway in the government until the end of the empire.

Out of the reforms of the Tanzimat emerged a new civil and military elite, some of whom favored elements of European culture and more democratic forms of government. Among them, a group of intel-
lectuals and bureaucrats, sometimes called the Young Ottomans, revitalized Ottoman literature and called for a new synthesis that would combine the best elements of traditional Islamic culture with European ideas and technology. These reformers debated issues such as constitutional freedoms, changing the Ottoman calendar and clocks to European time schemes, “modern” schools, and the “woman question,” the rights and education of the “modern” woman.

The reformers also considered the question of slavery. Britain had been trying to force the Ottoman empire to end the slave trade for some time, but the Young Ottomans tended to conclude that slavery in Muslim countries was fundamentally different from that found in European colonies and in the Americas. Indeed, there were fundamental differences from the Atlantic slave trade. Ottoman slavery included the elite kul system, and was primarily domestic rather than agricultural. It was characterized by a predominance of female slaves (rather than the Atlantic slave trade’s 2-3:1 male to female ratio), the use of both white and black slaves, and the provisions of Islamic law which stated that the children of a slave female and her master were free and entitled to inherit.

In 1876 a group of Ottoman reform-minded elites spearheaded a drive to depose Sultan Abdülaziz and install Western-style constitutional government in the Ottoman Empire. They did not wish to eliminate the monarchy, and the new constitution they proposed left considerable power in the hands of the sultan. But they did want an elected assembly, freedom of the press, and equality for all Ottomans. The constitutionalists installed a new sultan, Abdülhamid II (1876–1909). But once Abdülhamid consolidated his power, in 1878, he abrogated the constitution and suspended the parliament.

**Abdülhamid II and the Young Turk Revolution**

Abdülhamid, paradoxically, was both a reformer and an autocrat. He continued many of the trends set in the Tanzimat era but controlled opposition through spies, censorship of the press, exile, and imprisonment.

The sultan faced severe challenges on all fronts. Russia declared war on the empire in 1877, resulting in the loss of more Ottoman territory and the creation of a large refugee population fleeing newly acquired Russian lands. Britain occupied Egypt and the island of Cyprus. Meanwhile, the empire, hampered by huge debts that it could not pay, was engaged in trying to redeem its Balkan territories.

Abdülhamid tried to control the centrifugal forces at work on the empire by enhancing central government control, bolstering the military, and establishing closer relations with an increasingly powerful Germany. Kaiser Wilhelm made two state

Abdülhamid II. Photography was all the rage in the empire during Abdülhamid’s reign, and the sultan supported several court photographers. He sent commemorative volumes documenting his reforms and Ottoman progress to heads of state in the United States and Britain. Widespread discontent with his oppressive rule lent strength to the constitutional movement of the Young Turks, who ultimately deposed the sultan in 1909.
Halide Edib, born into an elite family in Istanbul in 1883, was a famous Turkish author and nationalist leader. Her father was a progressive who believed women should be educated. Thus Halide was schooled in Turkish, English, and French by tutors. She later became one of the first graduates of the new American College for Girls and wrote a famous novel on the problems of the educated woman. Married at a young age to a prominent scholar many years her senior, she divorced him in 1910 when he decided to take a second wife. Afterward, Edib became a pioneer educator, fought along with her second husband in the War of Turkish Liberation after World War I, and became a prominent international lecturer. She was a member of the Turkish parliament from 1950–1954. Halide Edib’s memoirs reflect the era of transformation during which she came of age. Ottoman society during the rule of the Young Turks was refashioning itself and the “Woman Question” was a topic of considerable debate. Here she reflects (for 1913–1914) on the differences between the generations and on a conflict of class and dress that arose while she was pursuing her work in education.

