

GLIMPSES OF THE AGES  
OR THE "SUPERIOR" AND "INFERIOR"  
RACES, SO-CALLED, DISCUSSED IN THE  
LIGHT OF SCIENCE AND HISTORY

BY

THEOPHILUS E. SAMUEL SCHOLES, M.D., ETC.

FIAT JUSTITIA, RUAT CÆLUM

VOL. II



London

John Long

Norris Street, Haymarket

MCMVIII



# CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	I
(a) THE GAUGE OF HUMAN CONDUCT . . . . .	I
II. CHRISTENDOM DISPOSING OF THE DYING NATIONS . . . . .	13
III. BRITAIN ELIMINATING THE "UNFIT," OR THE MANNER IN WHICH COLOURED BRITISH SUBJECTS ARE BROUGHT INTO THE EMPIRE . . . . .	32
(1) KANO AND SOKOTO . . . . .	32
(2) THE SIERRA LEONE PROTECTORATE . . . . .	48
IV. THE MANNER IN WHICH COLOURED BRITISH SUBJECTS ARE TREATED WITHIN THE EMPIRE . . . . .	91
(a) CERTAIN POPULAR FALLACIES . . . . .	91
V. THE MANNER IN WHICH COLOURED BRITISH SUBJECTS ARE TREATED WITHIN THE EMPIRE . . . . .	98
(b) THEIR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS . . . . .	98
(1) INDIA . . . . .	99
(2) THE BRITISH WEST INDIES . . . . .	123
(3) WEST AFRICA . . . . .	160
VI. THE MANNER IN WHICH COLOURED BRITISH SUBJECTS ARE TREATED WITHIN THE EMPIRE . . . . .	168
(c) THEIR SOCIAL CONDITION . . . . .	168
VII. REASONS ALLEGED AS ACCOUNTING FOR THEIR SOCIAL CONDITION . . . . .	190
VIII. THE REAL REASON THAT ACCOUNTS FOR THEIR CON- DITIONS . . . . .	230
IX. CHANGE OF POLICY . . . . .	263
X. THE CAUSE OF THE CHANGE OF POLICY . . . . .	284
XI. UPON THE EMPIRE, THE EFFECTS OF BRITAIN'S PRESENT POLICY . . . . .	313
(a) DEMORALIZATION AND DEVITALIZATION . . . . .	313

	PAGE
XII. UPON THE EMPIRE, THE EFFECTS OF BRITAIN'S PRESENT POLICY . . . . .	329
(b) MISREPRESENTATION . . . . .	329
XIII. UPON THE EMPIRE, THE EFFECTS OF BRITAIN'S PRESENT POLICY . . . . .	347
(c) A DUAL STANDARD OF JUSTICE . . . . .	347
XIV. PRESENT POLICY SUPPORTED BY A FALSE DELICACY . . . . .	405
XV. WORKING THE EMPIRE FROM WITHOUT ; OR, JUDGING THE FUTURE BY THE PRESENT . . . . .	419
XVI. WORKING THE EMPIRE FROM WITHIN ; OR, PROBABLE EFFECTS OF BRITAIN'S ORIGINAL POLICY . . . . .	439
XVII. IMPERIALISM AND ITS NESTOR . . . . .	449
XVIII. GENERAL SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION . . . . .	475
INDEX . . . . .	489

## PREFACE

ACCORDING to the original intention, this work was to have been a single volume, but by necessity it was subsequently increased to two volumes. And whilst the author, with some reluctance, was essaying to comply with the added demand, the same taskmaster, returning, raised the number of two volumes to that of six volumes. Thereby, having somewhat recovered the equanimity of his mind, as well as the assurance that the master of these exactions has at length reached the limit of his impositions, the author is to announce, although with diffidence not unmixed with trepidation, that the entire work "Glimpses of the Ages" will appear in six volumes.

That it is with reason that the author, in making this announcement, according to its second amendment, should indulge the sentiments of diffidence and trepidation is, he thinks, shown by the following review of the first volume of "Glimpses of the Ages" :—

" 'Glimpses of the Ages.' By Theophilus E. Samuel Scholes, M.D., &c. (John Long). This is one of those books that make one doubt whether the invention of printing is all the blessing some would have us believe it to be. The purpose of 'Theophilus E. Samuel Scholes, M.D., &c.,' who also, we observe, rejoices in calling himself 'Bartholomew Smith,' is to declare that the Negro is a fine fellow—a proposition which it does not require four hundred pages to demonstrate. It could have been done at the

bottom of a picture post-card. Of course he is a fine fellow. The book is cram-full of stupid blunders, while the 'authorities' quoted are either of the antique variety or of a kind quite beneath contempt. The learned author gives names of places that do not exist, mis-spells well-known proper names, turns 'u's' into 'n's' with a perversity that is astonishing, and mauls the history of a great civilization in a way that gives one a positive itch. We are warned that this is but the first volume of 'Theophilus E. Samuel Scholes, M.D., &c.'s' effort in this subject. Has he no candid friend who can use the necessary restraint to prevent this abuse of the printing press? We observe that he tenders his thanks to 'Mr. W. W. Campbell, M.R.C.S., &c., who on reading the manuscript through made very valuable suggestions.' Why did Mr. Campbell omit the obvious suggestion 'Don't'?"

It is true, of course, that in this neurotic explosion, by which the reviewer has relieved the tension of an over-excited brain, he stands quite alone. For in their reviews of this first volume a few of the reviewers were facetious, or they aspired to that estate, the majority were serious, and not a few of them were appreciative. So that, with this solitary exception, none of these reviewers evinced in their criticisms the disorders which have vented themselves in this remarkable outburst of bile.

But since the body of the reviewers have proved themselves superior to the employment of converting the noble edifice of criticism into the wigwam of lampoonery, it may be asked why the author, in this regard, should trouble about the delinquency of a single weak member. The answer is that it is my nature to be concerned about the weak; and in that concern, perceiving the ravages—moral, mental, and physical—which one volume has wrought upon this weak member of my reviewers, I have felt myself compelled also to consider what, upon him, is likely to be the effect of six volumes. Indeed, so deep has been my concern with respect

to this weak member, that, in accordance with his suggestion, I consulted my friend Dr. Campbell before he left this country, as to whether he thought that I should proceed with the work. And he, perhaps owing to the fact that he took a more favourable view of the case of the reviewer than myself, advised me to proceed.

But even though I was fortified with this support of Dr. Campbell's counsel, had it not been that I was still being impelled to the task by the strong arm of necessity, I doubt whether I should have proceeded. However, now that I am to produce not only a second volume, but also a third, a fourth, a fifth, and even a sixth, I find relief in the reflection that as an interval of one year at least must elapse during the publication of each successive volume, the recuperative power of this weak reviewer will doubtless enable him during each interval to recover from the effects of the preceding shock. Thus my solicitude for the well-being of this reviewer finds at least a partial relief.

The object of the work that is to be published in six volumes is to inquire scientifically and historically into the circumstances in which the colourless peoples designate themselves as the "superior race," and in which they designate the coloured races as "inferior races." The inquiry is divided into the physical, mental, and moral aspects. Of these three aspects, the two former are treated in the first volume of "Glimpses of the Ages" which has already been published; and the third, or the moral aspect, is to be treated in five volumes, of which the present volume is the first of the five.





# GLIMPSES OF THE AGES

## I

### Introduction

#### THE GAUGE OF HUMAN CONDUCT

(a) **T**HE white, or colourless race, has asserted that it is the superior race, and that the coloured are inferior races. (b) This superiority which it claims for itself, and the inferiority which it attributes to the coloured races, it bases upon certain physical, mental, and moral distinctions that it alleges to exist between itself and the coloured races. (c) And in virtue of this superiority which the colourless race claims for itself, and of the inferiority which it attributes to the coloured races, it announces the right to possess the inheritances of those coloured races and the duty to shape their destiny.

Thus, having appropriated the patrimony of the coloured races, now the colourless race so controls the future of these coloured races that, as rivals, they are generally precluded from the higher pursuits of life. The physical, mental, and moral distinctions, that are alleged to exist between the coloured and colourless races, being the great props upon which the superiority of the colourless race, and the inferiority of the coloured races, lie, in the first volume of this work, in accordance with the plan which is laid down there, I have examined two of these supports, viz. the physical and mental supports.

And so in the present volume, in the further pursuit of that plan, we shall examine the third—that is to say, the moral

support. In other words, we shall examine the distinction which is said to exist between the colourless race and the coloured races, by which the former has become the superior race and the latter the inferior races. Thereby, in the present volume, our inquiry shall be directed either to the confirmation or to the disproof of the moral superiority of the colourless and the moral inferiority of the coloured races.

In dealing with the subject of the physical superiority of the colourless race and the physical inferiority of the coloured races in the first volume, I took, as an example, the crania of the colourless race and the crania of the coloured races; and by showing that the same varieties which are found in the one class are found in the other class—the same procedure being followed with respect to the other parts of the organism—I concluded that between the physical structures of the colourless race and the physical structures of the coloured races there exist no such differences as to warrant the statement that the one race is superior and that the other races are inferior.

Similarly, in dealing with the subject of the mental superiority of the colourless race, and the mental inferiority of the coloured races, I showed that exactly the same conditions have been manifest in the one class that have been manifest in the other class; thus, (a) that of the Indo-Germanic race, a section of that race—the coloured section, the Hindoo—without models, produced a civilization; (b) that another section of that race—the European communities—after existing in the crudest savagery for many ages, upon receiving models directly and indirectly from members of the class that had spontaneously produced civilizations, likewise produced civilizations, and at various and irregular periods; (c) that in both the Hamitic and Semitic races there has existed in like manner a spontaneous class which, without models, produced civilizations; that there has also existed in these two races savage sections which, upon receiving models directly and indirectly, at different and irregular periods, from the spontaneous class, have produced and are producing civilizations. Thus the same conditions of spontaneity, savagery, imitativeness, and progress being alike manifest in the colourless and coloured races, I have concluded that there is no difference intellectually between the two great classes.

But the mode of reasoning I have employed in the study of the subjects of the physical and mental superiority of the colourless race, and of the physical and mental inferiority of the coloured races, is not that which I shall employ in the study of the subject of the moral superiority of the colourless race and the moral inferiority of the coloured races. The method which I shall employ upon the subject of the moral aspect is, in the first place, that of producing the ethical standard of the white man; and, in the next place, that of gauging the white man's practice by his moral standard. We proceed, then, to the task of producing this standard. In regard to things outside of himself, man sustains a threefold relation, (1) a relation to the material world, (2) a relation to his fellows, and (3) a relation to his Maker.

The relation between man and the material world is seen in the fact that the same elements which compose the parts that constitute the material world also compose the parts that constitute the human frame. Thus, as there are in the composition of the material world the elements, hydrogen, sodium, calcium, magnesium, potassium, and iron, etc. (vol. i, 161), so there are in the composition of the human structure these same elements. The relations between man and his fellows, and between man and his Maker, give rise to what are called morals. And as man transgresses or fulfils the laws of these relations, so he is accounted immoral or moral.

