



colloquium-journal

ISSN 2520-6990

Międzynarodowe czasopismo naukowe

**Jurisprudence
Economic sciences
Historical sciences**

**№33(85) 2020
Część 3**



colloquium-journal

ISSN 2520-6990

ISSN 2520-2480

Colloquium-journal №33 (85), 2020

Część 3

(Warszawa, Polska)

Redaktor naczelny - **Paweł Nowak**
Ewa Kowalczyk

Rada naukowa

- **Dorota Dobija** - profesor i rachunkowości i zarządzania na uniwersytecie Koźmińskiego
- **Jemielniak Dariusz** - profesor dyrektor centrum naukowo-badawczego w zakresie organizacji i miejsc pracy, kierownik katedry zarządzania Międzynarodowego w Ku.
- **Mateusz Jabłoński** - politechnika Krakowska im. Tadeusza Kościuszki.
- **Henryka Danuta Stryczewska** – profesor, dziekan wydziału elektrotechniki i informatyki Politechniki Lubelskiej.
- **Bulakh Iryna Valerievna** - profesor nadzwyczajny w katedrze projektowania środowiska architektonicznego, Kijowski narodowy Uniwersytet budownictwa i architektury.
- **Leontiev Rudolf Georgievich** - doktor nauk ekonomicznych, profesor wyższej komisji atestacyjnej, główny naukowiec federalnego centrum badawczego chabarowska, dalekowschodni oddział rosyjskiej akademii nauk
- **Serebrennikova Anna Valerievna** - doktor prawa, profesor wydziału prawa karnego i kryminologii uniwersytetu Moskiewskiego M.V. Lomonosova, Rosja
- **Skopa Vitaliy Aleksandrovich** - doktor nauk historycznych, kierownik katedry filozofii i kulturoznawstwa
- **Pogrebnaya Yana Vsevolodovna** - doktor filologii, profesor nadzwyczajny, stawropolski państwowy Instytut pedagogiczny
- **Fanil Timeryanowicz Kuzbekov** - kandydat nauk historycznych, doktor nauk filologicznych. profesor, wydział Dziennikarstwa, Bashgosuniversitet
- **Kanivets Alexander Vasilievich** - kandydat nauk technicznych, docent wydziału dyscypliny inżynierii ogólnej wydziału inżynierii i technologii państwowej akademii rolniczej w Połtawie
- **Yavorska-Vitkovska Monika** - doktor edukacji, szkoła Kuyavsky-Pomorsk w bidgoszczu, dziekan nauk o filozofii i biologii; doktor edukacji, profesor
- **Chernyak Lev Pavlovich** - doktor nauk technicznych, profesor, katedra technologii chemicznej materiałów kompozytowych narodowy uniwersytet techniczny Ukrainy „Politechnika w Kijowie”
- **Vorona-Slivinskaya Lyubov Grigoryevna** - doktor nauk ekonomicznych, profesor, St. Petersburg University of Management Technologia i ekonomia
- **Voskresenskaya Elena Vladimirovna** doktor prawa, kierownik Katedry Prawa Cywilnego i Ochrony Własności Intelektualnej w dziedzinie techniki, Politechnika im. Piotra Wielkiego w Sankt Petersburgu
- **Tengiz Magradze** - doktor filozofii w dziedzinie energetyki i elektrotechniki, Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Gruzja
- **Usta-Azizova Dilnoza Ahrarovna** - kandydat nauk pedagogicznych, profesor nadzwyczajny, Tashkent Pediatric Medical Institute, Uzbekistan

    SlideShare



INDEX COPERNICUS
INTERNATIONAL

НАУЧНАЯ ЭЛЕКТРОННАЯ
БИБЛИОТЕКА
LIBRARY.RU

«Colloquium-journal»

Wydrukowano w «Chocimska 24, 00-001 Warszawa, Poland»

E-mail: info@colloquium-journal.org

<http://www.colloquium-journal.org/>

CONTENTS

HISTORICAL SCIENCES

Bohatchuk S. HISTORY OF UKRAINE IN THE WORKS OF M. MAKSYMOVYCH	4
Гибадуллин Р.М., Гибадуллина Н.М.-Н. ФИННО-УГОРСКИЙ ФАКТОР ЭТНОГЕНЕЗА КРЯШЕН КАК НАУЧНАЯ И ИДЕОЛОГИЧЕСКАЯ ПРОБЛЕМА	8
Gibadullin R.M., Gibadullina N. M.-N. THE FINNO-UGRIC FACTOR OF ETHNOGENESIS OF KRYASHENS	8
Levchuk K.I. ESTABLISHMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF ECOLOGICAL ORGANIZATIONS OF UKRAINE (1985-2000)	12
Pikovska T.V. THE STRUGGLE OF EUROPEANS FOR THE COLONIZATION OF AFRICA	18

JURISPRUDENCE

Михновец Ю.И. ПРОБЛЕМЫ ИНОСТРАНЦЕВ ПРИ ТРУДОУСТРОЙСТВЕ НА ТЕРРИТОРИИ РЕСПУБЛИКИ БЕЛАРУСЬ, ТРУДОВАЯ МИГРАЦИЯ НАСЕЛЕНИЯ	26
Mihnovets Y.I. PROBLEMS OF EMPLOYMENT OF FOREIGNERS ON THE TERRITORY OF THE REPUBLIC OF BELARUS, LABOR MIGRATION	26
Сизова О.С. СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ МЕХАНИЗМЫ ПРОТИВОДЕЙСТВИЯ КОРРУПЦИИ В РОССИИ	28
Sizova O.S. MODERN MECHANISMS OF RESISTANCE CORRUPTION IN RUSSIA	28
Печень Є.В. АКТУАЛЬНЕ ПИТАННЯ ІСНУВАННЯ МОНАРХІЇ НА СУЧАСНОМУ ЕТАПІ РОЗВИТКУ ЛЮДСТВА: ТЕОРЕТИЧНИЙ АСПЕКТ	30
Pechen Y. CURRENT ISSUE OF THE EXISTENCE OF THE MONARCHY AT THE CURRENT STAGE OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT: THEORETICAL ASPECT	30
Поліщук М.Г. МИРОВА УГОДА В ЦИВІЛЬНОМУ СУДОЧИНСТВІ: ПРАВОВА ПРИРОДА, ПЕРЕВАГИ ТА ПРОБЛЕМИ ЗАСТОСУВАННЯ	32
Polishchuk M.G. AGREEMENT IN CIVIL JUDICIARY: LEGAL NATURE, BENEFITS AND APPLICATION PROBLEMS	32
Сорокин М.А., Курушина Д.С. МЕЖДУНАРОДНО-ПРАВОВОЕ РЕГУЛИРОВАНИЕ В ОБЛАСТИ ИСПОЛЬЗОВАНИЯ КОСМИЧЕСКОГО ПРОСТРАНСТВА В МИРНЫХ ЦЕЛЯХ	35
Sorokin M.A., Kurushina D.S. INTERNATIONAL LEGAL REGULATION IN THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE	35