[A]fter her divorce Halide took a house in Istanbul where she lived with her two sons and her beloved grandmother, an elderly woman of the elite class.] Granny was living with me as usual, but I had lost the old sense of nearness to her for the moment. I was constantly out for lessons and lectures; the [Turkish nationalist] club demanded much of my time and my circle of friends had a great deal happen to it. My writing I had to do after ten o’clock at night when the noisy little house slept and left me quiet in my room. Granny also enjoyed those quiet hours; she came to me for talks then. She was much shocked by the new women. Their talk, their walk, their dress, and their general aspect hurt her. She felt lonely, like a stranger in a world where she felt she had stayed too long, like a visitor who has outstayed his welcome; it was as if the newly arrived guests had taken all the room and they looked ever so different from her. She suffered because they shook their arms when they walked, looked into men’s eyes, had loud voices, and smoked in public; above all they did not iron their clothes as she did every morning.

[One afternoon Halide took a short cut through a poor section of town, Arasta Street, on the way home from the school where she taught.] I had on the fashionable [tight] black charshaf [long overgarment] and veil of my class..... up and down the street walked a series of little girls..... they had print dresses of the poorest sort, and bare feet shod with wooden clogs which they dragged painfully, but they had a saucy and aggressive way of walking in spite of this impediment. One had a dirty baby in her arms, half her own size, and the baby’s nose was running all the time. Another had a broken silk umbrella, which must have had a prosperous past and was evidently stolen property. All lifted their dresses in mock imitation of the chic women of the city; all strutted in a make-believe promenade of great ladies. I must admit they made me ashamedly conscious of how ridiculous our class could be.... “Oh, oh, look at her!” shouted the girl with the umbrella—there was neither rain nor sunshine. “On her head she has a cauldron, a silk shawl around her belly has she. She has a well-ring around her throat and wrists [white collar and cuffs] and her shoes are bath clogs [high heels].” A unanimous shout of laughter, accompanied by savage and significant movements, inimitable imitations but openly hostile to me, greeted her speech..... I would have given anything to throw off the offending garments, which displayed my class, at whose expense they were laughing, and join in their play. As it was, I was in real danger of being badly stoned, or of having my dress torn in a way that would have been worse than inconvenient. I immediately lifted my veil and joined in the conversation. The human face, especially the human eyes, have their force among their kind. A human being whose eyes and face are invisible is easier to attack..... I disarmed the little crowd for a moment. But the moment I made the slightest show of movement, they all bent down, picked up stones from the old pavement and got ready in case I should escape. [Edib was rescued by a shopkeeper who drove the children off. In the future she took care to let her dress “resemble that of the other women of the neighborhood” and not to cover her face when she traveled about Istanbul’s poorer districts.]

Questions to Consider

1. Why did Halide’s grandmother feel like a stranger in her own home?
2. What does the children’s attack on Halide suggest about class and fashion?

visits, in 1889 and 1898, including a triumphant trip to Jerusalem during which the kaiser, a good politician, declared his friendship with the world's Muslims. Wilhelm's visit had an impact on the architecture of Jerusalem as well as on Ottoman-German relations. The gates of the old walled city of Jerusalem were too narrow to admit the kaiser's carriage. Rather than subject the German empress to the indignity of getting out of her carriage and walking through the gate, Abdülhamid had one of the gates knocked out and enlarged.

The sultan fostered the ideology of Pan-Islam to legitimize his reign and mobilize the support of the world's Muslims. His rhetoric of Islamic unity and his claim to be caliph decidedly did not strike a chord among all Muslims. But his project for a Hijaz railway to bring pilgrims from Damascus to the Holy City of Mecca did generate popular support for the sultan, and schoolchildren across the empire contributed their coins to help ensure its success.

The constitutional ideal in the Ottoman Empire, however, had not been lost, and opposition to the sultan mounted as Abdülhamid entered the third decade of his reign. Outside the empire, a group of exiles labored to promote the reinstatement of the constitution. Inside the empire revolutionary sentiments grew among students, bureaucrats, and some members of the military. In 1889 a group of students in the military-medical school founded a secret organization called the Committee for Union and Progress (CUP). This group was instrumental in mobilizing opposition to the regime.