With regard to the relation between man and his fellows, the historical or traditional belief that the three great divisions of the human race have a common origin or a common descent from a single human pair is in perfect accord with the facts of science. For whereas the differences of colour and of types of features which are seen in the divisions of the races appear to point to a diversity of origin, we learn from the science of anatomy that these physiognomic and complexional distinctions are not greater than the differences of colour and of form—if, indeed, they are as great—that appear in the structures of the human organism: structures which are all of them the products of a single pair of cells. So that, concerning the organism, as it is certain that these structures, with their diversity of colour and of form, have originated from a single pair of cells, so, concerning the races, it is most probable that all the sections, with their variations of colour

and of types of features, have originated from a pair of human beings (vol. i, 151).

The relation between man and his Maker is perceived in the universal homage which man, in every condition of life, pays to Him (vol. i, 142).

The relation, then, between man and the material world, between man and his fellows, and between man and his Maker being thus established, we observe, further, that such relations carry with them mutual obligations. The material world fulfils its obligation to man by ministering to his requirements. It feeds, clothes, houses, and warms him; whilst man, on his part, fulfils his obligation to the material world by improving it, or by rendering it the more valuable. He drains and tills its fields, decks its plains with cities, tunnels its mountains, bridges its rivers, covers its seas with sails, and by telegraphy he binds together its continents. The discharge of this mutual obligation by man and by the material world, is by the law of work, or the putting forth of energy. The earth exerts herself in order to produce grass for the cattle, "and herb for the service of man: . . . and wine that maketh glad the heart of man, and oil to make his face to shine, and bread which strengtheneth man's heart." And man exerts himself to enrich the fields with grain, and with flocks and herds; he exerts himself to adorn the plains with cities, the cities with industrial and fine arts; and to discover the laws of solid, of liquid, of gaseous matter. The motive power, if I may employ such a term, that determines the material world to put forth her energies for the well-being of man is blind obedience to natural law. The motive power that determines man to put forth his energy for the improvement of the material world is self-interest.

But the material world, in the discharge of its obligation to man, and man, in the discharge of his obligation to the material world, are each of them profited thereby. Should any part of the earth be unable to produce food-stuffs, water, building materials, substances for clothing, or any of the media of exchange that are used for procuring these objects—in a word, should such a place be absolutely barren—then, as the result of its inability to fulfil its obligation to man, it would be left by man unimproved and profitless. But if that territory should be able to support man, it would in turn be

improved by man ; and the greater the support it may be able to yield, the greater the improvement it would receive. If man, on the other hand, should fail to fulfil his obligation to the material world, he too for this failure would be the poorer. Should he neglect to cultivate its soil, to dig its ores, to utilize its stone or timber, its cotton or wool, to study its colour, sound, and form, and to investigate the principles of its moods and acts, then by the omission he would be the poorer ; whereas, in the discharge of these obligations, he would be the richer materially and intellectually.

The relations between man and man assume a variety of forms ; such, for example, as those which exist between the members of a family, between friends, master and servant, members of a guild, citizens of a state, peoples of the same race ; and, lastly, between the varieties of the species man—namely, the Semetic, Hamitic, and Japhitic races. Treating these groups as if they formed a circle, of which, according to the degree of intimacy of their parts, that of the family is the centre, and that of the races is the circumference, and passing from the centre to the circumference, we encounter in the progress a great succession of degrees of relation. And as obligation is the resultant of relation, we have, in consequence, a great succession of degrees of obligation.

But now the question arises whether these degrees of relation, with their corresponding degrees of obligation, conform to any single law. I have said that the principles by which the relation between man and the material world is governed are, in the one case, that of blind obedience to natural law, and, in the other case, that of self-interest. The diverse degrees, then, of relation twixt man and man, are they governed by laws of corresponding diversity, or do they conform to any single law ? They conform to a single law. And what is that law to which they conform ?

It is the law of goodness. Goodness is defined as the state of being good. That which is good contributes to the diminution of pain and to the increase of happiness. Goodness, therefore, as regards man and man, contributes to the diminution of pain and to the increase of happiness—moral, mental, and material. And the law by which pain is diminished and happiness is increased is that which is given by the great Galilean, Jesus of Nazareth (the greatest teacher that has appeared

among men), in one of His two precepts, wherein human ethics are summarized. It is, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." The love that is embraced by this sublime and transcendent precept is the species of which the love of husband and wife, of parent and child, of friends, of citizens, of country, and of race, etc., are varieties. It is the hand of which these latter are the fingers. Again, "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them : for this is the law and the prophets."

And these form the gauge of human conduct. In their import this and the preceding passage are identical, the latter being but the fuller exposition of the former ; hence they shall be used interchangeably. The law which is announced by the two passages is meant to govern every member of the human family, as truly as the law of gravitation is meant to govern every atom of the universe. And this is the law to which the individual or the community conforming, develops those qualities of character which in the concrete are designated as good, and in the abstract goodness. The obligations, then, that arise out of the relations between man and man—extending from the members of the family to the members of the races—are to be fulfilled by the law of goodness. That is to say, that intercourse twixt man and man, to their mutual progress and happiness, is governed by a law that is as real and that is as inexorable as the law, for example, that governs the physical health of man. The law is, ". . . whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them : . . ." Therefore, morally, the individual, the community, or the race, who, or which, in the discharge of their obligations to others most conform to this law, is the superior to those who least conform to it. In other words, the difference between man and man, morally, is in the degree in which they fulfil their obligations to each other.

In this respect he who increases the happiness of his fellows—friend, or foe, or otherwise—by the endeavour to do to them as he would be done to by them, is the superior man ; and he who through the omission of this endeavour decreases the happiness of his fellows is the inferior man. The former is the gentleman or the lady, and the latter the ungentile-man or the ungentile-woman. Therefore, according to this definition,

the standard of gentility that is here represented differs from that which is ordinarily accepted.

By the meaning which is commonly attached to the terms "gentleman" and "lady," birth, education, wealth, or station, a knowledge of the rules of what is called good society, or courtliness, one or more of these are the qualification of a gentleman or a lady. That is to say, that lineage, that mental, physical, social, and material endowment or acquisition, constitute a gentleman and a lady. But by the meaning that is attached here to these terms by me, the qualification of the gentleman and the lady is moral rather than mental or material. It is the individual who, making the measure of his actions to himself, the measure of his actions to others, cherishes sentiments and performs actions towards them akin to those that he cherishes and performs to himself; and who, by the process, develops that fineness of moral texture of which the reflexion in his character is called goodness. Those who produce this fineness of moral texture may differ widely in outward circumstances. One may be a prince, the other a peasant; one a philosopher, the other illiterate; one well known, the other unknown; one rich, the other poor; one a lady of rank, the other a washer-woman. But in essentials they all are of one class, although in non-essentials they are of different classes.

The difference between these cases—of the lady of the palace and the lady of the wash-tub, between the prince and the peasant, the philosopher and the unlettered, the famous and the unknown, the rich and the poor—is that of surroundings only. Arrayed in the fine linen and decked with the jewellery, of learning, fame, rank, or wealth, etc., and occupying the platform of position which these non-essentials likewise constitute, this section, more than the other that is destitute of these adjuncts, is conspicuous, is looked up to, and is admired. But being mere accessories, these externals are not substitutes of that inherent or heart-qualification that is alone gentility. Thus they who, cultured by the law of goodness, are ladies and gentlemen, although living poorly and obscurely, are like the natural flower that is hidden in the crevice of the rock. Whilst they who, uncultured by the law of goodness, are not ladies and gentlemen—although appearing in the similitudes of conventional goodness, they bask in the light of popularity

and influence—are like the artificial flower that is exhibited. In their case nearness of vision diminishes admiration, but in the former case nearness of vision heightens admiration.

But let it not be thought for one moment that I have been inveighing against learning, physical culture, wealth, position, lineage, etc., for I have not been doing so. These acquisitions are regarded by me as things which upon their possessors confer distinction. Further, I regard them as vehicles of the most beneficent favours; thereby it is my belief that they are worthy of resolute and honourable pursuit. But, at the same time, I regard these acquisitions alone as being inadequate for the proper discharge of man's mutual obligations; and this for the reason that, unattended by right feelings, such obligations can never be well discharged, and that these acquisitions in themselves are incapable of producing right feelings. The measure of our actions to ourselves being made the measure of our actions to others, and the process of the measurement developing in us the qualities of goodness, the qualities of goodness confer upon the use of our acquisitions unalloyed benefit and value.

Thus, in order to discharge rightly our obligations to our fellows, there must exist behind all our acquisitions—mental, material, and social—the moral element. It were, perhaps, good that the heart-gentleman were well known rather than obscure, that he were rich rather than poor, as by means of these vehicles the range of his goodness could become more extensive; but, on the other hand, it were better that he should be without these vehicles than that, having them, he should be without their contents.

This generation, the wisest that the world has ever produced, glories in its devotion to what it calls “the practical side of things.” And in its overpowering zeal for “the practical side of things” it gnashes in anger at the ideal and the theoretical. Therefore, to it, how humiliating should be the fact that the practical side of things, upon which it professes to set the greatest value, had existed—as ideas, ideals, or theories—for itself, had been but an idea, an ideal, and a theory. Thus the practical stage is merely that at which theory is solidified, theory at the anterior stage being in solution. And there is no idea, ideal, or theory against which this spirit of marvellous pretension raises its head more loftily



than that which is signified by the precept, “. . . whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.” Yet it is quite true to say that no natural law is fitted to confer upon human society so much benefit as this moral law is fitted to confer. It will be more convenient to illustrate the practical bearing of this law in another connection ; and here I will not pursue it any further.

What I have been saying, as well as the few remarks that am about to add, concerning the law of goodness, may be presented under the heads of (a) necessity, (b) practicability, and (c) importance. Dealing here with the last head, I observe that the importance of the law of goodness is most strikingly exemplified by the relation which it bears to its great companion law, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.” And what is the relation ? It is that of a demonstrator. That is to say, that in regard to the individual or the community, obedience or disobedience to the law of the brotherhood of man, demonstrates the fulfilment or the non-fulfilment of the law of the fatherhood of God. For the expression of the human brotherhood, viz. love to man, is the proof of love to God, which is the expression of the Divine Fatherhood, so that love to God is not an abstraction, but a concretion. Thereby the true gauge of love to God, whether it be by the individual or by the community, is neither that of need, of form, or of fervour, but is that of love to man. For if a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar : *for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen ?*” And it is as that which demonstrates the presence or absence in man, of love to God, that this law of goodness, or the doing to others as we would be done by, derives its importance.

