OUKA
The University of Osaka
Institutional Knowledge Archive

Title	Work in Progress Seminar in English for Postgraduate Students : Postgraduate course program at the department of Occidental history, Osaka University
Author(s)	
Citation	パブリック・ヒストリー. 2019, 16, p. 67-75
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://doi.org/10.18910/71604
rights	
Note	

The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA

https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/

The University of Osaka

Journal of History for the Public, 16 (2019), pp. 67-75.

Work in Progress Seminar in English for Postgraduate Students: Postgraduate course program at the department of Occidental history, Osaka University

In 2018 the Department of European and American History at Osaka University introduced a new unit to the Postgraduate Program. The Unit is aimed at encouraging postgraduate students to present their works in progress in English. The enrolled students are to read their paper either at special sessions of postgraduate seminars in the Department or at other recognized venues. The following three essays are prepared by the second year students in Master Program for these occasions. The first one is a summary of the paper presented by Kazuma Morii at HeKKSaGOn 2018 Young Scholar Symposium at Osaka University (11 April 2018). The second one is read by Koto Fukunaga at the special session (23 July 2018) and the third one is read by Masafumi Kudo at the same venue (30 July 2018).

Summary of the presentation at HeKKSaGOn 2018 Young Scholar Symposium, Osaka University

Rethinking the Resistance to the Anti-Slave Trade Movement in Britain

Kazuma Morii

The British parliament passed an act for abolishing the slave trade in 1807, twenty years after the abolitionist movement started in 1787. Although the abolition of the slave trade has long been studied, discussions on its causes are so controversial that there is no established explanation. This report tries to shed light on this issue through rethinking the resistance to the anti-slave trade movement. John Anstruther will be examined as an example of MPs, who, at first, resisted the abolition of the slave trade, but finally changed their attitude to support it. An analysis of his political life shows that to some extent, the conduct of MPs who opposed abolition was more affected by their desire for political survival than their serious concern for the future of Britain or their economic interests in the slave trade.

In the 19th century, Whig historians understood the abolition of the trade as evidence for the humane and liberal nature of Britain. In his *Capitalism and Slavery* (London, 1944), Eric Williams proposed that economic reasons were more important. He claimed that the slave trade was no longer profitable in the late 18th century, and that was the main cause for the end of the slave trade. Although his explanation had a significant impact, his decline theory was turned over by later quantitative studies. Researchers after that studied the people and society involved in the abolitionist movement. The activities of Quakers and Evangelicals were a primary focus, but the participation by other people, for example, conservative people or Anglicans, was also

revealed. These studies showed that people participated in the anti-slave trade movement from a variety of backgrounds.

Although the abolitionist movement had involved various people and had continued since 1787, the actual vote against the slave trade did not take place until 1807. This delay is important in considering the cause of abolition because it means that the decisive votes were cast by those previously opposed. The most recent studies focus on the anti-abolitionist movement. Paula E. Dumas, *Proslavery Britain: Fighting for Slavery in an Era of Abolition* (Palgrave Macmillan US, 2016) shows that proslavery existed in print, culture, art and Parliament. However, these studies view the resistance as connected with West India interests. Certainly, the West India interests were main actors in the resistance, but others were also involved in it. The West India interests were listed in Keiko Kawawake, "The House of Commons and West India Interests in the Age of the Slave Trade Abolition" (in *The scientific reports of Kyoto Prefectural University: Humanities*, 63, 2011, pp.57-110). When you see the names of MPs in Kawawake's list who voted against abolition on 15 March 1796, the West India interests constitute only 25% of them.

Who were the others that resisted the abolitionist movement? What was their motivation to oppose the movement? This report takes one MP, Sir John Anstruther as a case study(1). He is one example of the MPs, who changed their attitude between 1796 and 1807. Anstruther voted against abolition in 1796, but was listed as 'friendly' to abolition in 1806. Why did he change his attitude so dramatically?

Anstruther had no West India interests but had a post in East India. He joined the impeachment of Warren Hastings, the first Governor of the Presidency of Bengal, in his early years, and later worked as chief Justice in Bengal. While MPs' opposition toward or support of abolition was often linked with the economic situation of the trade, this was not the case with Anstruther. Rather than his individual background, he was influenced by political connections. Generally speaking, political considerations played a large role in the electoral system before the reformation in 1832, but Anstruther's decision on abolition was remarkably influenced by his political connections.