ECONOMIC SCIENCES

Ivakhnenko A.V. FORECASTING THE DEVELOPMENT OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INNOVATIONS AT INDUSTRIAL ENTERPRISES OF UKRAINE	37
Ваніна Н.М., Плотнікова Л.І. АГРОКЛАСТЕР ЯК ОРГАНІЗАЦІЙНО - ТЕХНОЛОГІЧНИЙ МЕХАНІЗМ УПРАВЛІННЯ ПІДПРИЄМСТВОМ АПК	41
Vanina N.M., Plotnikova L.I. AGROCLUSTER AS AN ORGANIZATIONAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL MECHANISM OF AGRICULTURAL ENTERPRISE MANAGEMENT	41

Гайсумов А.С. КОНКУРЕНЦИЯ И ОСОБЕННОСТИ ЕЕ ПРОЯВЛЕНИЯ В РОССИЙСКОЙ ЭКОНОМИКЕ	47
Gaisumov A.S. COMPETITION AND FEATURES OF ITS MANIFESTATIONS IN THE RUSSIAN ECONOMY	47
Бабич Г.Р., Махова А.В. ОБЗОР ДИНАМИКИ ВНЕШНЕЙ ТОРГОВЛИ РОССИИ И ВЕНЕСУЭЛЫ ЗА 2010-2019 ГГ.....	49
Babich G.R., Makhova A.V. REVIEW OF THE DYNAMICS OF FOREIGN TRADE BETWEEN RUSSIA AND VENEZUELA FOR 2010-2019.....	49
Бабич Г.Р., Махова А.В. АНАЛИЗ ТОВАРООБОРОТА РОССИИ И ВЕНГРИИ ЗА 2014-2019 ГГ.	51
Babich G.R., Makhova A.V. ANALYSIS OF TRADE TURNOVER BETWEEN RUSSIA AND HUNGARY FOR 2014-2019	51
Ільків Л.А., Горяк А.В. СУЧАСНІ ТЕНДЕНЦІЇ ВИРОБНИЦТВА ЗЕРНОВИХ КУЛЬТУР В УКРАЇНІ.....	53
Ilkiv L.A., Goryak A.V. CURRENT TRENDS IN GRAIN PRODUCTION IN UKRAINE.....	53
Михайлушкин П.В., Козырев Р.К. СОВЕРШЕНСТВОВАНИЕ ОРГАНИЗАЦИОННО-ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКОГО МЕХАНИЗМА ИНВЕСТИЦИОННОЙ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ В ОТРАСЛИ САДОВОДСТВА КРАСНОДАРСКОГО КРАЯ.....	56
Mikhailushkin P. V., Kozyrev R. K. IMPROVEMENT OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL AND ECONOMIC MECHANISM OF INVESTMENT ACTIVITY IN THE HORTICULTURE INDUSTRY OF THE KRASNODAR TERRITORY	56
Ротарь Т.С. СТАТИСТИЧЕСКАЯ ОЦЕНКА ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОГО ФИНАНСИРОВАНИЯ МЕР СОЦИАЛЬНОЙ ПОДДЕРЖКИ СЕМЕЙ С ДЕТЬМИ В РЕСПУБЛИКЕ САХА (ЯКУТИЯ).....	60
Rotar T.S. STATISTICAL ASSESSMENT OF STATE FINANCING OF SOCIAL SUPPORT MEASURES FOR FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN IN THE REPUBLIC OF SAKHA (YAKUTIA)	60
Симоненко Е. И. ПОСТРОЕНИЕ ПРОГНОСТИЧЕСКИХ МОДЕЛЕЙ РАЗВИТИЯ ПРЕДПРИЯТИЙ АГРОБИЗНЕСА	63
Simonenko E. I. CONSTRUCTION OF PROGNOSTIC MODELS OF DEVELOPMENT OF AGROBUSINESS ENTERPRISES	63
Кривошея А. Ю., Чухліб А. В. СТАТИСТИЧНИЙ АНАЛІЗ УРОЖАЙНОСТІ ЗЕРНОВИХ І ЗЕРНОБОБОВИХ КУЛЬТУР В УКРАЇНІ.....	66
Krivosheya A. Y., Chukhlib A. V. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF YIELD OF GRAIN AND LEGUMIN CROPS IN UKRAINE	66
Аюшеева А.А. МЕТОД УСЛОВНЫХ НАЧИСЛЕНИЙ В РОССИЙСКОМ БУХГАЛТЕРСКОМ УЧЕТЕ В ЦЕЛЯХ СБЛИЖЕНИЯ ОТЧЕТНОСТИ ПО МСФО И РОССИЙСКИМ СТАНДАРТАМ.	69
Ayusheeva A.A. ACCRUALS METHOD IN RUSSIAN ACCOUNTING FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONVERGENCE OF IFRS AND RAS.....	69

mizhnarodnym, vseukrainskym ta mistsevym statusom (vkluchaiuchy mistsevi osередky). – 44 s.

18. Dzerkalo tyzhnia. – 2001. – № 6, 10 liutoho.

19. Derzhavnyi arkhiv Lvivskoi oblasti, F. P-3, Op.62, Spr.755. – Informatsii i lysty TsK KPRS i TsK KPU pro stavlennia riznykh katehorii trudiashchykh do Komunistychnoi partii, pro suspilno-politychnu obstanovku, pidhotovku novoho Soiuznogo dohovoru, Ustanovchyi zizd tovarystva «Znannia» Ukrainy, Ustanovchyi zizd partii demokratychnoho vidrodzhenia Ukrainy ta in. (14. 02. – 7. 12. 1990 r.). – 153 ark.