Now, with regard to these remarks, the point that I wish to notice particularly, as that which bears directly upon the discussion that we are to pursue, is that the difference, which is a moral one, that exists between individuals or communities, by which the one class may be described as superior and the other class as inferior, rests upon the manner in which each class fulfils its obligations to its fellows. The class which, in the discharge of its obligations, diminishes the pain and increases the happiness of its fellows is morally the superior class ; and

the class which, in the discharge of its obligations, increases the pain and diminishes the happiness of its fellows is morally the inferior class. And so as the colourless race has asserted that it is morally superior to the coloured races, our attempt will be to notice, in the first place, the character of its actions in the discharge of its obligations to the members of the coloured races; and, in the next place, it will be to notice the character of its actions in the discharge of its obligations to its own members.

Such a notice will be the more interesting since the great principles of love to God—as it is demonstrated by love to man, and as both principles are comprehended in the great summary of the law and the prophets “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind,” and thy neighbour as thyself—are those by which the colourless race, in its actions, professes to be guided. Nay, more! They are the principles to which that race, in the attestation of its devotion, seeks to propagate among the coloured races, expending in the process hundreds of thousands of pounds annually, devoting the flower of its manhood and womanhood thereto, and which, moreover, in the severity of its zeal, it seeks to propagate even by force.

For the purpose of outlining the character which invests the acts of the colourless race toward the coloured races in the discharge of its obligations to those races, I will select examples from the coloured races themselves. To this end the coloured races will be divided into three groups. Of these, the first shall be the independent states, or those states which, in the management of their external as well as internal affairs, depend solely upon their own governments. China, Abyssinia, and Siam represent this class. The second group shall be the states that are known as “Protectorates”; they are states which have the management of their internal affairs, more or less, but are controlled in their external affairs by some outside power. Of these Protectorate states Tunis, and originally the Hausa states of the Soudan, Kano and Sokoto, are examples. And the third group shall be the states that are called Dependencies and Crown Colonies; and also a white sovereign state, of which coloured people form an integer.

Both the external and internal affairs of the dependencies and Crown colonies of this group are controlled by a sovereign state.

From the first of the three groups I select China, in order to outline the character of the acts of which the colourless race is capable toward coloured states that are wholly independent. From the second group I select Kano and Sokoto and the Sierra Leone Protectorates, to outline the character of the acts of which the colourless race is capable toward coloured states that are semi-independent. And from the third group I select British India and certain colonies of the British West Indies and British West Africa, also the Afro-American, of the United States of America, to outline the character of the acts of which the colourless race is capable toward coloured states, or coloured peoples, that are wholly dependent. This completing the first part of the inquiry—that is, the character of the acts of the colourless race toward the coloured races, in the fulfilment of its obligations to those races—we shall thereafter proceed to the second part, namely, the character of the acts of which the members of the colourless race, or the Caucasian states, are capable towards each other in the fulfilment of their mutual obligations. And the leading states of Europe, and also the United States of America, shall outline the character of those acts of which the members of the colourless race are capable toward each other.

But besides the profession of the colourless race that among its own members, and among the members of the coloured races, it practises the law of goodness, and besides its zealous endeavour to instruct the coloured races in the practice of this law, it possesses also an institution whose one duty is to secure the practice of this law, in its relation to man and in its relation to God. That institution is the Christian Church. Hence our discussion shall embrace the Christian Church. And, lastly, according to the conclusion at which we may arrive, we shall answer the question that is raised in the preceding volume of this work. It is as follows: “. . . if it be true that, by an inherent and irremediable bias, the coloured races move upon a plane that is morally . . . lower than that whereon the colourless race moves, then the present relation of wardship which they bear to the fair race, by whom the guardianship of their destiny is assumed, is correct; and the

epithets, 'subject races,' inferior races,' 'child-like races,' etc., by which the ward are denominated by the guardians, are also correct. But should it be untrue that science and history have thus spoken, what then?" In the present volume, according to the indications that are given above, the Chinese and the British Empires shall be alone considered. We pass, then, to the subject of China.

## Christendom Disposing of the Dying Nations

**I** BEGIN with a reference from a speech delivered in May, 1898, by the late Marquis of Salisbury, a speech in which the policy of the colourless race concerning self-governing and independent coloured states that are unable to protect themselves against aggression is boldly announced.

After drawing a contrast between those whom he describes as "the living nations" and "the dying nations," "the former with great countries and enormous power, growing in dominion, wealth, and organization, with facilities for concentrating upon a given point the whole military force of the population, and assembling great armies of a magnitude and power never dreamt of in the generations that have gone by, the latter, decade after decade . . . are weaker, poorer, and less provided with leading men, or institutions, in which they can trust, apparently drawing nearer and nearer to their fate. . . . In them misgovernment is not only not cured, but is constantly on the increase." "Their society, their official society, and the administration is a mass of corruption, so that there is no firm ground on which any hope of restoration could be founded," etc. Lord Salisbury thus concludes:—

"How long this state of things is likely to go on, of course, I do not attempt to prophesy. All I can indicate is, that that process is proceeding; that the weaker states are becoming weaker, and the strong states are becoming stronger. It needs no speciality of prophecy to point out to you what the inevitable result of that combined process must be. For one reason or another, from the necessity of politics, or under the pretence of philanthropy, the living nations will gradually encroach on the territory of the dying, and the seeds and causes of conflict among civilized nations will speedily appear. Of course, it is not to be supposed that any one nation of the

living nations will be allowed to have the profitable monopoly of curing or cutting up these unfortunate patients, and the controversy is as to who shall have the privilege of doing so, and in what measure he shall do it."

Thus far for Lord Salisbury.

In the course of his narration of the rise and progress of those ideas of which Mr. Cecil Rhodes' life-work was the embodiment, Mr. Stead, in the "Review of Reviews," of the 10th of April, 1902, after stating that Mr. Rhodes was an evolutionist, and after representing the salient features of evolution to be "The perfection of the species, attained by the elimination of the unfit; the unfavourable handicapping of the fit; The most capable species survives, the least capable goes to the wall; the perfecting of the fittest species among the animals, and of races among men, and then conferring upon the perfected species or race the title-deeds of the future" continues thus.

"That seemed to Mr. Rhodes, through his Darwinian spectacles, the way in which God is governing His world, has governed it, and will continue to govern it, so far as we can foresee the future."

It will be perceived that the principle which underlies both of these extracts are the same. The first implies that when a community—presumably a coloured community—has arrived at that point of its existence which, in the reference to the Romans in the previous volume of this work, is described as the third stage, or the stage of decay, it forfeits all right to remain independent; that therefore any other community or communities that occupy one or other of the two earlier stages that have been also described, as youth and manhood, may appropriate its territory and its inhabitants. And the second excerpt implies that the white race is the fittest of the human species, that as such it is its prerogative to survive; that whereas the "yellow," the black, and the brown peoples of the other races represent the unfit, they must "go to the wall."

The European peoples and peoples of European descent should be devoutly thankful that Mr. Cecil Rhodes was not a contemporary of Julius Cæsar, and that Mr. W. T. Stead, the

complacent and enthusiastic expounder and admirer of his views, did not also flourish at that period; for, according to the sentiments which the latter of the two extracts breathes, had such contingencies happened then, assuredly Europe to-day had been peopled by either Africans or by Asiatics. In these two extracts, then, the law is laid down by which the conduct of the colourless race towards the coloured races is governed. And, as we shall witness during our advance, the practices of the former of these two sections of the human family towards the latter are in perfect accord with the teaching of the two extracts.

Now, according to the plan that has been laid down, let us proceed to the examples wherein this Cecilian law of the cutting up of the dying nations, and the Rhodesian law of the hurling of the "unfit" to the wall, will be seen in operation.

For the murder of two German missionaries in the province of Shantung, China, at the beginning of the month of October, 1897, a force of German marines landed at Kiao-Chau, on 16 October, 1897, in order to demand reparation. Having expelled the Chinese troops and strengthened their position, the Germans made a demand from the Chinese Government for an indemnity, for the degradation of the governor of Shantung, and for the granting of a coaling station to Germany. These demands, which were afterwards granted, were followed by the dispatch of a naval squadron and a strong military force from Germany to Kiao-Chau. In emulation of this move by Germany, Russia, upon the pretext of seeking for her ships *only* winter-quarters, having previously obtained China's consent, ordered her fleet to Port Arthur.

In January, 1899, it was announced that Germany had obtained Kiao-Chau and the contiguous territory from China on a lease of ninety-nine years, and that the Chinese Government had transferred all sovereign rights of the territory to the lessee. The construction of a dock and a fortified coaling station was at once begun by the Germans, and in the course of the year the port was declared to be free. Germany secured also the right to build railways that should connect Kiao-Chau, Tsi-nau-fu, and Ichow. Russia followed up her stay at Port Arthur with the demand that that port, Talien-wan, and the adjacent territories should be leased to her for the same term of years and under the same conditions as those which Kiao-

Chau had been leased to the Germans ; also that she should have the right to build a railway to connect these places with the main Trans-Siberian line. Of course, the Chinese Government granted these demands.

Then the French came, and the chief demands that they made were for the cession of a port at Kwang-Chau-wau, on the Sei-Chau peninsula, near Hainan, upon the same terms as those that were granted to Germany ; and for the assurance that no part of the provinces of Kwang-tung, Kwang-si, and Yun-nan should be alienated to another power.

The next applicant was Britain. Her demands, which are always very modest, were for the cession of the islands and waters of Wei-hai-Wei, when the Japanese occupancy should cease.

In strict accord with the law which the late Marquis of Salisbury so succinctly formulated, so ably expounded, and so zealously practised, in regard to the treatment of the dying nations, these four vivisectors plunged their scalpels into the "dying" carcass of China. But attending their vigorous initiative there was a contingency which, strange as the fact may appear, none of the eminent prosecutors had anticipated, and therefore had provided against ; it was the possibility of their anatomical assaults being resisted by the patient. Well, China did resist, as it was her duty to have done.

A movement, known as the Boxer movement, beginning in 1900, particularly in the north, spread itself with terrible fury, until, with the exception of the southern provinces, it had covered the entire empire. Anti-foreign in character, it killed native Christians, murdered missionaries, destroyed property, slew the Chancellor of the Japanese Legation and the German minister, isolated the capital by destroying the means of communication that connected it with the outer world ; besieged and bombarded the foreign legations, and threatened to exterminate from the country all that was exotic.

In the provinces of Chi-lu, Shantung, Shan-Si, Honan, and Che-Kiang alone, ninety-four missionaries were reported to have been massacred ; of these, forty were women and twenty-five were children. Seventy-eight adults and seventeen children were reported to have been missing. Besides there are details to show that tortures of the most reprehensible kind had accompanied some of these massacres.



An international force of English, French, Germans, Americans, Russians, Japanese, Austrians, and Italians, and consisting of 20,100 men, was dispatched during the following year (1901) to relieve the legations. In a sermon that was preached by a great and versatile ruler, when his contingent was on the eve of departing for China, there occurred these words: "Once again has the heathen spirit of the Amalekites been raised in distant Asia. With great power, much cunning, with destruction and murder, it will dispute the way to European trade and European culture, will dispute the victorious march of Christian custom and Christian faith, and again is heard God's command, 'Choose us out men, and go out, and fight with Amalek.'" And the following was the marching order with which the contingent force went forth: "If you close with the enemy, know that quarter is not to be given, and that no prisoners are to be taken."