In 1908 a military revolt became the catalyst for the second Ottoman constitutional revolution, known as the Young Turk Revolution. Support for the revolt spread rapidly, and the revolutionaries demanded that
Abdülhāmid reinstated the constitution. He acceded reluctantly to their demands, elections were held, censorship was suspended, and the Young Turks relegated the sultan to a position of secondary importance. Among the issues debated by the new assembly were rehabilitating the navy, reforming the police, and warding off attacks by the empire's neighbors.

Reactionaries launched a counterrevolution, in which Abdülhāmid was implicated, in April 1909; but it was put down by the army. Abdülhāmid was promptly deposed, and the CUP came to dominate the Ottoman constitutional regime. Although a new sultan was installed, the revolution marked the end of a centuries-long era of Ottoman monarchical power. The new government remained firmly in the hands of a civilian elite. Discontent simmered in the Arab provinces as the CUP continued the centralizing policies of Abdülhāmid. But in general, the government and the remaining provinces stayed committed to the empire until World War I.

As in other areas of the globe, the population of the empire was affected to varying degrees by this change of regime. The lives of peasants in the countryside were not radically altered, and many of those who held power under the old regime took positions in the new one. There was, however, a greater opportunity for political participation, more freedom of the press, a mass freeing of prisoners, and expanded opportunities for the lower classes to be educated and for women in the middle classes to have a greater role in public society.

**PERSIA AND THE GREAT POWER STRUGGLE**

The Ottoman revolution of 1908 was not the only upheaval to transform government and society in the Middle East. In fact, the same tensions among monarchy, foreign intervention, and Western-style constitutional reform that prompted the Young Turk Revolution also provoked a constitutional revolution in Persia two years earlier. Farther east, a series of Afghan rulers struggled to retain their autonomy while caught between the expansionist powers of British India and tsarist Russia.

**Qajar Rule and the Tobacco Rebellion**

Persia had been controlled by the Qajar dynasty since 1794. After a military defeat by the Russians in 1828, the Qajar shah was forced to concede extraterritorial rights to Russian merchants and give them special commercial privileges. Soon the British were demanding similar rights. As the nineteenth century progressed, the Qajars found themselves caught in a military and commercial squeeze play between Russia and Britain.

Foreign incursions reached a climax in the second half of the nineteenth century with the long reign of Nasir al-Din Shah (1848–1896). Unlike the Ottomans or Muhammad Ali, the Qajars remained dependent on the decentralized military power of tribal chiefs to defend Persia. Nasir al-Din implemented some military and educational reforms, but his government remained weak. To bolster his position, the shah negotiated loans, sold concessions to foreign investors, and brought in Russian military advisers to establish a Cossack brigade.

While Russian influence prevailed in the Qajar military, Britain moved to penetrate various spheres of the Persian economy. The British completed a telegraph line from London to Persia in 1870, symbolizing their increased interest in the area. In 1890 Nasir al-Din granted a British group exclusive rights over the entire Persian tobacco industry. This act alienated the merchant classes, who aligned themselves with the Shi’ite ulama to launch a rebellion against the shah and the tobacco concession.

The ulama in Persia had never been subordinated by the government to the same degree as in the Ottoman Empire. More like their counterparts in Africa, these religious leaders constituted a powerful force for opposition against the government and would be instrumental in the national revolutions of the twentieth century. During the tobacco rebellion of 1891, the ulama engineered a countrywide boycott of tobacco, and the shah was forced to cancel the tobacco concession. This boycott not only illustrated the mobilizing power of the Shi’ite clerics, but (like the Dinshaway Incident in Egypt) also pointed up popular discontent over the increasingly intrusive European presence.
The Persian Constitutional Revolution

By the opening of the twentieth century, parts of northern Persia were under the control of the Russians. Tsarist forces trained the Persian army, put up telegraph lines, established a postal system, and developed trade. Some Persian workers crossed into Russia to work in the Caucasus oilfields. The Russian ministry of finance even set up a bank, The Discount and Loan Bank of Persia, with branches in many parts of the nation. This bank lent the Persian government 60 million rubles and provided 120 million rubles to Persian merchants to enable them to buy Russian goods.