20. Prohramma «Semena demokratyy» – Kyiv, – 1996. – 13 s.

21. Puteshestvye vdol horizonta. – Kyiv, 1998. – 123 s.

22. Ekopravo. (Istoriia. Proekty. Spravy.). – Lviv., 1999. – S.6-12.

23. Uriadovyi kurier. – 1999. – 25 lystopada.

24. Ynformatsyonnii biulleten YSAR “Jednania”. – ISAR-KYEV. – 1999. – №48. – 21 s.

25. Potochnyi arkhiv Mizhnarodnoi Fundatsii Vyborchykh System (IFES). – Kyiv. – Opytuvannia hromadskoi dumky v Ukraini. 1999. – 122 s.

УДК 94(437+437.6)

Pikovska T.V.

*senior lecturer at the Department of Law,
Faculty of Management and Law
(Ukraine, Vinnytsia, Vinnytsia National
Agricultural University, Faculty
Management and Law, st. Solar 3)*

THE STRUGGLE OF EUROPEANS FOR THE COLONIZATION OF AFRICA

Abstract.

The article is devoted to the peculiarities of the European conquest of African territories. It is noted that in the beginning Africa was of interest to Europeans as a source of slavery. In fact, the colonial division of the world in the nineteenth century. First of all, the division of Africa.

Keywords: *colonialism, Africa, European countries, economic development.*

The essence, nature and direction of the processes of colonial transformation

African societies invariably attract the attention of scholars. Their study is constantly accompanied by an analysis of the development of African countries in the postcolonial era, which provides a clearer idea of the nature of the changes that took place during colonialism.

The aim of the article is to elucidate the peculiarities of the conquest of African territories by European colonizers, to study the mutual influence of European and African peoples on each other's cultural and socio-economic development.

Traditionally, approaches to the study of this issue, both in Soviet and Western historiography, have been characterized by Eurocentrism, a secondary attitude to the peculiarities of African societies [1,2,3,4,5,6]. The emphasis was on studying the activities of the European colonial administration and its implications for Africans. Thus, the active role was recognized only by one of the parties. Modern scientists, Vinogradov K. [7], Kobishchanov Yu., [8] Krylov A. [9], Nikin M. [10], believe that the colonial version of intercivilizational interaction is a typical example of interaction of different levels of society: African civilization was more lower level of development than European.

The search for a way to India began with the colonial conquest of Africa. Parking lots, which were built along this long road on African soil, eventually became strongholds of independent significance, ie starting points for the development of colonial trade, especially the slave trade in tropical Africa.

At the initial stage, in the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, the colonizers did not seek to penetrate deep into the continent. It was much easier to set up in coastal factors primitive exchange trade and thus create economic incentives to involve Africans, especially from among the social elite - elders, leaders, in this system of trade relations. However, in the XIX century. the situation began to change. Trade colonialism was transformed into industrial colonization, and the Portuguese and other slave traders were replaced by European capitalists interested in selling industrial goods and exploiting Africa's natural resources.

The nineteenth century, and especially the last third, were in the history of Africa a period of active colonial conquests, as well as a period of fierce rivalry between the great powers, especially England and France [3, p.56].

Colonial conquests took place in several directions, always from the coast to the depths of the continent. One of the directions was the movement from the west coast to the central areas of the northern savannah, where the leader was France. Another that crossed it was the movement of the British, who conquered the territory of southern Africa, to the north. The third direction was the development of Arabic and Arabic-speaking Africa, ie the territory from Mauritania and Morocco to Somalia and Zanzibar.

At the initial stage of colonialism, Africa was of interest to Europeans primarily as a source of the slave trade. At the time of the discovery of the Atlantic by the Portuguese and Spaniards, a developed slave trade existed in the Mediterranean. However, the Western Mediterranean was soon cut off from slave supplies in the

Eastern Mediterranean and around the Black Sea due to the Turkish conquest of Constantinople in 1453 and their subsequent blockade of routes to the East. At that time, Portuguese slave hunting had already begun along the west coast of Africa. The Dutch, French and British simply followed the Portuguese pioneers [10, p.68].

The question arises as to why Africa became the main center of the slave trade, because after the discovery of America, Europeans had the opportunity to deploy intensive exploitation of Native Americans.

The reason for giving African slaves an advantage over Native Americans was to believe that Africans were better and more reliable workers. By the 1720s, Africans were more expensive than Indians. However, the main factor in this priority was the relatively close location of Indian slaves from their tribal groups, which encouraged disobedience and flight. The British colonists also feared that Indian slavery would deprive them of their alliance with the Native Americans in the wars against the Spaniards and the French. In addition, Native Americans could be recruited to capture African runaway slaves and return them to their owners [5, p.95].

Before the advent of Europeans, there were three mechanisms for transforming a free man into a potential slave: pledge - payment of debts by giving one person in possession of another for work, litigation, capture during the war. All three mechanisms were used to conduct the slave trade. African societies began to specialize in the supply of slaves.

During the initial period of Portuguese dominance in trade in the fifteenth century, the slaves came mainly from a region south of the Senegal River in Sierra Leone, an area easily accessible from Cape Verde Islands, which the Portuguese called Cape Guinea. In the sixteenth century, Senegambia remained the main area of supply for a large number of slaves captured during the wars that accompanied the collapse of the state of Jolof [10, p.68].

In the eighteenth century, Senegambia and Sierra Leone have receded into the background, while West Africa has become a major source of supply. It was from here that 60% of the slaves exported by Portuguese, English and French traders were exported. In particular, the main supplier of slaves here was Benin - the only country in West Africa, which at that time was outside European control.

Although the British decision to abolish the slave trade in 1807 halted the flow of slaves to the British Caribbean and significantly reduced imports to the United States, more than 600,000 people were sent to the Spanish dominions of the New World in the nineteenth century. During this period, a significant number of slaves were supplied from Mozambique.

European trade expansion has drawn Africa into global processes. The demand for African slaves changed the political and economic situation of the entire continent. He gave a joint start to the new dependent states and specialized organizations of slave hunters. With the entry into the arena of the colonial struggle of England and France, these states begin territorial conquests on the African continent.

At the end of the eighteenth century, the French attempted to conquer Egypt. The Egyptian expedition, the colonial nature of which Napoleon himself did not consider it necessary to hide, was prepared in strict secrecy, which was explained not only by military-strategic reasons. The preconditions for these events were quite complex [1, p.55].