I will now proceed to the manner in which this mandate was executed, and for the description I shall draw from the splendid article of Dr. E. J. Dillon, which appeared in the "Contemporary Review" of 1901, vol. lxxix, p. 1. Splendid though it is in the richness, variety, exactness, and facility of its diction, yet to me the true grandeur of Dr. Dillon's article centres in the nobility of its sentiment. Here is a man who, after that Christendom had outlawed China, and with a vengeance as savage, though less excusable than that which China had meted out to it, had flung open against China the flood-gates of its deeply stirred, its unrestrained, and its resistless wrath, dared, in feeling and in utterance, in China and in Europe, to step out of the march of Christendom's jubilation at its action to China, and of its execration of China's action to it, to defend the right.

We begin with the system of looting that was practised upon the Chinese by the allied forces in China, a system which, strange to say, although harmless when compared with some of the other atrocities that were perpetrated, was the one which Christendom specially singled out for reprobation.

"The lawless looting, which the rules of war against barbarians were said to warrant, was continued until there was nothing left worth carrying off. And even then the practice was not everywhere forbidden. The Japanese were the first to stop it; and the Russians soon afterwards followed suit.

But then the Japs had netted very much more than their allies. They had gone about the work of plundering with the systematic thoroughness which crowned with success everything to which they set their hands during this war. Their countrymen who had resided in Pekin for years, and knew every nook and corner of it, pointed out all the lootworthy places to the newly arrived troops. The Mint and Treasury were among the first places visited. . . . Millions of easily-gotten taels are said to have thus found their way to Japan. But this was generally done in the heat of the combat, not when the fighting had wholly ceased and order was theoretically restored. So that technically, at all events, the Japs were not out of order."

"The looting which took place in the imperial apartments of the forbidden city was marked by a series of unrehearsed scenes of grim, Satanic humour, to which even a modern Hogarth could hardly do justice"—

"The civilians burst into the imperial chambers, despite the respectful request of the mandarins present ; but it was only, forsooth, to have a look or to take a photograph. Then they handled the furniture, but merely in order to ascertain the nature of the metals and the hardness of the wood. Then the drawers were pulled out and cases opened, just that they may glance at and admire the barbaric splendour of the Chinese court. And then there was a pause, during which the intruders looked less at the valuables and more at each other. One man would lift up a costly jade ornament or a fine piece of silver work, study it, glance furtively around, re-examine it with a blush, lay it down in a half-shamefaced, half-regretful way, and move on to another drawer. Then he would return to the first and begin these rites over again. One gentleman had only just turned his back for a second on a most artistic and ancient piece of jade work, and was coming back to—admire it once more, when he saw it in the side-pocket of another, who remarked, with a diplomatic euphemism : ' One cannot go without a *souvenir*.' That word *souvenir* was the formula which every one had been seeking for. Once found, they all breathed and plundered freely. Each one wanted a souvenir, and as there was little time to pick and choose, he took a number of articles home for inspection. The full tide of looting had now set in, and could no longer be stemmed, even by the sturdiest of those who were wont to

be 'honest in the daylight and virtuous in the presence of a crowd.' . . . Coolies carrying coals to steamers in Hong Kong could not be more expeditious than was this respectable gathering of military and civil officials in stowing away the most unwieldy vessels, images, and ornaments between their coats and their skins.

"It was very comical to see self-respecting individuals, their features serious and solemn, while their bodies were so monstrously mis-shapen that even as gargoyles they would have been impossible. One officer left with what many fancied must be a lady's *tournure*, expanded by the heat to alarming dimensions. His friends explained afterwards that the protuberance was caused by a magnificent vessel of old china, which he in some mysterious way secreted on his person."

The following is the conclusion of a letter to Professor Bruns in Tübingen by Professor Küttner (the head physician of a lazaretto that was owned by the Red Cross Society in China), and it is quoted by Dr. Dillon :—

"Many are going back home from China millionaires : a bold scoop into the pearl-treasures of the imperial palace of Pekin sufficed to compass this longed-for end."

Concerning the manner that the allies obtained labour, Dr. Dillon, adding to the last quotation, says :

"Human labour was obtained in the same unceremonious manner. I have seen a vulgar little ruffian in military uniform point a revolver at the head of a highly educated Chinaman, and call him off to do work as a scullion. I have known others to 'commandeer' food purchased in the Japanese quarter of Pekin for the sick of another district. In the course of time it became an established custom for all European institutions and individuals who had servants in their employ, or dependents under their protection, to give them a document in the nature of a passport. I have myself been present when documents of that kind were confidently proffered by Chinamen, and have seen ignorant and over-bearing soldiers tear the paper to bits, and drive the bearer of it home to drudge for themselves. Remedy there was none. And yet, while these enormities were being perpetrated in the European quarters of the capital, order reigned in the Japanese district. My own servant, when coming home with fruit one day, was seized in

this off-hand manner by two soldiers, and was being carried off when I met and released him."

Dwelling upon the same subject in another part of his article, Dr. Dillon continues :—

" To realize the semianarchical state of things that prevailed in the occupied cities is difficult for those who have not witnessed its dire and grotesque effects. Any foreigner, however lowly or brutal, had but to go out into the streets and say to any Chinaman, ' Come,' or merely to beckon to him, and he came. Then he was ordered to do any kind of rough work—or it might have been a crime, if the temporary slave-owner were so disposed—and the unwilling slave obeyed. If he lagged he could be struck, kicked, or wounded ; if disobedient, shot. I saw a very willing worker near Tungtschau being kicked black and blue by a soldier because, failing to grasp the meaning of his assailant's gestures, he did not start off in hot pursuit of a horse or mule that had wandered off an hour before.

" One could read painful eagerness to divine and obey in the usually stolid face of the native, and blind passion in the features of the Asiatic tormentor. Absolute power of life and death over a fellow-creature is always demoralizing ; conferred upon a boor, it is no better than a razor in the hands of a madman. Down in the deepest folds of some characters which, in ordinary life, seem only moderately egotistical, lie germs of that pure malignity which delight in human pain.

" After the massacre of ' the 300 of Taku ' "—this massacre will be referred to presently in more detail—" coolies did not flock eagerly or in numbers to the European employers. So the Europeans went out into the highways and byeways, and drove before them every able and frail-bodied man whom they met, forcing them to serve as coolies, and perform the most exhausting, protracted, and dangerous open-air work that can be imagined. The boats were mostly heavily freighted ; the stream abounds in shallows, zigzags, no-thoroughfares, and strong currents ; the banks are so high that the human draught-horses have sometimes to trudge in the mud up to their waists, or to walk for hours in pestiferous water. In periods of peace this work is done by regular coolies—a set of men who, if given sufficient time, will, by the action of the law of adaptation, lose their souls for lack of use. But during the ' war ' any one who was caught was bound to serve. Fancy the feelings of an English barrister, *U.S.* man,

officer, or official, if he were suddenly surrounded by a gang of armed Chinamen, and obliged to choose between work of this kind and instant death! That was what sometimes happened to the Chinese.

"The work was all the more arduous that there were not enough coolies to each boat, so that a few men had to perform the task of many. One very heavy barge was dragged by five, two of whom ought to have been at school, and one in the asylum for the old and infirm. The ages of the men pressed into the service varied from seven to seventy. Tugging manfully away at one boat, I noticed a gang of four, of whom one was a boy of twelve, his face horribly twisted by nature and wrenched awry by disease; while another was a shrunken, shrivelled-up old man, whose grave was yawning to receive him. Distasteful to them as was this service into which they had been driven, the coolies exerted themselves as no other men in Europe or the world could or would, and seldom did they need the stroke of the stick or bough which was the soldiers' way of reminding them of the necessity of haste.

"The higher the boats moved upwards on the river, the more difficult grew the work of towing. They were once kept at it from 2.30 a.m. until 12.30 a.m., with one hour's official rest during the twenty-two hours. Then they got two hours for sleep, and those who had not fled were up again and working. With a blue rag round their loins, or quite naked and unashamed, they waded for hours in the river or floundered about the mud, the fierce rays of the sun playing upon their bare backs, on which the soldiers had often left blue welts or red, raw wounds. Their woes were countless. They were continually in danger of drowning, for many of them could not swim a stroke. They were ever getting cut or hurt. If disabled, they were left stranded in a swamp or a heap of ruins, where they were put to death by the Boxers for helping the invaders."

From looting and forced labour, our progress through these heart-rending tragedies has now brought us to that of massacre. At this third stage there will be found some of the fruits of the bellicose sermon with which the Christian monarch despatched his troops to China, and from his laconic command, "Take no prisoners, give no quarter," dreadful echoes will be heard. At this stage, too, there appears a fact which we shall have further opportunity of observing, namely,

the indifference, if not the contempt, in which human life is held by the colourless race, when that human life happens to be tabernacled in a body that is coloured. I commence with the extract from a letter that a German marine had written home, and that Dr. Dillon culled from the Frankfurter "Kurier" :—

"With the Chinese whom we encounter without arms we don't stand on ceremony. They have got to toil hard; if any of them won't, he is at once riddled; less by us than by the Russians and the Japanese, who do the thing wholesale. No prisoners are taken. 'That is to say, if any are made, they are at once shot down when the battle is over. . . .'"

"If you close with the enemy, know that quarter is not to be given, and that no prisoners are to be taken." Therefore this singularly humane mandate of a pious, Christian ruler has been literally fulfilled.

"At first the butt ends of rifles helped us considerably, but they broke off easily in the case of the '98 rifle, so that the bayonet took their place. It was terrible to see, and one almost felt pity; but when one reflected on the treatment which these fellows would have doled out to us if they once got the whip-hand of us, that thought kept down any such feeling."

The following excerpt which appeared in an English daily paper is of the same purport as the above :—

'A sample of the brutality of the war in China is furnished by a Pekin correspondent. The Germans attacked a town which was said to be full of Boxers and Chinese Imperial troops. No quarter was given, and five hundred Chinese were killed. Only one casualty was reported by the Europeans.'

Dr. Dillon then continues :—

"One day a body of Chinamen insulted a soldier of another nationality. The offence may have been real or imaginary: my own belief, based upon the statements of the man himself, is that the jostling he resented was accidental. Thirty jaded workmen walking home and chattering together are more liable to elbow a passer-by, without intending to hurt his feelings or provoke his anger, than an individual alone."

how, the soldier held that they had deliberately offended him, and he resolved to make them rue it. He kept abreast of the gang until they met some Japanese, and these he asked to arrest the natives and bring them before his commander.