The British in turn set up the Imperial Bank of Persia in the southeastern part of the country. In 1901 Muzaffar al-Din Shah (1896–1906) granted a British subject a concession for the oil rights to all of Persia except a few northern provinces. This grant would lead to British control over Persian oil that would continue into the second half of the century. Already crippled by his economic dependence on foreign powers, the shah made three costly trips to Europe during his short reign. These visits were criticized by the Persian public as extravagant. But the shah used these visits to solicit still more foreign loans from the British, the French, and the Russians.

Aiming to dominate the sea routes between Suez and their Indian empire, the British also gained footholds in the Persian Gulf region through treaties with a number of shaykhs, including the rulers of Muscat, Oman, Bahrain, and Kuwait (1899). In 1903 the British foreign secretary issued what has been called a British Monroe Doctrine over the area: "I say it without hesitation, we should regard the establishment of a naval base or a fortified port in the Persian Gulf by any other power as a very grave menace to British interests, and we should certainly resist it by all means at our disposal." Thus, the British won the imperialist struggle for control of the Persian Gulf just as France won the struggle for control of the coast of North Africa. Persia had no navy and could not, in any case, match British firepower.

Responding to foreign intervention in Persia, the shah’s ineffectual rule, and the growing impetus for representative government, various factions within the nation mobilized a revolt beginning in 1905. This revolution began with a series of protests culminating in a general strike. Mass demonstrations, a strike by the ulama, and a massacre of protesters in Tehran by the Cossack brigade followed in 1906.

The shah succumbed to this pressure and authorized a Constituent National Assembly. Elections were held, and new newspapers flourished in the capital. But Muzaffar al-Din died in 1906, and his successor, Muhammad Ali Shah (1907–1909), soon attempted to overturn the constitutional regime, plunging Persia into civil war. The new shah’s tyranny and his use of Russian troops against Persians prompted some members of the ulama to send a telegram to the Ottoman sultan, asking for his aid to protect fellow Muslims.

After a bitter struggle, the constitutional forces won and deposed Muhammad Ali Shah in July 1909, installing his 12-year-old son in his place. The nation has had a constitutional government ever since, although its power has often been compromised by the preservation of the monarchy.

The Persian constitutional revolution was watched closely in Istanbul and served as a prelude to the Ottoman revolution, which followed quickly on its heels. The constitutionalists in both empires were inspired by the example of Japan, a modernizing power with a strong military. They were impressed that Japan was an Asian power (with a long history of traditional monarchy) that had successfully modernized and decisively beaten a European power, Russia,
The Century of Western Dominance

1881 and 1901 Amir Abdur Rahman consolidated his power over Afghanistan, but Britain retained its hold on Afghanistan's foreign affairs.

Russia, meanwhile, was expanding toward the southeast. Many indigenous peoples, such as the Mongols, Afghans, Turkomans, and Tatars, came within Russia's sphere of influence. Their cities—Samarkand, Tashkent, and Bokhara—became tsarist administrative centers. Russia's advance was accomplished not only by its army but also by the construction of the Trans-Caspian railway, which, at its completion in 1888, reached 1064 miles into the heart of Asia. The Orenburg-Tashkent railway, completed in 1905, stretched 1185 miles farther. Inspired by the feats of both the army and the engineers, some Russian imperialists dreamed of conquering Afghanistan and penetrating India itself. But British pressure blocked Russia's design on Afghanistan, and a British military expedition to Lhasa in 1904 countered Russian influence in Tibet.

