

UCLA

UCLA Historical Journal

Title

Economics Foundations of British Overseas Expansion 1816-1914. By P. J. CAIN. London: Macmillan, 1980. Pp. 85. Bibliography, index. \$5.25 (paper).

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4hf1x5jh>

Journal

UCLA Historical Journal, 3(0)

Author

Long, Roger D.

Publication Date

1982

Copyright Information

Copyright 1982 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

Peer reviewed

the British position must be upheld against growing foreign threats. In the belief that open conflict with the Boers was inevitable, Milner did his best to shape public and official opinion. Porter details Milner's approach to public opinion thus contrasting it with Chamberlain's methods and goals.

While the author successfully builds a case for Chamberlain's education campaign, it was only one significant factor in the coming of war. This study shows that Chamberlain's handling of colonial affairs in South Africa contributed to the deterioration of Anglo-Boer relations by confusing the real issues. Yet Porter's suggestion that without the educational campaign the situation could have been resolved in a peaceful settlement ignores the overall situation. The clash of British economic and strategic interests with expanding Boer nationalism was the formula for war. Porter's study is nonetheless well written and documented, and it opens a new path of inquiry. Valuable insights into the role of Chamberlain serve to enlighten the reader on the impact of democratic politics on the policy making process.

Van M. Leslie
University of Kentucky

Economic Foundations of British Overseas Expansion 1815-1914. By P. J. CAIN. London: Macmillan, 1980. Pp. 85. Bibliography, index. \$5.25 (paper).

As one of a series in the "Studies in Economic and Social History," P. J. Cain has written an excellent introduction to the motives for Britain's imperial expansion, both in the formal and in the "informal empire." His work is a critical essay on three general and some two hundred specialized books and articles dealing with all aspects of British expansion overseas. Divided into two parts, Cain's book deals first with 1815-1875 preceded by an analysis of the background to that period. It then covers the "scramble for Africa," the expansion of the formal empire, and ends with the events leading to World War I.

John Gallagher and Ronald E. Robinson on the one hand, and later, Desmond C. M. Platt on the other, have, in our era, reproduced the eighteenth century argument between the radical anti-imperialists and free trade imperialists. Writing when an anti-imperialist view of the nineteenth century was prevalent, Gallagher and Robinson asserted that it was insufficient to look at Britain's formal colonies alone; the "informal empire" of economic, political, and cultural influence was far more important. After 1815 Britain's main interest was in extending sufficiently her informal control in order to integrate as many areas of the world as possible into its expanding economy. The British replaced the eighteenth century urge for political possessions with the desire for informal control. They then modified this theory to state that control was extended beyond the area of economic development to include those areas of the world which were

vital for strategic protection. In sum, their theory was "trade with informal control if possible, trade with rule when necessary." Robinson later argued that those parts of the world which had political independence, such as Latin America, were most dominated by Britain.

In his critique of Gallagher and Robinson, Platt reaffirms that overseas expansion was not in favor in the early nineteenth century. But he believes the main concern of government was in negotiating "open door" or most favored nation treaties and then rectifying treaty violators, rather than in defending bondholders or other traders. Platt argues further that the lack of interest in informal control was a reflection of the lack of any real stimulus to economic expansion overseas. Britain was, throughout most of the nineteenth century, self-sufficient agriculturally, and the emphasis between 1800 and 1850 was on the growth of domestic investment and the home market. The traditional markets in Europe, America, and the formal empire provided all foreign supplies and outlets. Boundaries continued to expand not because of the British government but, as John S. Galbraith has argued, because the instability of the "turbulent frontier" caused the "man on the spot" to take action in order to maintain peace. The frontier was consequently pushed back--a fact which Westminster, in the days of slow communication, usually had to accept when it finally found out.

Cain believes that Gallagher and Robinson were rightly criticized for assuming a free trade policy in Britain by 1815. Free trade was not generally accepted before the 1840s. He asserts, however, that Platt was right about a self-sufficient Britain but "does not appreciate the extent to which this traditional system began to break down in the aftermath of the Napoleonic Wars" (p. 17). In the white settled colonies after 1850, Britain "swapped a system of close economic control, which became increasingly inconvenient, for an informal relationship in which economic control was maintained through cultural imperialism" (p. 24). In India, the East India Company's monopoly of trade with Britain was abolished in 1813, but by the 1840s pressure was being exerted to bring India into a closer economic relationship with Britain.

It is in the "informal empire" in Latin America that a good deal of controversy surrounds the nature of Britain's relationships with local states. "Did the British try to gain hegemony through free trade or did they simply bargain with others for entry into the market on a basis of equality, scrupulously refusing to use their power to influence these smaller and weaker powers as Platt has argued?" (p. 27). Graham argues that cultural imperialism, particularly in Brazil and Argentina, turned out to be more efficacious in the long run anyway.

From 1875 on, there was a revived interest in closer economic unity with the empire, especially in the white settled areas, and agitation for the incorporation of large areas of Africa and Asia into the formal empire. Exports to the empire as well as the growth of the income from services such as shipping and overseas loans greatly offset Britain's declining competitiveness abroad, and the export of capital grew enormously. This export of capital and the very rapid growth in the empire in Africa and Asia led contemporaries,

such as John A. Hobson and later, Rosa Luxemburg and V. I. Lenin, to suggest a link between the two which Gallagher and Robinson have denied. For them formal control was first, a means of preserving free trade and second, a way to ensure stability where informal control had broken down. While Platt has attacked this view and argued that Britain had a policy of anticipatory annexation as traders were afraid of the protectionist policies of other nations, Cain believes that the spread of industrialization in Europe, especially after 1870, was not taken into account by Gallagher and Robinson in Afro-Asian expansion. Also, their view of the continuity of British policy throughout the century does not consider sufficiently the extent to which metropolitan policies could influence both formal and informal conditions and policies in the empire.

Cain nonetheless supports Platt's view that an increasing need for overseas markets as well as the ramifications of a rapidly expanding export of capital led to imperial acquisition in the latter part of the century, but Hobson and his successors did not appreciate sufficiently the industrial motives for expansion and the extent to which government used financiers rather than the reverse. The evidence for the whole period from 1815 to 1914, Cain believes, suggests that economic motives were always important in British considerations for expansion.

Cain claims there is an obvious need for a closer investigation of links between eighteenth and nineteenth century imperialism, and more study of the effects of British penetration of the economies under British domination. He also suggests that studies should be made of the relationship between Britain and less "backward" states. S. Sideri, for example, has shown that Portugal was as much dominated by Britain as many African or Asian territories.

Cain's recommendations are sound. His book is basic to any study of the above ideas or any other examination of British imperialism and as such should be on everyone's bookshelf whether as a basic guide or as an aid in original research.

Roger D. Long
University of California, Los Angeles