"I knew the commander, who told me afterwards that he would have frightened the prisoners, condemned a few to some light punishment, and set them all free; but he never had it in his power to be so merciful. On the way to their headquarters the Japs were accosted by soldiers of another nation, who inquired what was wrong, and, having heard the story, exclaimed :

" 'Leave the matter to us. We will deal with the ruffians. We'll answer for it that there will be no further complaints about them.' The Japs, unwilling to make enemies for so little, yielded with grace, and the prisoners walked on unconcerned and smiling as before. That was a constant feature in executions : the men seldom knew whether they were being driven to work or to die, and sometimes were not even aware that the matter was open to doubt. But when in position to be shot, their horror at their fate, but hardly perhaps the heinousness of their crime, dawned on them, and some of their number fell upon their faces and pleaded for mercy in unintelligible words and pathetic gestures. They were clutched by their queues and hauled back into position, where they remained quiet. Then," says my informant, "there was a loud volley; I saw blue pants staggering and falling down. One man spun round like a spinning-top, others wriggled for a time on the ground. The whole thing was over in a very few minutes."

Dr. Dillon thus comments on the subject :—

"It was certainly unwise and provoking on the part of the natives to hustle a foreign soldier in the street; and nobody would have grudged them meet punishment for the offence if done intentionally. It may even have been the proper course to shoot them, one and all, as if the act were the outcome of a conspiracy. Those are points which I cannot discuss. What seems deplorable is the eagerness of Christian men to take the lives of their fellows."

Of the slaughter that has been alluded to already of the three hundred Chinese coolies in cold blood, Dr. Dillon has this to say :—

“The story has been often told since then, not merely in the north, but throughout the length and breadth of China. The leading facts, as narrated on the spot, are these. Some three hundred hard-working coolies eked out a very cheerless existence by loading and unloading the steamers of all nations which touched Taku. For the convenience of both sides, they all cooped themselves up in one boat, which served them as a permanent dwelling. When times were slack they were huddled together there like herrings in a barrel, and when work was brisk they toiled and moiled like galley slaves.

“Thus they managed to get along, doing harm to no man, and good to many. The attack of the foreign troops upon Taku was the beginning of their end. Hearing one day the sharp reports of rifle shots, this peaceable and useful community was panic-stricken. In order to save their dreary lives they determined to go ashore. Strong in their weakness, and trusting in their character of working men who abhorred war, they steered their boat landwards. In an evil hour they were espied by the Russian troops, who at that time had orders, it is said, to slay every human being who wore a pigtail. Each of the three hundred defenceless coolies at once became a target for Muscovite bullets. It must have been a sickening sight when it was done. But it was not on that sentimental ground that the Chinese felt indignant at it; they stigmatized it as an act of cruel injustice. It was also utterly useless.”

‘It may be right to give no quarter to your enemies in battle,’ “some of them said to me, when talking the matter over,” “to us that appears to be a rule which only warped minds would lay down, and none but savages would follow. But in military matters we are behind the times, and may be wrong. Still, even if it be advisable to shoot down your enemies in battle without mercy, does it not behove you at least to see that they are your enemies, and that you and they are in battle?’

‘Those coolies were no man’s enemies, and they stood in greater fear of a skirmish than a hare does of the hunting hound. The troops know that that is so. They were poor, unenviable wretches, wildly holding on to the last rung of life’s ladder, and whose deaths would be mourned by no man. The only people who ever missed them have been sea-captains, who could not get their work done at the bar. Why butcher them? They could inflict no harm upon Europe, and would not if they could. Their lives were spent in working ~~in~~ the



foreigner. Kill the Boxers, shoot down the Imperial troops, and hang all who have abetted either, if wholesale slaughter be helpful to you, but why slaughter the innocent as Europe has done?'

Before quitting this branch of a truly distressing subject, let us turn to one more scene :—

"I have lived," says Dr. Dillon, "for twelve or thirteen days on that foul river" (the river Pei-ho), "and never was I more profoundly impressed than by what I saw in its waters and on its banks. The first day after I had left Tientsin I was towed by untiring coolies through a land thickly studded over with what had once been human dwellings, but were now high heaps of smouldering rubbish.

"Here and there a gorgeous door remained standing, one of the silent witnesses to the thriving community which had lived here and died. Many a signboard and placard was still intact, and there was a touch of terrible humour in the singing-hall poster which I saw on the entrance to a maze of ruins, for it might have just been stuck up, so fresh and bright were its colours and illustrations. Beside the door sat a human form with leaden eyes bulging out from their orbits, and a few houses lower down loomed a large inscription: 'Perpetual peace.'

"We were traversing an improvised city of the dead. One dwelling, which had the appearance of wholeness, aroused my curiosity, and utilizing the time afforded me by the snapping asunder of the tow-rope, I jumped ashore and entered it. It had been gutted. Everything within had been destroyed except in one room. There the stale remains of a frugal meal were still recognizable, but on the ground, beside two stools, lay a man and the woman who should have shared it. They were horribly slashed up; their chop-sticks lay at their feet. In the courtyard was a little child, its hair done up in four plaits, interwoven with red ribbon, its head crusted with black, clotted blood, and shrouded by a swarm of flies. Nor was this by any means the only scene of the kind. And yet throughout this weird necropolis there had lately been heard the sounds of laughter and weeping, the lisping of innocent children, the articulate joy of mothers and fathers! In the twinkling of an eye it had been transformed, and fathers, sons, daughters, and mothers now lay hidden in the ~~mid~~ <sup>mid</sup>, covered with matting, buried in the rubbish, or

floating down the river. A wave of death and desolation had swept over the land, washing away the vestiges of Chinese culture. Men, women, boys, girls, and babes in arms had been shot, stabbed, and hewn to bits in this labyrinth of streets, and now, on both banks of the river, reigned the peace described by Tacitus. In the trees of the deserted tea-gardens, and in the great weeping willows by the way, no solitary song-bird relieved the eerie silence ; the bats alone flitted about the dusky air, and ungainly carrion birds circled around with funeral clang of wings."

And now we have reached the sum and the summit of these iniquities, for we are to refer to the abuse of helpless and unoffending women. Having told us that the Japanese were wont to have notices posted upon the doors of the houses of those Chinese citizens who had been loyal to the allied forces, with the instruction "not to molest the inmates who are good, loyal people," and having narrated how one day in a house of one of these so-called protected people, he found a Chinaman, the father of the household, writhing in agony from the effects of a bullet that was lodged in his breast by a French soldier, Dr. Dillon goes on to say :—

"In the spacious courtyard of another house the whole family, all females, were upon their knees when we arrived, striking the ground with their foreheads, in our honour, their faces colourless almost to transparency, their bodies suggestive of breath-lacking skeletons. Mother, sister, and three daughters knelt on the stones like victims awaiting their turn to be strangled or beheaded. They looked as if they had gone without food for a week. I felt ashamed of having come hither and made these piteous creatures *kotow* to us, whom they must inwardly loathe and hate. The way they smiled upon us was itself full of pathos. I was about to say so to my comrades, when the mother noticed that her youngest, a girl of three or four, had boldly stood up, and with the fearlessness of childhood was staring defiantly at us. Horrified at this dangerous folly, she pressed her forcibly on to her knees, and caused the tender little head to strike the stones ungently. One of us rushed across the yard to save the child from further violence, but the mother, mistaking his intention, barred his way with her prostrate body, and piteously craved for mercy. 'What in Heaven's name is this?' I exclaimed one day, thumping with my knuckles a very big black box in

the house of a rich man, who may have then been in Abraham's bosom or in Dives' company. The house was in Tungtschau, and a torturing stench proceeded from it. 'It is the girls, sir, three girls,' answered my attendant, who was a European. 'Their corpses are lying in the box there,' he explained. 'Who put it there?' 'Some officers.' 'Are you quite sure of it?' 'Yes, sir; I was here when it was being done.' 'Did you see the young women yourself?' 'I did. They were the daughters of the man who owns the house. The officers raped them, and then had them stabbed with bayonets. When they were dead they were put into this box, and it was covered up, as you see.' 'Good God, what a dismal state of things we are come to.' 'That sort of thing happened before, sir. Very often, too, I can tell you. There were worse cases than this. These here were raped and stabbed; others have been raped to death, and got no stabbing.'

But are we not told that the Chinese are the Amalekites of the East, and that these rapists are of the chosen people whom the Almighty has sent to chastise Amalek? As an associate, into what company is the Almighty brought!

"It is true that the characteristic traits of this international campaign, so far as Chinamen have felt its effects, have been bloodshed, rape, and rapine. Males and children have been killed, not always with merciful speed, and more than once they were half-killed and possibly buried alive—the soldiers' time being short and their victims many. I was told of one Chinaman who was shot along with several others, left for dead, shot a second time in the river, into which he had flung himself on regaining consciousness, and found next day on the opposite bank of the Pei-ho with about a dozen ugly wounds bandaged, and in process of healing.

"The officer, who then blew the man's brains out, told me the story, which his companions confirmed. Females of all ages have been abused to death. The circumstantial tales told of the dishonouring of wives, girls, children, in Tientsin, Tungtschau, Peking, are such as should in normal being kindle some sparks of indignation, without the aid of 'sickly sentimentality.' Surely one needs not to be Puritanical or hysterical to condemn the wholesale ravishing, sometimes to death, of terrified females between the ages of six and sixty by ~~clod~~ hopping, brutish soldiers, who misrepresent alike

Christianity and civilization. I know well a man whose wife had been dealt with in this manner, and then killed along with her child. He was one of the 'good, loyal people,' who were on excellent terms with the Christians; but if ever he gets a chance of wreaking vengeance upon the foreigners he will not lightly let it slip.

"I know of others whose wives and daughters hanged themselves on trees or drowned themselves in garden-wells, in order to escape a much worse lot. Chinese women honestly believed that no more terrible fate could overtake them than to fall alive into the hands of Europeans and Christians. And it is to be feared that they were right. Buddhism and Confucianism have their martyrs to chastity, whose heroic feats no martyr eulogy will ever record. Some of those obscure, but right-minded girls and women hurled themselves into the river, and, finding only three feet of water there, kept their heads under the surface until death had set his seal on the sacrifice of their lives. This suicidal frenzy was catching. It sometimes spread like wild-fire, and the military authorities felt bound to stop it by force. A number of soldiers, possibly with one or other of the would-be criminals among them, were sent to the rescue. And they succeeded in saving the lives of many. But they complained that some of the women were doggedly resolved to die. In the water they offered a strong and often successful resistance to the efforts of their would-be saviours. Some having been taken out of the river safe and sound, plunged in a second time, and found a merciful end. I have spoken to some of the men who took part in the work of rescuing those faithful wives and modest daughters, and they extolled their heroism to the skies.

"But a large number of ill-starred women fell alive into the hands of the allied troops. I saw some of them in Peking and Tungtschau, but already dead, with frightful gashes in the breast, or skulls smashed in, and one with a horribly mutilated body. There is a lady missionary in Peking who, in company with a female colleague, busied herself, to my knowledge, for months in shielding Chinese women and girls from being raped by Christian and European soldiers, and the work was anything but easy, though I have reason to believe that it proved eminently successful. Even in broad daylight soldiers hung about the Refuge, and employed various devices and tricks to get hold of the women whom they ought to have been the first to protect."