First, how did he live his political life previous to voting against abolition in 1796? When he started his career, he stood on the opposition side to the government. For his political survival, his parents wanted him to ally with Henry Dundas, who had some power in his family borough. Nevertheless, he disliked and attacked Dundas at every opportunity, which led to Dundas's refusal of support for Anstruther in 1789. As a result, young Anstruther lost his seat in his family borough at the next election.

Dundas was one of the MPs, who opposed the bill for abolition in 1796. If Anstruther continued his attack against Dundas, he would have supported abolition in 1796. However, he

(1) Institute of Historical Research, 'ANSTRUTHER, John (1753-1811), of Anstruther, Fife.' in History of Parliament: British Political, Social & Local History (https://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1790-1820/member/anstruther-john-1753-1811), 15/09/2018.

changed his attitude 180 degrees.

After Dundas refused his support, Anstruther fortunately obtained his seat for Cockermouth, continuing to act with the opposition until 1792. But the situation changed after 1792, when, considering the political situation around him, he joined the conservative Whig camp. Moreover, he entered the 'third party,' a conservative group opposing the French Revolution, in 1793. He now supported the government. Thanks to this, Anstruther was placed on the committee of secrecy in 1794. He went on to support the Seditious Meetings Act as a government supporter in 1795. Anstruther went back to his seat for the family borough with Dundas's blessing in 1796. Now he supported Dundas. It was at this moment that he voted against the abolition of the slave trade, on 15 March 1796. He opposed the abolition for his political survival.

Later, he was listed as "friendly" to abolition in 1807, but this was also the result of his attitude to support the government for his political survival. In June 1797, he was appointed chief justice of Bengal, a post he had hoped for seven years before. Anstruther's performance in India was evaluated in conflicting ways. He was said to be 'an intriguing political character, almost always influenced by some interested or disgraceful motive, extending even to his judicial decisions[(2)]'. But he hoped for a peerage and was confident that he had improved the standards of justice in Bengal. After arriving home in July 1806, Anstruther accepted the post of management in the Commons of Privy Council business. He came into Parliament again on the family interest and supported the government, and at this time he was listed as 'friendly' to the abolition of the slave trade.

Anstruther's decision to vote against/for the abolition of the slave trade was not related to his sincere concern about the future of Britain, nor his economic interests in the slave trade. His only concerns were for his political survival. He opposed the abolition of the slave trade in 1796 because he needed to keep a good relationship with Henry Dundas. He supported the abolition of the slave trade in 1806 because he was a supporter of the government. The political situation played a key role in Anstruther's case. This was not exceptional. In order to answer the question of why MPs changed their attitudes from 1796 to 1807, it is not enough to trace the activity of MPs who were closely connected with the West Indies. Rather, we need to trace the conduct of MPs who were influenced by other factors, such as the political situation in Anstruther's case. Their decisions were weak, but their power in numbers had an influence on the timing for abolition.

(2) Alfred Spencer, ed., *Memoirs of William Hickey*, iv (1790-1809), London, 1925, p.388, from Digital Library of India (https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.155976), 15/09/2018.

The paper read at the special session of the Department (23 July 2018)

The Unified Styles of the Army Uniform in Imperial Germany 1907-1910

Koto Fukunaga

The theme of my study is "The Unified Styles of the Army Uniform in Imperial Germany from 1907 to 1910." I believe that the first uniform adopted for all the German states was a symbol of nation building. As you know, in 1871 Germany was divided into a number of states and after the founding of the Imperial German Reich the states still remained in this new country. In this new empire, the states kept their own traditions, armies, administrative systems and (limited) sovereignties. A uniform, especially a military uniform, is often a symbol representing national identity.

For my bachelor's thesis, I wrote about the uniform of army officers in Imperial Germany as a symbol of the aristocratic ideology. In my master's thesis all of uniforms, including soldiers' dress, are comprehensively considered. Also, this time I focus on the relationship between Prussia and Bavaria. In the previous researches, the conflict between Prussia and Bavaria was pointed out. They were the two most influential states in the German Reich, and Bavaria had antipathy towards the power of Prussia. Imperial Germany advocated federalism, but in fact after the unification in 1871, German states, especially smaller states, submitted to Prussian power. For example, their military forces were integrated into the Prussian army. The second biggest state, Bavaria, maintained its own traditions, administrative system, and army. The Bavarian soldiers and officers wore light blue uniforms; this often represented their separate sovereignty.