After brilliant victories in the Italian campaign of 1796-1797, Napoleon's popularity grew. In these circumstances, the Directory, which at that time ruled the country, entrusted him with an expedition to Egypt. This idea also interested Napoleon, because according to contemporaries, he dreamed of conquering India, where he planned to go after the capture of Egypt through Constantinople, which he was going to make the center of his empire. In May 1798, the French squadron left Toulon.

The French, unexpectedly for them, met with strong resistance in Alexandria. On July 21, 1798, a battle between the French and Mamluk troops took place near the village of Embaba, in which the French won. It was called the "Battle of the Pyramids". On July 24, the French entered the capital of Egypt. Given that formally the ruler of Egypt was a representative of Porta - vali, and real power was concentrated in the hands of the Mamluk beys, who fought among themselves, Napoleon tried to oppose the Mamluks and Porta and the Egyptian people. Such a policy required overcoming the cultural and religious barrier that separated the Egyptians and the French [1, p.56].

In August 1798, Napoleon signed a decree establishing the Egyptian Institute in Cairo, which was to study Egypt, as well as to strengthen education among the population. 165 scientists went to Egypt with Bonaparte, representatives of various branches of science on which this task was assigned.

On the recommendation of the Egyptian Institute, an attempt was made to introduce the basics of administrative and municipal service in the country. Egypt was divided into provinces, headed by administrative bodies - "sofas" - of influential sheikhs. The streets of Cairo began to be cleaned regularly, and city lighting was established [1, p.57].

Bonaparte paid special attention to establishing relations with influential Muslim clergy. He demanded from the sheikhs of al-Azhar a fatwa, which would approve the establishment of French control over Egypt. The sheikhs said that to obtain a fatwa, the French must convert to Islam. Napoleon replied that he did not mind. In Europe he is a Christian, in Egypt - a Muslim. But the French did not want to perform the rite of circumcision and adopt a "dry law". As a result, the question of their conversion to Islam disappeared by itself.

Egyptians were irritated by the behavior and customs of the French: the attitude towards women, the habit of openly showing their feelings, constant drinking. On October 21, 1798, an anti-French uprising broke out in Cairo, and Napoleon had to abandon all his forces to suppress it. After these events, Napoleon realized the impossibility of his plans in Egypt. In August 1799 he secretly left Egypt. The French army was withdrawn from Egypt only in 1801 [1, p.57].

After the Napoleonic Wars, France had to create its colonial system from scratch. The first French colony was Algeria in North Africa, conquered in 1830. After the transformation of Algeria into a colony, the Europeans launched an offensive against the rest of the Maghreb countries, which still retained their independence. In particular, French incursions into Tunisia intensified, but British opposition forced France to temporarily abandon attempts to seize the country. In 1837, France, England, and Italy provided credit to the Tunisian bey, and in 1869 the bey was forced to transfer public finances under the control of an international commission. Tunisia has become a dependent country. France had the predominant influence here.

In 1859, during the suppression of the uprising of one of the border tribes of Algeria, French troops invaded Moroccan territory. At the same time, Morocco was attacked by Spanish troops. The Sultan was forced to pay a large contribution to the Spaniards. In order to pay the sultan's contribution, he had to conclude an agreement on an unprofitable loan with England. Morocco became a semi-colony of several states [1, p.61].

In the first half of the XIX century, in tropical Africa, a small part of the territory was under European control. Relying on the previously captured points on the Gold Coast, England launched an offensive on Ashanti. In 1831, the state of Ashanti relinquished control of the coast, and Britain confirmed its independence.

On the west coast, the British captured Sierra Leone and expanded their possessions in the Gambia. By the middle of the XIX century, the British launched active operations in the Niger Delta. British warships were sent several times to the island of Lagos, which held key positions there. In 1852, the British succeeded in imposing a protectorate on Lagos. However, due to the resistance of the population, Lagos became a colony only in 1861 [7, p.172].

France tried to capture Senegal, but met resistance from the Wolof people and in 1871 was forced to make peace and recognize its independence. Portuguese possessions in Angola included the coastal areas from the mouth of the Congo to Cape Capo Negro. In Mozambique, Portuguese control was limited to the coastal strip. In South Africa, the basis of the colonial system was the Cape Colony. During the Napoleonic Wars, the Cape Colony passed to the British.

The deterioration of the situation in the metropolis caused an increase in emigration to South Africa, much of which was inhabited by Boers - the descendants of Dutch settlers. If in 1815 only 46 people moved from England to the Cape colony, in 1816 - 85, then in 1817 there were already 419 emigrants [7, p.172].

After the establishment of British rule in the Cape Colony, there were constant conflicts between the new administration and the Boers. In 1833, when the British abolished slavery, the Boers decided to leave the colony. They went north. Fighting with African tribes and displacing them from fertile lands, they reached the year of Orange and Baal. Here the storm in the middle of the XIX century, created their own independent republics - Transvaal and Orange [4, p.58].

Although in the first half of the nineteenth century, Europeans carried out a number of territorial conquests, the main events that formed the colonial system in Africa took place in the last third of the nineteenth century. In the last third of the nineteenth century, increased activity of colonizers in southern Africa. This was facilitated by the discovery of diamond and gold deposits, which caused the "diamond fever" of the 1870s and the "gold rush" of the 1880s.

In 1880, the British were forced to recognize the independence of the Boer republics. After gaining independence, the Transvaal storms invaded the territory of the Botswana tribes, where in 1882 and 1883 they founded two republics: Stellaland and Gossens. There has long been controversy in London over whether to react to the events in the country of the Botswans. All doubts ceased when, in 1884, Germany became active in Africa and the German South-West Africa was formed west of the Botswana country. In 1884, Germany concluded a trade agreement with the Transvaal [4, p.58].

In December 1884, 4,000 British soldiers, led by General Warren, landed in South Africa. After eliminating the Boer republics of Stellaland and Gossens, Britain offered the Botswana tribes an English protectorate.

Kama I, the leader of the Bamangwat tribe, proposed to spread the British protectorate over large areas - 80 thousand square meters. miles. As it turned out, he ceded to the British the lands of the Ndebele people with whom he was at war at the time. In 1885, London decided to declare the southern part of the lands of the Bastvans a royal colony - the Territory of Bechuanaland, and the northern - the Protectorate of Bechuanaland [3, p.54].