Here is a people, sedulously eschewing the intercourse and society of other peoples; a people preferring a life of seclusion; and cherishing towards others a feeling of contemptuous disregard; this people, however, at the cannon's mouth, is forced into the arena of international commerce and politics, in order that it may take up the obligations and the responsibilities of these pursuits. Of the compact into which this Chinese people was thus forced there have been the two following results: the compulsion to import and consume a highly deleterious drug; and to receive the propagators of a foreign faith, a faith of which the heralds enjoy the patronage and the prestige of the powerful states to which they severally belong. In process of time this people is a belligerent in a momentous struggle.

Shorn of some part of its territory, and weighted with the huge indemnity of 100,000,000 taels, it emerges from the struggle. And smarting under the triple irritant of defeat, debt, and loss, the murder of two missionaries in its dominions, missionaries of whom the very nature of their calling implies sacrifice, and that not excluding life itself, is committed. But the murder of these two missionaries is made the pretext, not only for demanding compensation from the Chinese Government for the loss of their lives—a demand which had been lawful—but it is made the pretext for demanding also territorial and other concessions. The cupidity of other nations being aroused by the granting of these concessions to one of their number, first one, then another, a third, and then a fourth, each one being backed by an armed force, demands of the concessionist a like treatment.

Now, what country is there in the West that would not have risen in insurrection if circumstanced as were the Chinese, and if provoked as they were? The Government of China is said to have connived at the Boxer movement. But no doubt that which concerning the East is stigmatized as treachery or connivance had been characterized concerning the West as compliance with the national sentiments. In murdering innocent and defenceless persons, including women and even children, and intensifying their agonies by the pangs of torture, the conduct of the Chinese most assuredly deserves the strongest reprobation; and to the extent that the Chinese Government may have directly or indirectly contributed to

these outrages, it incurred thereby a very grave responsibility. But concerning these massacres of Europeans, on the other hand, can Europe herself be acquitted of all responsibility? Europe, which in the recklessness of her maniacal craving for concessions has outraged every sentiment of the patriotism of China, can she be acquitted of all responsibility?

And how has Europe visited these misdeeds of China—misdeeds for which she herself is so largely responsible? By imposing upon China an indemnity of 450,000,000 Hai-Kuan taels. But, as is shown by the extracts from Dr. Dillon's able and outspoken article, even this crushing indemnity is the least part of the overwhelming load which Europe, the aggressor, after goading China to deeds of violence by her insatiable and grasping greed, has as a punishment for those deeds of violence, imposed upon China.

For, in addition to this awful sum of 450,000,000 taels that are exacted for crimes of which she was herself directly the cause, Europe laid upon China the abuses of rape, murder, and rapine. Thus, according to the evidence that is before us, what charges have we to make against this coloured and heathen state? The charges of murder and pillage. But about these crimes are there no extenuating circumstances? For we have seen in the first place that China, because of the reverses she had sustained in a great war, because of the loss of territory she encountered, and because of the imposition upon her of a burdensome indemnity, was at least in an irascible mood. That she was in the position of one who, having on his person great treasure, enters into combat with another, and is worsted in the fight. Mortified at his defeat, and much bruised in his body, he is set upon by members of the crowd that had been watching the *mêlée*; the assailants are resolved upon securing his property. Thereupon, summoning the whole force of his remaining strength, the man meets the attack of his new adversaries with the violence of a savage impetuosity. But who will deny that in his defence against this counter-attack there was in this man's case extenuating circumstances? Similarly, who will deny that when China, brooding over her defeat by Japan, is attacked on every side by European states, in order to despoil her of her territory, she meets her assailants with the vengeance that she deals out to them, there are in her crime extenuating circumstances?

Therefore, with the charges of murder, with torture, and of rapine that is made against this yellow, self-governing, and independent state, there are extenuating circumstances. Now what about the white states? Against these white states charges are also preferred—charges of murder, with torture, and of rapine. Are these all? No! What other charge is there? The charge of rape. According to the evidence, wives have been raped, daughters have been raped, children have been raped—their ages extending from six to sixty. Some were raped and then stabbed; others were raped to death, and this terminus of infamy was reached by officers of the allied forces as well as by the common soldier. To these crimes are there any extenuating circumstances? No! but there are aggravating circumstances—aggravating circumstances in which China, as the wealthy man, who having entered into combat with another, is beaten by his opponent; and the helpless condition of whom the bystanders perceiving they attack him to secure his goods. Thus, balancing the crimes of this yellow and heathen state—the crimes of murder, with torture, and of rapine, but with extenuating circumstances, with the crimes of the white and Christian states—the crimes of murder, with torture, of rapine and of rape, without extenuating circumstances—which is the greater? And so which section is the more immoral, the yellow or the white? And if we take this case as typifying the characteristic relation between white states and coloured, independent and self-governing, but weak states, could it be inferred that as far as this division of the coloured races are concerned, the colourless race shows itself to be more moral than the coloured races?

China, then, outlines the character of the acts of which the colourless race is capable toward coloured states that are wholly independent. Those acts are territorial plunder, and the punishment of the plundered one if he should resist. The punishment including a huge indemnity, murder with torture, and rape and rapine. And of the Cecilian law of the cutting up of dying nations, this is the interpretation.

### III

## Britain Eliminating the "Unfit," or The Manner Coloured British Subjects are brought into the Empire

#### KANO AND SOKOTO

FROM the example of the Cecilian law of the "cutting up of the dying nations by the living nations," we pass to those of the Rhodesian law, of the hurling of the "unfit" to the wall. This Rhodesian law will be considered under two main divisions: I. The manner coloured British subjects are brought into the Empire; II. The manner coloured British subjects are treated within the Empire. And the second head will be discussed under three subdivisions: (a) Certain popular fallacies; (b) Political and economic conditions of coloured British subjects; (c) Social conditions of coloured British subjects. As has been intimated, we begin the consideration of the first division of the subject with the Protectorates of Kano and Sokoto, or Northern Nigeria, of which they form a part. And by way of preface I present the following tabulation as the category in which Kano and Sokoto appear. Now, as well as in the past, war, or what is more mildly or evasively called "punitive expedition," is the chief gate through which coloured peoples pass into the British Empire. And as indicating how frequently the passage is made by these peoples, I will append here a list—an imperfect list, however—of wars that have been waged against them from the middle of the last decade only:—

Chitral . . . . .	1895	Matabeleland . . . . .	1896
Ashanti . . . . .	1895-6	Mashonaland . . . . .	1897
Sudan . . . . .	1896-9	North West Frontier	
Ashanti . . . . .	1900	of India . . . . .	1897-8



In 1901 there were also the following "punitive expeditions": Northern Nigeria, the Kontagora and Bida expeditions, the Fawari and the Yola expeditions. In Southern Nigeria in that year there was an expedition to Benin City. Also there have been similar operations in Somaliland and Uganda. And besides these, such names as Hazara, Manipur, Tokar, Tushai, and Tirah likewise recall other expeditions of the last decade; the present decade has also witnessed the Aros, the Mahsudo, the Sokoto, and Kano expeditions, and the last two have occurred with frequent repetitions.

News reached this country in the earlier part of 1903 concerning the "capture of Kano" and the "fall of Sokoto." Details of the battles that ended in the capture of Kano are that the expedition under the Lieutenant-Colonel Morland, having left the advanced posts of Zaria on the 29th January, 1903, came into touch with the enemy's cavalry a few miles from the walled town of Faki, between Zaria and Kano, on the 1st of February, the enemy being pursued by the mounted infantry, made for the gates of the town, which on entering, it shut, and then manned the walls. The British troops awaited the arrivals of its main column, and in the meantime a force of mounted infantry, under Captain Porter, was ordered to guard the gates. Colonel Morland, who arrived soon after, sought in vain to induce the people to lay down their arms. The King had vowed that to any one who should enter the town the penalty would be death.

The guns of the invading force were brought up, and their fire was directed upon the main gate. This barrier being partially destroyed, a storming party, which was armed with axes, and that was led by Captain Mackey, was now ordered to force its way through the remains of the gate; and to occupy a high rock inside that overlooked the town. This was successfully accomplished. On their entrance into the town the storming party discovered that the King and three of his chiefs—who had evidently been standing just inside at the gate, in order to bar the access to the British—had been killed by a shell that had penetrated the gate. Stricken with terror at the bursting of the shell, and at its fatal issue upon the King and chiefs, the defenders, forsaking their position upon the wall, had fled away. A force of sixty cavalry also, dashing out by another gate, although pursued

by the mounted infantry, effected its escape. On the side of the British, Lieutenant Wright, of the mounted infantry, was wounded, whereas of the enemy, thirty were slain. Fighting having now ceased, the town was put in charge of the surviving chiefs.

This town of Faki having been secured, the progress to Kano was continued. After a march of eighteen miles, the first halt was made; the British encamping in a strong position six miles from Kano. During this advance the cavalry of the Emir was falling back upon the city. At six o'clock on the following morning Colonel Morland, having left the carriers (seventy-six men) and a maxim, in charge of Captain Hall, in a zareba, which was practically impregnable, quitted the camp. Two hours later, he brought his column to within eight hundred yards of the walls of Kano. A few shots had been exchanged between the scouts of both sides. The loopholed walls, nearly forty feet high, had been strengthened, and were now strongly held. The column was greeted with the fluttering banners of the enemy, and with the volleys of its rifles and guns. On the British side, at a range of four hundred yards, the maxim was placed in position, and four guns were brought into position, against the main gate. But after an hour's engagement the gate was still intact; and the walls, which were forty feet thick at their base, and four feet thick at the loopholes, were still impervious to the charges of the seventy-five millimetre guns. Accordingly, another gate was chosen for attack, a force being left at the main gate to hold the defenders in check. After a bombardment had been kept up for some time at the second gate, a breach into it was eventually made, and a storming party, under Lieutenants Dyer and Gascogne, was ordered to carry it by assault. In the rear of this force, a party which Captain Farquhar led was carrying axes, scaling ladders, etc.

At the sound of the charge by the massed buglers, the whole party—in the rain of a heavy fire from the defenders on the wall—advanced upon the gate and effected an entrance. As Lieutenant Dyer, the head of the storming party, passed through the gate, the enemy forsook the wall. A force of cavalry and several hundred footmen that had been stationed inside the city made their escape. The guns of the invaders had meanwhile been passed through the gate,

thereby the whole of the invading force started in pursuit of the fleeing foe. A force of the fleeing cavalry had reformed, as if they intended to charge, but upon the pouring of some shrapnel into their midst they broke up and fled in disorder. The slain of this battle was some two hundred of the enemy's horsemen.

The part of the enemy that was still holding the main gate now abandoned the post; but it took the British twenty minutes to make an entrance through it. Inside, between the wall and the city proper, there is an intervening space of two miles, and Colonel Morland resolved that any fighting which might yet remain should be confined to that zone.