By the terms of the Anglo-Russian entente in 1907, Russia and Britain agreed to leave Afghanistan intact. Russia agreed to deal with the sovereign of Afghanistan only through the British government. Great Britain agreed to refrain from occupying or annexing Afghanistan so long as the nation fulfilled its treaty obligations. This partnership was, however, only a marriage of convenience brought on by larger pressures in Europe. Neither side wished to alienate the other in the face of the emerging threat of Germany's war machine.

CONCLUSION

By 1914, European states had established their primacy over Africa and the Middle East. While thousands of Africans worked in European-owned mines, thousands of Persians crossed into Russia to work in tsarist oilfields. While financiers in London, Berlin, and Paris skimmed the profits from the resources of Africa and Asia, European officials and diplomats dictated policy for much of the region. Although the Young Turk and Persian Revolutions brought constitutional governments to the Ottoman and Qajar Empires in the Middle East, only Persia would survive the consuming conflicts of World War I. The Young Turks, engaged in rebuilding the Ottoman Empire, chose to enter the war on the German side and suffered disastrous consequences.

Even before 1914, however, the forces that would eventually remove European dominance in the next half century were at work. In Africa and Egypt various indigenous groups mobilized to throw off the European yoke. In Europe citizens and parliamentary representa-
tives debated the relative costs and benefits of empire and colonies. Many remained committed to social Darwinism, the idea of civilizational hierarchy expressed in the notions of carrying “white man’s burden” of spreading “civilization” to the “lesser peoples.” But despite European military, economic, and technological superiority over the Middle East and Africa, the “white man’s burden” would become increasingly onerous as the twentieth century progressed and as the conquered peoples mobilized to gain independence and to assert their own cultural identities.

Culture and identity, of course, are not fixed; they are constantly evolving. The period from 1800 to 1914 in the Middle East and Africa was one of particularly intense and rapid cultural change prompted by marked transformations in economic organization and in the technologies of transportation and communications. The effects of such transformations on African and Middle Eastern societies were compounded as those societies were subjugated by, or subordinated to, European states and economies.

People reacted in different ways to that subordination, depending on their position, class, education, religion, and ethnicity. Some advocated emulation of European influence in order to regain lost powers; others advocated vigorous resistance and adherence to traditional mores; many saw some advantage in compromise, taking technologies and organizational structures from the West while retaining many elements of the old order.

The assertion of European primacy over Africa and the Middle East had dramatic effects. Europeanization altered economic, political, and legal structures. In many cases it radically altered the education systems and even the languages of the conquered territories. French and English culture were adopted to some degree by many subject peoples, especially among the upper and middle classes. Other African and Middle Eastern peoples rejected the imported European traditions or modified them to suit their own needs.

European influence thus created new cultural syntheses. While upper-class ladies in Istanbul sought out French fashions, upper-class European women dressed in “Turkish” style and consumed Orientalist art. In many ways, however, European culture was a veneer applied to powerful local cultural traditions. Islam retained its strength, and European Christian missionaries met with little success in their efforts to convert Muslims in the Middle East. African peoples adapted Christianity to their own rituals. Armed with the technological, intellectual, and political lessons they learned confronting the Europeans, African and Middle Eastern peoples would soon craft new states in the nation-state mold of the new twentieth-century world order.
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You can obtain more information about topics included in this chapter at the websites listed below. See also the companion website that accompanies this text, www.ablongman.com/brummett, which contains an online study guide and additional resources.

Age of European Imperialism: The Partitioning of Africa in the Late Nineteenth Century
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Site discusses the partitioning of Africa and includes an interesting selection of maps tracing the imperial drive in Africa.

End of the Slave Trade in Africa
http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/africa/africasbook.html
The Impact of Slavery
Documents regarding the termination of slave trade in Africa, from the Internet African History Sourcebook.

Internet Islamic History Sourcebook: Western Intrusion, 1815–1914
http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/islam/islamsbook.html
Extensive online resource for links about the history of the Middle East, including short primary documents describing nineteenth-century European imperialism and the end of the Ottoman Empire.
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