In 1886, the world's largest diamond deposit was discovered in the Transvaal. This leads to an active interest in her diamond mining company de Beers, which was owned by English businessman Cecil Rhodes. He sought to expand British possessions to the north. In particular, on land located between the rivers Zambezi and Limpopo. Rhodes considered the inkos (ruler) Lobengul and his warlike people Ndebele, or, as their neighbors called them, Matebele, as an obstacle to the realization of their plans [3, p.54].

In 1887, the Transvaal envoy Pete Grobler intimidated Lobengul with the danger of an English invasion and imposed a "peace and friendship treaty" on him. But this success cost him his life: on the way back, he was killed under unknown circumstances.

Of particular concern to Lobengula was the British decision to draw the border between the lands of the Ndebel and Bamangwat. Realizing that any attempt at a clear demarcation would provoke controversy and the British would take advantage of it, he suggested that Bamangwat leader Kami I resolve the matter on his own.

In 1888, however, the British imposed their "peace and friendship" treaty on Lobengula and in the same year forced him to grant a concession to extract gold to Charles Rudd, the emissary of Cecil Rhodes [3, p. 55].

Upon learning that the text of the concession agreement had been deliberately translated incorrectly, Lobengula decided to send the embassy to the United

Kingdom. He turned to one of Rhodes' rivals, the company of Lord Gifford and financier Coston. Edward Mound, the company's representative in Bulawayo, took on the task of accompanying Lobengula's ambassadors to England. Mound understood that it would be difficult for the ambassadors to achieve anything, moreover, he did not want the mission to succeed - he simply sought to use it in the fight against Rhodes.

Equipping Lobengula's mission, in addition to the £ 600 needed to finance the trip, he provided the ambassadors with several head of cattle to feed. Lobengula chose Babian, who had a good memory, and Mchete, who was considered a good orator, as his envoys [3, p.55].

The mission was delayed in Cape Town. The Minister of the Colonies advised Lord Nutsford to advise the Gifford-Coston Group to unite with Rhodes. Both sides agreed. By the time the ambassadors sailed from Cape Town on the Moor, an agreement had already been reached.

After landing in Southampton, they arrived by train in London and stayed at a hotel, where they were immediately besieged by journalists. The sensational nature of the mission forced Queen Victoria to receive the ambassadors almost immediately, on the third day of her stay in London. The reception was more ceremonial than business. The ambassadors spent almost the whole of March 1899 in London. They saw quite a lot, from ballet at the Alhambra Theater, which impressed them, to the zoo. They visited the Bank of England, in the bowels of which they were shown gold bars and offered to pick up bags of gold coins. At lunch at the Society for the Protection of Aborigines, they met with the famous writer Ryder Haggard [2, p.75].

There were two meetings with the Minister of the Colonies, Lord Nutsford. During the final conversation, he conveyed to the ambassadors the Queen's response to Lobengula's letter, which consisted of several vague phrases. The British government, of course, did not take any action against the concession hunters.

Only one wish of Lobengula was fulfilled - to send a representative of the queen to him. The Ministry of Colonies took advantage of this request to appoint a resident of Bulawayo a few months later. The misunderstanding quickly became clear. In August 1889, Lobengula responded to a letter from the British colonial authorities: "As for Her Majesty's offer to send her envoy to me, I thank Her Majesty, but I do not need him. I will make this request when the need arises." [4, p.58].

After overcoming all rivals, Rhodes created the "British South African Company". On October 29, 1889, the company received a charter from Queen Victoria, which gave the company the right not only to monopolize the resources of the Zambezi and Limpopo interfluvies, but also to create an administrative apparatus and its own army. This army in 1893 started a war against Matebele. At the same time, regular British troops withdrew from Bechuanaland. In this war, the British first used a novelty of military equipment of the time - Maxim machine guns. After defeating Lobengula retreated to the north. The country was occupied by the British. In honor of Cecil Rhodes, it was named Rhodesia.

In 1896 Matebele and Mashona resumed armed resistance. The British began to suppress the uprising. As a result of Rhodes' advance into the continent, Anglo-Portuguese relations worsened. There were bloody skirmishes. The treaty of 1891 established the borders between Portuguese Mozambique and English possessions in the Zambezi River basin. As a result of further British advance, new colonies were formed: Northern Rhodesia (north of the Zambezi) and the inhabited Malawi Nyasaland, located along Lake Nyasa [4, p.58].

Thus, all of South Africa was captured by the colonizers. England had a dominant position here. Its possessions were surrounded on all sides by the Boer republics, which would inevitably lead to new clashes.

In 1895, an attempt was made by the British to capture the Transvaal, which aggravated the Anglo-German controversy. In December 1895, the main forces of the South African Company were transferred from Rhodesia to the town of Pizzani Potlego on the border with the Transvaal. The formal reason for the war was to help the English population of the Transvaal, which suffered from persecution by the Boer authorities. The British hoped that the uprising in Johannesburg against President Kruger would begin at the same time as the intervention of British troops, but this did not happen and the British were forced to surrender [2, p.76].

The news of the attack on the Transvaal reached Europe on December 31. The actions of the British were of particular concern in Germany. Emperor Wilhelm at a meeting with the country's leadership proposed to bring the Marines into combat readiness, to declare a protectorate over the Transvaal and send troops there. But William did not have a navy, and his plan to create a bloc of continental powers against England was unrealistic. Therefore, on the advice of government officials, he limited himself to a telegram to President Krueger, in which he expressed his support.

This telegram immediately became a newspaper sensation and caused a wide resonance in European countries. Wilhelm's government began talks with Lisbon, trying to find out whether the Portuguese would allow the German expeditionary force to pass through Mozambique to the Transvaal. The British government announced the creation of a so-called flying squadron, British firms broke off commercial relations with the Germans, and the London crowd broke the glass in German shops.

When it became clear that the attempt to attack the Transvaal had failed, the question arose of punishing the perpetrators. British soldiers and their commander, Jameson, were in prison in Johannesburg. The British government promised Krueger that he would punish Jameson, his soldiers and officers as his subjects. After transporting them to England, the soldiers were released. Only Jameson and five officers were on the dock. Officers were sentenced to five months in prison and Jameson to fifteen. Cecil Rhodes was forced to resign as Prime Minister of the Cape Colony [3, p.54].