Nevertheless, after 1907, all the uniforms including those of Bavaria were integrated into the same style. How was this integration carried out between the two major states, Prussia and Bavaria? What kind of historical importance does this unification have and why was it possible? These are the questions I want to ask in my master's thesis.

Now, I'd like to introduce some previous research. A Japanese scholar, Yoshihiro Iida, says that in 1860 the German nation was built through the military crisis against Denmark and France, and the foundation of a customs union. On the contrary, Otto Dann explains that German nation building was incomplete. According to Dann, Imperial Germany wasn't a typical nation state. On the other hand, Hidetoshi Takahashi, who received Dann's guidance in Germany, says that after 1871, networks of communication were slowly developed through administration and traffic, etc. My viewpoint is nearer to Dann's and Takahashi's. I do not think that the German nation did grow rapidly, but slowly until the beginning of the 20th century.

Here I will show you a brief outline of this presentation. It has three sections. Firstly, I will explain the history of the German military uniform. Secondly, I will discuss the background of the unification of styles of the uniform, and especially the rationality of the new styles. Thirdly, I will assert that nation building is another reason for introducing the uniform.

Original German military uniforms had many variations, as many independent countries

existed and each of them had their own military forces. Officers and soldiers of some countries had worn different uniforms. After the founding of the German empire in 1871, various colors and styles of uniforms were retained and colors were sometimes symbols of the states. For example, the Prussian army's uniform was traditionally dark blue and the Bavarian army's was light blue.

From 1907 to 1910 the uniforms were changed and integrated into a new form with only one color, field gray (in German feldgrau). Firstly, in 1907, this style of uniform was introduced for the soldiers in the infantry and artillery. The style was imported from the German colonies. The next year, cavalry soldiers began to use the uniform. Finally, in 1910, officers started to wear the new style of dress.

The unification is often looked upon as a result of the influence of a global tendency for military uniforms becoming simple and plain to be adapted to modern tactics such as trenches, skirmish lines, and guns with long range. At that time, it was already very important that soldiers were hidden from the rage of the enemy's guns. In fact, the British Army's uniform changed from red to khaki after the Boer War. The Japanese Army introduced a new uniform in khaki during the Russo-Japanese War, and after the end of the war, changed all of the army uniforms to this color. Their enemy, the Russian Army, decided to choose the same method. During this war, German officer Carl Adolf Maximilian Hofmann watched the battle between the Russian and Japanese armies. The newest styles of military uniforms were worn by both soldiers, and their usefulness might have been reported to German generals in Berlin or Munich by Hofmann.

However, the impetus for changing army uniforms to modern styles was not absolute. Not every country adopted such new style uniforms before the First World War. The French army, a strong, grand force in Europe in those days, kept their own traditional styles—a dark blue coat and red pants—until the early stages of World War I. They were good targets of machine guns, but before World War I, the danger of loud-colored uniforms was not well-known. Therefore, I can say that one has to consider not only the rationality of new uniform styles, but also other factors.

Now I want to explore the meaning of nation building. As was pointed out, there was a conflict between Prussia and Bavaria. A Bavarian politician from the Social Democratic Party of Bavaria, Georg von Vollmar, said, "If the uniforms of Bavarian government officials were dark blue, it would be unbearable for us." Uniforms always have symbolic meanings and military uniforms were often a symbol of a nation or country. Here, the dark blue uniform, of course, represents Prussia. Though there was such a strong hatred of Prussia, the integration of uniforms was carried out.

I want to illustrate the nationalist movement as another background for the success of uniform reform. At that time in Imperial Germany, there were a number of nationalist movements. The Association of German Warships (Deutscher Flottenverein) advocated the expansion of German marine power to oppose the UK. Many German people supposed that

old England would interfere with the developing of young Germany. Also, the Association of Veterans (Kriegerverein) became Kyffhäuserbund during the movement to build a statue of the first German Kaiser, Wilhelm I. After his death, this movement took root all over Germany, including Bavaria. The Bavarian people agreed with the project to make a statue of Wilhelm I as the first German Emperor. It reveals that the German people as a whole finally came to accept their new country, the German Reich.

Lastly, Kaiser Wilhelm Ⅱ loved the title of Emperor of the German Reich more strongly than the title of King of Prussia. On the other hand, his grandfather, Wilhelm I, did not like his position as German Kaiser. He always wanted to be the king of his country, Prussia. This generation gap represents a changing mentality of the German people. In 1870, the German identity was not developed, but by the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, such an identity had become normalized.