When the inhabited portion of the city was reached the troops, expecting another attack, were prepared for action. But as there was no sign of further opposition, Colonel Morland marched to, and occupied, the King's palace. This royal residence, which covered fifty acres of ground, was found to be a strong fort that was enclosed by a high wall. With a thousand of his cavalry the King had fled to Sokoto, on the 2nd of January, but he had commanded that his leading officers whom he left behind should fight to the death. And the officer to whose charge the King had committed his armoury died at his post. All the soldiers and carriers of the invading force were quartered at the palace. The fighting force of the enemy had included eight hundred cavalry and five thousand infantry; of these three hundred were killed. The British captured eighty horses, several rifles, three British carbines, several hundred guns, and a large quantity of powder and cartridges.

Concerning the fall of Sokoto, the following are among the facts that are reported. Colonel Morland, the leader of the British force, on reaching the ridge upon the following morning, after their night's encampment five miles from Sokoto, formed square, and moved down into the valley, wherein lies the city. The ground, cut up in the valley by the enclosures of cultivated fields, and intersected by sluggish streams, and the road sentinelled by hedgerows on either side, encumbered the advance. The moment that the enemy, which occupied the opposite slope and which numbered six thousand horsemen and footmen, espied the British appearing

over the ridge, they began to move downward in the direction of the square.

Apparently without any generally recognized leader, they galloped on in isolated and independent bands, till they were well within range of the withering fire of the maxims. And so desperate was their valour, that in not a few cases, on being shot down they rose again to their knees, crawled to within a few yards only of the square, attempted to renew the charge, until with gleaming eyes, and amid despairing cries to "Allah," exhausted by their repeated wounds, they fell dead. The first of these rushes was repulsed, and the square advanced, but with considerable difficulty; for the ground was rough, and the mounted infantry of the enemy hovered on either flank. By this time the enemy's cavalry was well engaged. Proceeding down the slope, the square now came under fire of the Sokoto riflemen. They were armed with modern rifles of small bore, and were supplied with smokeless powder. Having driven off the sharpshooters, the square resumed its advance, and continued on its way until the mass of the enemy, in full view, appeared on the plateau.

At this point the maxims and other guns were ordered by Colonel Morland to open fire, and as the enemy did not attempt to make a combined charge, the invading force proceeded towards the city gates. Five hundred yards away there was floating a great white flag—the ensign of the Emir. Around this emblem there were grouped "the chief of the Sokoto force." By this time the fire from the square had done its work, having broken up the main body of the enemy, which was now scattered in all directions, a remnant only remaining about the flag. These brave Moslems, brandishing their weapons, and crying "Allah! Allah!" refused to give way to the storm of deadly bullets that were falling about them. Now and again an individual, heedless of the calls to surrender, and of the offers of quarter, rushed forth upon the square, but only to fall, a few feet from the guns, a lifeless corpse.

Swept down at last by the hail of bullets, the dead bodies of these heroes defending to the very end their ruler's and their country's flag, were found enshrouded in its folds. Meanwhile, the enemy's horsemen fled in all directions, some having even got round to the rear of the British force, and were

attacking the guards of the baggage camp. But they were being hotly pursued by the mounted infantry of the invader. The square followed the mounted infantry around the walls of the city; and after an engagement with the enemy, which lasted two hours and a half, they halted for breakfast. Finally, by a company which Colonel Morland had sent to reconnoitre it, the city was found to be quite deserted. Thereupon the British troops marched through the gates and took possession of Sokoto. And as an example of the reign of terror whereof this region has been the unhappy object from the time onwards that Kano and Sokoto were conquered, I submit the following excerpt from the correspondence of the daily press, relating, let it be remembered, to the events of a single year only. The writer proceeds:—

“ May I direct your attention to the ‘ London Gazette ’ of 25 August, which gives an ample history of the administration of Nigeria during 1903-4? It is estimated that no less than 150 native towns and villages were destroyed in about two years by various expeditions sent out by British authorities to collect taxes and to ‘ open the country up to trade,’ and to punish the natives for various offences. Enormous quantities of native cattle were seized and carried off, and other native goods were also confiscated! Maxim guns and seven-pounders and modern rifles were, of course, the weapons used to bring the natives to a sense of what civilization expects of them, and, on a low estimate, eight or ten thousand natives at least must have been killed or wounded. This is how we are administering our native territories in Nigeria . . .

“ By all means, let us attack wrongdoing wherever it shows its head, but let us not pass over such horrible wrongdoing under our own rule, and salve our consciences by denouncing the wrongdoing of our neighbours. Why is it that no British missionary in Nigeria is raising his voice in the British Press against these evils? Surely we need a Nigeria ‘ Reform Society ’ as well as Congo ‘ Reform Society.’ Or is it because we want to draw attention from these evils at our own doors that some of our own countrymen are so very prominent in denouncing similar evils elsewhere? ”

Now, behind the recital of the movements and incidents that attended the capture of these two native Mohammedan

states there lies the all-important question, Why has England slain these hundreds of people, and incorporated their territories with the British Empire? To this question I furnish the official reason which has been assigned. In the correspondence that passed between the Colonial Office and His Majesty's High Commissioner of Northern Nigeria, Sir F. J. D. Lugard, which was published in February, 1903, and which deals with the whole subject, the High Commissioner gave this as his reason for recommending expeditionary measures against the states of Kano and Sokoto. That reports had reached him that the Sultan of Sokoto and the Emir of Kano were unfriendly towards the British; and that himself had perceived certain signs of the unfriendliness that was alleged. That "in these circumstances it became necessary to reinforce the garrison at Zaria, so that it should be able under any circumstances to hold its own." But that this precautionary measure was at once construed by the people "into preparations for war, and that throughout the whole Protectorate it is now the universal belief among native chiefs that an immediate advance on Kano is intended. The Emir, on his part," the dispatch continues, "responded (I am informed) by reducing the taxes on the people, so as to gain popularity, and is making all preparations; in such circumstances it is impossible to draw back. The whole country would proclaim that we had feared the issue, and in my belief Kano, with a large access of strength from waverers, would advance to attack us, while our supposed fear might give occasion for risings elsewhere in the whole Protectorate."

This is the primary reason that is given by Sir F. Lugard for urging upon His Majesty's Government the necessity for undertaking an expedition against Kano and Sokoto. The subsidiary reasons that were put forth were slave-raiding, interference with the course of trade, and that the Anglo-French Commission may be enabled to proceed with its duties.

Commencing with the first and chief of these reasons, what does it resolve itself into? This, that if one state rightly or wrongly suspect another state of entertaining warlike designs against it, the state that is suspected is bound in honour to attack the state by which it is suspected, lest that by failing to do so it should be accused of cowardice:

But in Europe is this the principle that is practised between the several states? If one European state which I will call X hear that another European state which I will call Y is preparing to attack it, and X, acting upon that information, make ready to defend itself, even if X were mistaken, would Y be justified in declaring war against X, and in seizing it? Would it be thought justifiable upon the ground that since X suspected Y of warlike intentions, if Y did not fight X it would be considered cowardly?

I venture to say that this is not the principle that is followed by European states towards each other, and that if one European state were to practise this principle against another its action would be severely condemned by all other civilized states. For it would be thought that Y's obvious duty was to have sought an explanation from X of the reason that he was arming. If this be so, then England's action in making war upon these native Mohammedan states deserves severe condemnation. For these states, not less than European states, have rights, and their rights are as sacred as are the rights of European states.

But respecting the unfriendliness of the Sultan of Sokoto and of the Emir of Kano towards the British, Sir Frederick Lugard tells us that "reports had reached him," and that he himself "had perceived signs." These reports and these signs may have meant much, or they may have meant little. But whether much or little, they led to a definite and important act. They led to the reinforcement of the garrison at Zaria. Therefore, unlike the "report" that Sir F. Lugard had heard, and "signs" that he had perceived, there was this patent and concrete act. But strange to say, that after these abstract "reports" and "signs" had led Sir Frederick Lugard to the concrete precautionary measure of reinforcing the Zaria garrison, when his concrete precautionary act led the Sultan of Sokoto to a similar precautionary measure, if he really did take such a measure, concerning his dominions, the Sultan's act, although the direct outcome of the prior act of Sir Frederick Lugard, was regarded by Sir Frederick Lugard as a menace to British authority, and as a cause for war. Could anything more unjust be conceived?

But the feebleness of this really feeble pretext for slaughtering these brave Nigerians is further increased, if possible, by

the probable inaccuracy of the "reports" that accused the late rulers of Kano and Sokoto of unfriendliness towards the British; reports, however, upon which the resolution of the High Commissioner to proceed to extremities with these states was chiefly founded. That these reports were probably inaccurate is borne out by statements which the High Commissioner himself has made, statements such as this: "The reports which reach us are so unreliable that even those which seem best substantiated prove later to be mere fabrications." Yet it was upon reports of this very kind that Sir Frederick Lugard partly concluded that the rulers of Sokoto and Kano were enemies of the British; and it was upon such reports that he declared war against Kano and Sokoto.

But Sir Frederick Lugard states also that he himself had observed in the rulers of Kano and Sokoto signs of unfriendliness towards the British. And this leads me to inquire whether there were any cause other than that which is assigned (*viz.*, the prohibiting of slave-raiding, etc.) that was sufficient to account for the strained relations that were alleged to have existed between the Mohammedan states and the British authorities. I find that there was such a cause. It is indicated in the following question, which was put by Sir Charles Dilke in the House of Commons, on the 9th of December, 1902, to the Secretary of State for the Colonies:—

"I beg to ask the Postmaster-General, as representing the Secretary of State for the Colonies, whether he is aware that, by a treaty concluded in 1884, Mr. Joseph Thomson undertook on behalf of the Niger Company to pay to the Emir of Sokoto a sum of about £1500 a year; that the treaty was renewed in 1890 and in 1894; that the Emir of Sokoto in those treaties was made to acknowledge the Niger Company as representatives of His Majesty's Government, and that this country, being still in possession of the consideration transferred in these treaties, has ceased the yearly payment to the Emir of Sokoto, and is now contemplating an expedition in the direction of Sokoto; and whether, seeing that a military expedition is now being sent against Kano, described by the Secretary of State for the Colonies as the Manchester of Africa, he will state what attempt has been made to remove by friendly negotiations the causes of difference between the Emir of Kano and His Majesty's Government?"



This interpellation, it will be observed, raises the question of breach of contract on the part of the British Government ; the sum involved is about £1500 per annum. Now is it not likely that the stoppage of this annual payment to the Emir would have made him cold towards the British ?

I do not hesitate to say that if the cordial relations that had existed between the British authorities and the Emir of Sokoto had become changed—the Emir appearing to be less friendly—his unfriendliness might very well have been due—if not entirely, yet chiefly—to the suppression of his allowance. Replying to the question which was put by Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Austen Chamberlain said : “ The yearly payment specified in the treaties referred to has not been made since the Royal Niger Company’s rights were transferred to the Crown, as the Sultan of Sokoto has always refused to recognize the transfer. Attempts have constantly been made by Sir Frederick Lugard to establish friendly relations both with him and with the Sultan of Kano, but hitherto without success,” etc.