The fate of the Boer republics was finally decided during the war of 1899-1902. Seven months before the start of the war, on March 11, 1899, Rhodes and Chancellor Wilhelm met in Berlin. Its goal was to achieve

German neutrality in the coming war with the Boers. Rhodes suggested that William not object to the British construction of the Telegraph and the Cape Town-Cairo railway, in response the British would not interfere with the construction of the Berlin-Baghdad railway and allow Germany to gain a foothold in the Samoan archipelago in the Pacific Ocean.

Oral agreements were enshrined in formal agreements a few months later. The British government ceded two islands in the Samoa archipelago to Germany, and the German authorities entered into agreements with Cecil Rhodes' companies to lay a telegraph cable and a Cape Town-Cairo railway through German East Africa [3, p.55].

The war was declared on October 11, 1899. In the first months of the war, the British were defeated on all fronts. The hostilities did not take place in the Boer republics, but in British possessions. Boer troops invaded the Cape Colony, Natal and even Bechuanaland. It turned out that the Boers had better weapons than the British, because President Krueger secretly bought weapons in Germany [8, p.44].

The Boers immediately surrounded three cities in different parts of South Africa - Kimberley, Ladysmith and Mafeking. The siege lasted several months. With the liberation of these cities, the war did not end. The war continued after the fall of the capital of the Transvaal of Pretoria on June 5, 1900. Gradually becoming a guerrilla and increasingly depleting the British army, it lasted until May 1902.

After the defeat of the Boers, the Republics of Orange and the Transvaal were handed over to British governors.

In West Africa in the last third of the nineteenth century. One of the main objects of British colonial policy was the state of Ashanti, which the British launched an offensive after the establishment of the Gold Coast. Ashanti's attempt to gain access to the sea led in 1873 to war with the British. After the British captured the capital of the state of Kumasi, Ashanti was forced to pay a large contribution and abandon claims to coastal areas [2, p.75].

Attempts by the British to finally subdue Ashanti provoked resistance from the population. After the recapture of the Kumasi by the British in 1896, the independent state of Ashanti ceased to exist. In 1900 the territory of the state was included in the colony of the Gold Coast.

In the 70's of the XIX century. the British established themselves in large areas on both sides of the mouth of the Niger. The state-states of lower Niger were conquered by force of arms. The area between Lagos and Cameroon has been declared a "Protectorate of the Nigerian Coast". On the right bank of lower Niger, the Yoruba states were the object of colonial expansion. Using military force, the British broke the resistance of the strongest Yoruba states - Abeokuta and Ibadan. In 1893, the British extended their protectorate to all Yoruba countries.

West Africa was one of the main targets of French expansion. Relying on their possessions at the mouth of Senegal, the French launched an offensive on Cairo. The reason was the refusal of the ruler of Cairo to grant

permission for the construction of the Dakar-Saint-Louis railway. In 1882 the territory of Cairo was occupied by French troops [10, p.69].

Moving in the direction of upper Niger, the French in 1883 captured the city of Bamako. From here, they launched an offensive on the two strongest states in West Africa - Segu and Wasulu. Segu was conquered in 1894. Wasulu's army put up an active resistance, which the French were able to overcome only in 1893 using the tactics of "scorched earth".

It was not easy for the French to conquer Dahomey, whose army numbered 12-15,000 soldiers, including women whom the Europeans called the Amazons. It took two wars for Dahomey to become a French colony in 1892.

East Africa has become one of the objects of rivalry between European nations. In 1876, W. McKinnon, chairman of the British Indian Shipping Company, decided to begin construction of a railroad from the East African coast to Lakes Nyasa and Victoria. These plans were unofficially approved by the British government and Sultan Zanzibar Bargash, who was considered the ruler of all of East Africa. A company was established and the text of the concession was prepared, under the terms of which Bargash was to transfer power to the company in the interior in exchange for part of its profits. Bargash's favorable attitude to the agreement was explained by the fact that his power over these areas was purely formal.

In the spring of 1878, negotiations ceased. Business circles in London did not want to invest in areas with unexplored resources without government guarantees, and he was not ready to provide them [5, p.96].

In 1884, the British demanded that the Sultan of Zanzibar declare that he would not cede his "sovereign rights" to anyone without the consent of Britain. This declaration was signed by the sultan in December 1884. At that time, K. Peters, the founder of the Society of German Colonization, signed treaties on the protectorate of Tanganyika with local leaders. Following the Berlin Conference, Germany declared a protectorate over the territories specified in the Peters Treaties.

The Sultan protested and sent a detachment led by a British officer to Kilimanjaro. But after the British detachment, the German visited there and signed new agreements. In December 1885, Bargash, renouncing his protest and treaties in the Kilimanjaro area, recognized the German protectorate over Witt and effectively handed over Dar es Salaam to her control.

In October 1886, Germany and Great Britain concluded a treaty on East Africa. The parties to the agreement "singled out" the islands of Zanzibar, Pemba, Lamu, the cities of Brava, Merka, Mogadishu and Kismayo. Vita was recognized as a German protectorate. The interior of East Africa (up to Lake Victoria) was divided into two spheres of influence: English and German.

Britain continued to try to oust Germany from the region. In 1887, McKinnon founded the British East African Association and received a concession from Sultan Bargash. For 50 years, the Sultan transferred to the association all the fullness of political and legal

power, including the right to collect duties in their possessions. In 1888, the association was reorganized into the British East African Company (BSAC).

In 1889 BSAC managed to establish a protectorate over the Lama. The struggle for Uganda was particularly intense. To establish a protectorate over Uganda, the BSAC sent Captain Lugard and a military detachment there. K. Peters was ahead of Lugard and signed a contract with Buganda's tavern Mwanga [5, p.105].

In May 1890, Salisbury began negotiations with Germany on the redistribution of spheres of influence. Britain gave up the area near the lake. Tanganyika. Germany was forced to abandon Wit, recognize Uganda as a British sphere of influence, and the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba as British.

protectorates. In 1895, a British protectorate was established over Kenya.

In the last third of the XIX century, territorial conquests in Africa are carried out by Belgium. Belgium's entry into the arena of colonial politics is associated with the name of King Leopold II.

Leopold II was known in both Belgium and Europe for his propensity for adventure and financial fraud. Leopold's attention to the Black Continent was drawn to the archivist of the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, E. Banning, who was interested in events in Africa. It was he who recommended to the king the book of the German traveler Schweinfurt "In the heart of Africa", which put forward the idea of creating sub-Saharan Great Negro states under the protectorate of Europeans. Leopold was deeply interested in this idea.