National identity became stronger and stronger through the antipathy to the UK and some nationalistic movements, and at that time new uniforms with rational styles were introduced all over the world. The German army's new uniform, introduced from 1907 to 1910, had the symbolic meaning that the German nation was united. This uniform did not have various colors, but only one—field gray. This represented that the army in this uniform belonged only to the German nation.

THE PAPER READ AT THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE DEPARTMENT (30 JULY 2018)

Bobrzyński's Idea of a Nation: Between Rzeczpospolita and the Habsburg Monarchy

Masafumi Kudo

Poland was divided into three parts by Prussia, Russia, and Austria in the last third of the eighteenth century. A divided Poland gained independence from these three empires in 1918, after the end of the First World War. This independent Polish state was, however, not at all similar to pre-partitioned Poland. It was, instead, a Polish national state. Under imperial rule, Polish nationalism was characterized as resistance to the empires that divided and ruled Poland. In other words, Polish nationalism has been described as the events leading up to Poland's "rebirth" after the First World War.

Galicia, however, a portion of partitioned Poland ruled by Austria, has not figured in any discussion about the period of partition. The reason is that Galician Poles submitted to rule from Vienna. No resistance occurred there during the latter half of the nineteenth century, the period that Polish radical nationalists opposed German or Russian rule. In the context of Polish history, the period of Partition has been seen as the period when the Polish nation was created. For that reason Galicia's experience was not considered to be a part of the Polish nation's historiography.

Galician Poles, however, especially the elites, made efforts to maintain an idea of the Polish nation under Austrian rule. In this situation, the independence of the Polish state was not an essential condition for the idea of the Polish nation to survive. If we acknowledge this situation under partition as the creation of the Polish nation, how could Galician Poles legitimize this Polish nation which had no independent state? I will discuss Michał Bobrzyński, a Galician statesman, who played a leading role in shaping the idea of Polish nation in Galicia, in order to examine this question. My guess is that there was something in Galicia that made Galician Poles content to stay within the Habsburg Monarchy.

Bobrzyński has been discussed in the context of relations between Vienna and Galicia but not in the larger context of Polish history. He has been an overlooked leader (or maker) of the Polish national idea in this period because of his loyalty to Franz Josef, Austria's Emperor. I try to reinterpret him in the context of the Polish national movement and to show an alternative form of nationalism through Bobrzyński and Galicia.

Bobrzyński was born in 1849 in Cracow. His father was not a descendant of the szlachta (the traditional Polish ruling class), but a physician. In Galicia, the szlachta exercised influence on society or community at large. However, his family was well known in that city. He entered the Faculty of Law of Jagiellonian University, Poland's oldest institute of higher education and one of the oldest in Europe. Entering the University in 1867, he obtained his doctor's degree in 1872. He then studied German law in Strasbourg for five years.

In 1877, he became an associate professor at Jagiellonian University. Two years later he was promoted to professor and published his most influential book, *Polish History in outline* (pl: *Dzieje Polski w zarysie*). This book represented the claim of the Cracow School which attributed the cause of the country's division to Poles themselves. In this book, he attacked the Romantic nationalism that caused the revolts against the portioning empires.

My presentation is based on a part of *Polish History in outline*, titled "Short study about state and society." In this short chapter, as the title indicates, Bobrzyński analyzed both state and society, and also discussed the concept of nation. This article clearly demonstrates his idea of the nation.

In order to think about this problem, I focus on another, but closely related issue about the nation as envisioned by Bobrzyński. Among Polish nationalists in Russian Poland, for example, Roman Dmowski conceived of the nation as a horizontal order. The basis for that conception was the belief that the Polish state had destroyed itself due to the political weakness of the peasants. In Poland before the Partition, the szlachta strongly influenced Poland's politics and society by electing Poland's kings, being representatives in the Sejm (the national diet), possessing land holdings, and so on. Thus, the Polish state before the Partition is often called the "republic of the szlachta." Polish nationalists argued that the invasion and the division of Poland by three empires were caused by the szlachta's political paralysis. Thus, Polish nationalists at the end of nineteenth century tried to establish the nation to include peasants in order to overcome the effects of the Partition and to create the independent state of Poland. Now, we should

remind ourselves of the phrase written by Benedict Anderson, one of the most outstanding theorists of nationalism. In his brilliant book, *Imagined Communities*, he said, "…the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship."