To carry out his plans to conquer Africa, the king could not turn to his own bourgeoisie for help, although their interests in Africa coincided completely. His authority as a monarch and businessman was undermined by numerous financial scams. Therefore, he decided to pass off his own financial interests as scientific.

In 1876, at the initiative of the Belgian monarch, an international scientific conference was convened in Brussels, the purpose of which was to organize a systematic study of Africa. At the conference it was decided to form an "International Commission for the Study and Civilization of East Africa", on whose behalf Leopold II began to act [10, p.78].

The king later renamed the commission the International African Association, and then changed the name of the organization several more times. For the practical implementation of the ideas of the organization, a joint-stock company was created, the controlling stake of which belonged to the king. The main task of the society was to establish the International African Association's bases in Africa. However, Belgian expeditions met resistance from German and British contenders for African lands.

At this time, news reached Europe of the discovery of Henry Morton Stanley, who established the identity of the Congo and Lualaba rivers. The discovery of a new direct waterway to Africa directed Leopold's efforts in the other direction. He decided to enter the African continent not from the east, where the British and Germans gained a strong position, but from the west, where the weakened Portugal could barely control the

coastal strip. In October 1878, Leopold met with Stanley, after which a plan was published for the development of the middle reaches of the Congo River and the construction of a railway to bypass the river rapids [4, p.58].

Stanley began concluding agreements with local leaders on the transfer of their states to the International Association. But Stanley's discovery attracted not only the attention of the Belgian king. In July 1881, on the shores of Stanley Poole, Stanley met with an expedition of Savornian de Brazza, a representative of the French government. Paris, in connection with this meeting, stated that Leopold's "international organization" could not act as a legal entity and had no grounds to claim patronage over the Congo Basin.

While Belgium's European rivals clarified relations over the rights to the Congo River basin, Stanley managed to sign more than four hundred agreements with local leaders. And the king himself, taking advantage of the contradictions of the great powers, managed to convince the leaders of each of them that it is more profitable for them to recognize the rights of his association than to yield to competitors [6, p.55].

The fate of the Congo Basin was finally decided during the Berlin Conference of 1884-1885. The Congo Basin, excluding the possessions of France and Portugal, was declared a "Free State." That is, the colonial states had equal rights to operate in this territory. Leopold II was responsible for overseeing the rights of the local population and missionaries. The treaties concluded by Stanley received international recognition.

Using inter-tribal enmity, Leopold formed mercenaries and with their help captured the territories that were to become part of the "Free State of the Congo" under the Treaty of Berlin. Until 1908, the Congo was the personal property of King Leopold.

Northeast Africa became the scene of a struggle between England and France. In 1869, in the presence of the Empress of France, the grand opening of the Suez Canal, built under the direction of F. Lesseps, took place. The new waterway determined the exceptional geopolitical and economic importance of Egypt, which was located on the shores of two seas.

In 1875, Benjamin Disraeli bought a large stake in the Suez Canal from the head of Egypt, Ismail. Gradually, it is gaining more and more influence in the region. Taking advantage of the bankruptcy of the Egyptian treasury, France and England established financial control over the country through the "Egyptian Debt" established in 1876 [10, p.74].

In 1881, British diplomats, together with the military, prepared for a major operation in Egypt, where a mass movement against the domination of foreigners was spreading. It was necessary to convince the public of England and Europe of the selflessness of the actions taken to protect the interests of the owners of Egyptian shares. The main task was to choose a moment to attack Egypt so that France could not intervene in these events.

On July 11, 1882, Admiral Seymour's squadron bombed Alexandria, where a landing party landed, but it was decided to strike the main blow from the Suez Canal zone. The British occupied Ismailia (on the route

of the canal) and from there launched an offensive on the Egyptian capital. On September 13, the British defeated the Egyptian troops near Tel el Kebir, and in a short time the British garrisons occupied Cairo, Alexandria, Suez, and Port Said. By the mid-80's of the XIX century, the British did not make a final decision on the fate of Egypt. Since the second half of the 1980s, British policy in Egypt has been aimed at turning it into a colony.

In 1882 -1883 Sudan was conquered by Egypt in the 20-30s of the XIX century, freed from foreign domination. Here a religious movement led by the head of the Muslim sect of dervishes Muhammad Ahmed spread. Several corps, consisting of Egyptians and mercenaries, led by British officers, tried in vain to regain control of Cairo. In early 1885, the rebels liberated Khartoum and destroyed an English expeditionary force led by General C.J. Gordon [4, p.58].

A new attempt to conquer Sudan, the British began in 1896, commanded by General G. Kitchener. The first battles with the Sudanese began in the summer of 1896, but then the cholera epidemic slowed the onset. Dongola was occupied only in September.

In early 1897, Treasury Secretary M. Hicks Beach in the lower house and Prime Minister Salisbury in the upper house made a statement about British policy on the Nile. The prime minister acknowledged: "We see the occupation of Khartoum as our goal." The decisive battle took place on September 2, 1898 near the then capital of Sudan, Omdurman. Kitchener's troops defeated the Sudanese army. A few days later, Kitchener received word that a French detachment was stationed on the upper reaches of the White Nile.

A detachment of French Captain Marshan went on an expedition to the White Nile. In July 1898 the detachment occupied the Sudanese village of Fashoda. It was here that he met with General Kitchener's British troops.

Official reports of Kitchener's meeting with Marshan have been preserved. The parties first exchanged courtesies: Marshan congratulated the caliph on his victory over the gangs, and the general congratulated the captain as the leader of the scientific expedition. He offered to take the French on his ships to Cairo. The French refused. In response, Kitchener, pointing to the numerical superiority of the British, threatened to expel the French by force. According to eyewitnesses, the situation improved when Kitchener and several officers went ashore and agreed to have lunch and a drink with the French. The first stage of the crisis ended with the raising of the Egyptian flag and the presentation of a written protest to the French.

Kitchener also left one of the battalions and appointed his commander, Major Jackson, "governor of Fashoda province." Kitchener sailed south. He left the garrison in Sobata, and then returned along the Nile, passing non-stop past Fashod [7, p.188].

The events in Fashod led to the aggravation of relations between England and France. On September 30, 1898, a sharp dialogue took place between the French Foreign Minister Dalcasse and the British Ambassador Monson. The Minister rejected the demands made by

Britain to withdraw French troops. In response, Salisbury said that England would not agree to any compromises and would remain on the Nile as a conqueror. Demonstrative mobilization of the fleet began, and British newspapers launched a large-scale anti-French campaign.

French society at that time was divided by the "Dreyfus affair" and in conditions of continuous internal turmoil, none of the cabinets, which often replaced each other, could risk further aggravation of relations and war with England. The last and most important reason that determined the outcome of the crisis was that for all the significance of the Anglo-French contradictions, they were inferior in their "weight" in the international arena to the Franco-German. Germany would benefit most from the war in Europe. Therefore, France decided to avoid war even by reducing international prestige [7, p.189].

In October 1898, France recognized the entire Nile region as a sphere of British influence. In January 1899, London announced the emergence of the Anglo-Egyptian "condominium" in Sudan. This was the final end of the Fashod crisis.

After the Berlin Conference (1884. -1885), Italy began an active colonial policy. It considered the territory of its influence in the countries of Northeast Africa, in particular, Ethiopia. In the 1980s, Ethiopia merged into a still weakly centralized empire. It was during this period that it became the object of aggression by Italy [7, p.190].

During this period in the northern Ethiopian land of Tigray ruled the Emperor of Ethiopia, John IV. In 1884-1889 he, in alliance with Great Britain, waged war with Sudan. As a reward, he was promised Turkish-Egyptian possessions in present-day Eritrea. Italy's ally in the area was Sahle-Maryam, ruler of Central and Southern Ethiopia, one of the main contenders for the imperial throne. In 1889, Emperor John IV was killed in a battle with the Sudanese, and Sahle-Maryam became Menelik's emperor in Ethiopia. Italy established two of its colonies on the borders of Ethiopia: Eritrea and Somalia, concluding the Treaty of Uchchal with Menelik. Under his terms, Menelik transferred to Italy the rights to the northern regions of the Tigris.

One of the clauses of the Uchchal Treaty was read differently in the official versions in Italian and Amharic. In the Amharic text it was stated that the emperor of Ethiopia could use the help of the Italian government, and in the Italian text the word "may" was translated as "agree". On this basis, the Italian government informed other states that under the rules established at the Berlin Conference, Ethiopia became a protectorate of Italy. A year later, Ethiopia began protesting for support in Britain, France and Russia.

In December 1894, Ethiopia started a war against Italy. Despite the resistance of the Tiger troops, the Italians quickly moved inland. The Ethiopian army won its first victory in October 1895 at Amba-Alaz in southern Tigris. Ethiopian troops cleared most of the Tigris from the Italians. In mid-1896, an army of 100,000 Ethiopians took up positions near the city of Adua. General Baratieri entered here with a corps of almost eighteen thousand.

The battle began on March 1, 1896 and lasted from sunrise to sunset. It ended in the complete defeat of the Italian corps. Of the 18,000 Italians, 15 were either killed or taken prisoner. Ethiopians lost about 10,000 killed.

The defeat in this battle provoked protests in Italy against the Crispi government and its colonial policies. Ethiopia remained one of the few African states that did not fall under the rule of the colonizers [8, p.46].

An interesting page in the history of Ethiopian contacts with European nations is the activities of a Russian hospital in Ethiopia. In October 1896, Ethiopia was abandoned by a medical unit of the Russian Red Cross, which provided assistance to the victims of the war with Italy. However, there are five doctors left in Addis Ababa to work at the Russian-based hospital.

In early March 1898, a permanent hospital was opened under the Russian mission. It was located in the western part of the city and was originally housed in tents. After the start of the rainy season, which made it impossible for the hospital to operate in tents, doctors persuaded Governor Menelik to build a stone building for the hospital. Because the hospital was small and could not accommodate everyone, its patients were primarily the wounded, or those who needed urgent surgery.

The activities of Russian physicians were not limited to work in the hospital. In particular, Dr. Brovtsin and paramedic Sason had to accompany Menelik in the campaign against the ruler Mengesha. The expedition proved to be extremely difficult: the conduct of hostilities was complicated by the lack of provisions, which pushed the soldiers to looting. Clashes with the local population not only claimed dozens of lives, but also significantly increased the number of injured. The reception of the wounded, the number of which sometimes exceeded 300 people a day, was combined with long and exhausting crossings in the mountains [9, p.56].

During the campaign in the troops and among the local population, an epidemic of influenza spread, which further increased the number of patients. Exhausted, Brovtsin and Sasonov were looking forward to a replacement. But on January 22, 1899, they were told that, by order of Nicholas II, the entire mission would remain in Ethiopia for another nine months. Emperor Menelik, to emphasize the merits of doctors, awarded Brovtsin the title of life surgeon, and Sason the life masseur of His Imperial Majesty [9, p.57].

Thus, the colonial division of the world in the nineteenth century, first of all, the division of Africa. In the early twentieth century, after the Anglo-Boer War of 1899-1902, two states were considered sovereign in tropical and southern Africa: Ethiopia, which managed to defeat the Italian army in 1896, and Liberia, which was founded by people from Black America.

References

1. Perminov P. Bonapart v Egipte ili nedolgoe carstvovanie sultana el'-Kebira. Aziya i Afrika segodnya. 1984. №3. S.55-61
2. Davidson A. Sesil' Rods i ego vremya. Moskva. 1984. 367s.
3. Davidson A. Zhizn' i smert' Lobenguly. Aziya i Afrika segodnya. 1984. №12. S.52-55.
4. Davidson A. Afrikancy otkryvayut Evropu. Aziya i Afrika segodnya. №2. S.56 – 59
5. Istoriya Kenii v novoe i novejshee vremya. Moskva., 1985. 392 s.
6. Sokolov D. Koronovannyj moshennik. Aziya i Afrika segodnya. 1984. №6. S. 54 – 56
7. Vinogradov K. B. Vverh po Nilu ... na puti k Fashodskomu krizisu. Novaya i Novejshaya Istoriya. 1998. №5. S. 171 – 190.
8. Kobishchanov YU Bitva pri Adua. Aziya i Afrika segodnya. 1996. №8. S.44-46
9. Krylov A. Pervyj russkij gosital'. Aziya i Afrika segodnya. 1989. №9. S.55-57.
10. Nikin M. D. Kolonializm v tropicheskoj Afrike. Vostok. 1998. №1. S. 68.-78