Bobrzyński, on the other hand, did not oppose the existence of aristocrats and monarchs. In his "Short study about state and society," he stated that either monarchy or aristocracy was acceptable as well as democracy. Anderson has also said that the nation was imagined as sovereign. That statement, however, would conflict with Bobrzyński's idea. What is more important, Bobrzyński thought of the nation as a community made by the state. Thus, the state precedes the nation and the form of the state would have to influence the form that the nation assumes.

In the latter half of the nineteenth century, "an age in which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying the legitimacy of the divinely-ordained, hierarchal dynastic realm," as Anderson said, why did Bobrzyński invent such an idea of the nation?

Bobrzyński also said that the people who live in the state are its citizens. He thought it was not only the right but also the duty for citizens to participate in government to work for a better state. Citizens could petition the government to act for the benefit of everyone in common. In other words, any government, including a monarchy or one ruled by an aristocracy, was responsible for governing its people (or citizens) not for personal interest, but for the common good.

When we approach the subject of Bobrzyński's nation, we should consider the Habsburg Monarchy's governing system. The Habsburg Monarchy comprised many crown lands. Each crown land maintained its own political system. What is more, these crown lands were not uniformly governed under the Austrian Empire's legal system. Each land had a separate contract with the Austrian Emperor. Even though it was not completely autonomous, every crown land could generally keep its own governing systems and culture, including language. Earlier, the Austrian Emperor had tried to centralize power and to rule solely as a German state, forcing all parts of the Monarchy to use German. That experiment failed. As a result, in 1867, Franz Josef, Austrian Emperor, reconfirmed Hungary's autonomy. In the Monarchy's Austrian portion, the Emperor guaranteed all ethnic groups' rights in the crown lands which included the right to use their mother tongue. In Galicia, because of the commitment of Galician Poles within the Austrian government, they not only received their cultural rights but political freedom as well, in other words, autonomy. Additionally social classes that had existed before the Partition remained, despite the emancipation of the serfs in 1848. In Galicia, the szlachte exercised influence on society or community at large.

As I mentioned above, the Habsburg Monarchy was divided into two parts in 1867, Hungary and the rest, often called Austria. The Austrian portion, the Austrian Empire, had an Imperial Council called the Reichsrat. Its representatives were elected from every crown land. This Austrian portion was formally called "the Kingdoms and Lands Represented in the Imperial Council." This Imperial Council was a bicameral body. The upper house was

the House of Lords; the lower house was the House of Deputies. Franz Josef tried to obtain agreements between the Emperor and the individual crown lands by this council system.

I now return to the subject of Bobrzyński's Polish nation. I have no definitive answer, but I wish to offer an interpretation. I think that these governing systems of the Habsburg Monarchy are similar to what existed in Poland before the Partition, that is, Rzeczpospolita. Although I have briefly mentioned it earlier, I need to explain it in more detail.

To be honest, Poland before the Partition was not a single state but a union composed of individual states. Poland before the Partition was mainly composed of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. These states were collectively called Rzeczpospolita, meaning "republic." Although it was called a "republic", a king reigned. This king, however, was elected by the szlachta. In the Rzeczpospolita, there were no differences in rights and privileges between szlachtas, including the king's election, regardless of property or origin. In terms of political rights and privileges, each szlachta was equal.

That situation was, however, destroyed because of the Partition. In Prussian and Russian Poland, those empires severely Germanized and Russianized Poles, especially after the 1863 revolt in Russian Poland. On the other hand, Galicia received autonomy in 1867. This autonomy under the Habsburg government enabled Galician Poles to imagine and recreate Poland as it existed before the Partition. They could do this because the Habsburg's system of governance was compatible with that of the former Rzeczpospolita. And as mentioned above, the Habsburgs enabled crown lands to retain their former social structure so that the szlachtas could continue to be landowners and exert influence politically and economically. In that sense, Rzeczpospolita did not exist in any part of partitioned Poland other than in Galicia.

This idea of Bobrzyński's raises some problems in the area of nationalism studies. Generally understood, the nation was built in the modern era and based on the ideas that appeared in the turn of the nineteenth century. Bobrzyński's idea, however, was based on a pre-modern form of states. This vision was made possible by the Habsburg Monarchy's pre-modern system. But, as we all know, the Habsburg Monarchy collapsed and the Poles established their own state, the Republic of Poland, in 1918.