To this question a flimsier reply could not possibly have been given. I am quite at a loss to understand why the Sultan of Sokoto should have entertained for the late Niger Company an affection so tender and profound—for it is only upon such an hypothesis that his alleged refusal “ to recognize the transfer ” appears to me to be intelligible—as to be unable to bring his mind into accepting His Majesty’s Government as a substitute for that company, even though the inability should involve to his revenue an annual loss of £1500.

But it is interesting to notice that in the correspondence which has been alluded to already as having passed between the Colonial Office and Sir Frederick Lugard there has been no mention whatever of the Sultan’s refusal “ to recognize the transfer,” whereas concerning the stoppage of his allowance, it appears that neither the Colonial Office, the late Niger Company, nor the High Commissioner could arrive at the manner wherein, or the reason wherefore, the allowance was stopped. So then, if the Sultan had been angry, there appear from these facts to have been strong grounds for his anger, and there appear also to have been strong reasons for such signs of displeasure as he might have shown towards His Majesty’s Government. Therefore, what should have

been done, even if it had been established—which it had not been—that the Sultan was preparing to attack the British, was to have first settled his lawful claim. For whereas the rumour of such an attack—of which, however, the truth appears to be opposed by facts—did not absolve His Majesty's Government from the obligation of the indebtedness, the settlement of the claim in all probability would have removed its chief cause. Hence it would have been easier to have adjusted afterwards such minor matters, for example, as that of slave-raiding.

But instead of this just and prudent course, the British representative at Northern Nigeria first violates an honourable compact ; and then, as if fearing the consequences of his misdeed, he hastens to reinforce his garrison. And when he learns from reports that are usually untrustworthy that his example of strengthening his forces as a precautionary measure was being followed by his dupe, upon the principle that if one should suspect you of wishing to fight, when you had not so intended, lest that you should be thought to be a coward, you must fight, he resolves to crush his dupe. The result being that hundreds of the wronged are slain, and their country incorporated with the British Empire. Has history ever recorded a greater wrong, a more stupendous injustice ?

But in this drama there has been another influence at work—an influence which, as a factor towards the Anglo-Sokoto and Kano conflicts must have had its due weight. In another connection I have had occasion to refer to this influence, and the following are some of its sentiments :—

“ Slowly and surely, and almost unnoticed in England, British civilization is extending itself northward towards the confines of the great Sahara. The great slave-traders of Bida, Kontagora, and Yola have fallen, and the influence of England has now extended as far as Zaria, only ninety miles from Kano. Here are installed Captain Abadie. . . . and two of my colleagues, Dr. Miller and Rev. G. P. Bargery are now, I hope, there in order to select a site for the mission. Soon they proceed another 150 miles north to Katsena, the University city of the Housa, never before visited by a white man, as far as I know, in order to continue their study. In this mission he has full support and sympathy of General Lugard.

"Whilst it will take two or three years to reap the full benefit of the removal of the notorious slave-raiders, I have alluded to, the improvement is already most marked. To the South of Zaria slavery in its worst forms is abolished, and everywhere people are gaining confidence in British administration. . . .

"The full effect of this on trade cannot show itself yet, but already considerable development has ensued. General Kembell's subjugation of Kontagora has had an immense effect, as it was a widespread idea among the people that the British would have the greatest difficulty with this chief, than whom no man was more dreaded in Housaland. His removal was a real deliverance to the people. . . . Up the Benue the downfall of Yola, over five hundred miles from Zaria, has proved of considerable importance in the interest of the people. . . . Before the end of the year British supremacy will, I believe, be established right up to Lake Chad. Recent events have no doubt had a wholesome effect upon the King of Kano, and even if he proves recalcitrant I do not believe his people will side with him in hostility against us. . . .

"The importance of Kano, commercially, is well known. At present but little of its trade comes through British channels. . . . Its main trade is at present across the desert to the Mediterranean ports. . . . If we are to get the trade of this place, it is necessary that the Lagos railway shall be extended from Ibadan, its present terminus to Kano, as quickly as possible. . . ."

The influence that I have referred to as having, no doubt, made itself felt in the shaping of the policy by which the overthrow of Sokoto and Kano was projected and executed is that of Bishop Tugwell. Under the great and honoured society of which he is a distinguished representative, Bishop Tugwell had undertaken a journey to the Soudan, in order to establish there new mission centres. Kano was one of the places whereat he sought to plant the missionary banner; but the hostility of the King burked the design. However, judging from the character of the extracts that are quoted here from the report of an interview which, according to Reuter, a press representative had had with Bishop Tugwell on his return to this country after a sojourn of some twelve months in the Soudan, one has received the impression that Bishop Tugwell's visit to the Soudan partook quite as much of the

political and the commercial casts as it partook of the religious cast.

Thus, it appears from these extracts that Bishop Tugwell had been privy to the fact that a military expedition against the two Mohammedan states would be undertaken ; that he approved of the expedition ; and that he approved of it on political, commercial, religious, and philanthropic grounds. On political ground, because it would result in the extension of British rule ; on commercial ground, because it would secure the extension of British trade ; on religious ground, because it would facilitate the founding a missionary establishment at Kano, etc. ; and lastly on philanthropic ground, because it would arrest the practice of slave-raiding.

But in approving of the suppression of Sokoto and Kano by England, in approving of the absorption of these states into the British Empire, Bishop Tugwell, and the society which has accomplished and which is accomplishing in Africa a great work, are both necessarily involved in the wrongs that have been committed against those two states ; the wrong, first of all, of stopping without cause and in defiance of a solemn compact the allowance of the Sultan ; the wrong, in the next place, of adding the menace of reinforcement of the British garrison at Zaria, after that it was heard, and after that it was suspected that the Sultan was displeased with the Government ; the wrong in the third place, of making war upon the Sultan, of slaying his subjects and seizing his country, because that it had been gleaned from fluctuating reports that, in imitation of the British, he too was putting his country upon the footing of defence. And so, in opposition to the letter, as well as to the spirit, of the faith which they preach, Bishop Tugwell and his society in this matter have done evil that good may come.

For desiring and for even passively co-operating to extend British rule and British trade by these means, I venture to say that Bishop Tugwell, according to the standard of conventional propriety that now prevails, would not be only exonerated from blame, but commended for his patriotism. And I am further of opinion that upon the principle that the end justifies the means, his endeavour to supersede Mohammedanism by Christianity, by means of the sword, would receive from conventional practice a warm eulogy.

Thus the following statement that was reported to have occurred in a speech which Dr. Lyman Abbot made at Boston, Mass., in 1899, during the session of the International Congregational Council, besides supporting Bishop Tugwell's position, represents also the mode that is now generally pursued, in the propagation of the gospel.

Dr. Abbot is reported to have said: "Missions may save some individual lives, and will emancipate some fragments of some tribes, but as far as the illumination of Africa is concerned, the mission stations are like glow-worms in the midnight darkness of a great meadow. If Africa is to be redeemed, first must go the law, and after that the gospel. The army is a necessary means of enforcing obedience to law." But notwithstanding the example and the precept of authorities so eminent, and notwithstanding the all but universal accord that is given to the example and precept of these eminent authorities, it seems to me that if the commands of Jesus upon this point of the propagation of the gospel be still valid in their authority and their supremacy, the commands that say, "Into whatsoever city or town ye enter, inquire who in it is worthy, and there abide till ye go thence. And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house or city shake the dust off your feet. . . . When they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another," then, inasmuch as these commands make no provision whatever for the overcoming of resistance by force in the propagation of the gospel, and inasmuch as they make no provision for the maintenance of order by force during the propagation of the gospel, the employment of force cannot be right; and the employment of force is a flagrant breach of these commands. When the work upon which the missionary sets his heart appears to be obstructed by a faith that he believes to be lower than that of his own, he having a physical power that is able to suppress the obstructing faith, and that is able to secure to his own obstructed faith external conformity at least, and having at the same time easy access to that power, his temptation to employ it is almost irresistible.

Nevertheless, the facts remain that whereas in those upon whose behalf this power is employed, its use is calculated to produce hypocrisy, on the part of the missionary who employs

it, by restraining in him those functions that nourish his own zeal, its use tampers with the very springs of his success. But if the rules which are laid down for the propagation of the gospel disallow the use of force as an adjunct of that propagation, do they sanction the missionary's advocacy of force in order to extend political and commercial power? And now I pass to the philanthropic ground upon which Bishop Tugwell encouraged the suppression of Sokoto and Kano, viz., that the atrocious practice of slave-raiding may be abolished. Excellent wish! Noble desire! But might not even such a desirable end have been secured without the committal of the great wrongs of shedding innocent blood and of violating a sacred compact? Is it inconceivable that if the agreement with the Sultan of Sokoto had been faithfully kept, the ascendancy which the British Government would have had over him would have been sufficient to procure the effectual suppression of slave-raiding?

Doubtless, as in other lands, slavery found an early home in Africa, but as an African institution, slavery, ah! this very system of slave-raiding received for centuries from Europe the most energetic support. Nor was England simply onlooker at this debasing spectacle. But the change that has happily come over Christendom in regard to this nefarious institution and its appurtenances, how did it come? Suddenly and decisively? By no means. It came during the long and dreary march of years, and of moral education.

Nor is it true, as this apparent anxiety to put down slave-raiding in Kano and Sokoto would have led one to suppose, that all other parts of the British Empire are entirely free from the blighting influence of slave-raiding. But what is true is that whereas concerning these two native states in West Africa His Majesty's Government has shown indignation—should I say righteous indignation?—against the practice of slavery, in East Africa, for example, the same Government protects the practice of slavery. It was in this sense that Mr. Joseph Pease observed, in the course of his speech in the House of Commons, on the 26th of May, 1903, that:—

“In November last a freed slave named ‘Ufunguo’ was not allowed to build a house for friends at the mission station interested in his emancipation. What did that mean, but

that a freed man could not get employment from the master he desired to serve? And what will this man and his fellow-negroes think of the advantages of freedom? The whole system which had been set up by the officials at Zanzibar, with the complicity of His Majesty's Government, was to make freedom less popular than slavery.

"The consequence was that there was a diminution in the number of slaves set free. Out of 25,000 negroes in Pemba 5000 were freed under the decree of April, 1897, but last year only 240 were freed. One of the officials had written home saying that the system of signing contracts was to be discontinued, but a gentleman who had just come back from East Africa, Mr. Duckworth, who sat for the Middleton division, . . . said that, from the investigations he had made there, he believed it would be a kindness to the Arabs themselves if the Government at once declared all slaves free. He said that in the event of rain failing to fall the negro population rushed to the towns, and the Arabs, taking advantage of their necessities, refused to part with them unless compensation was paid, as if they were legally slaves. . . . The missionaries on the spot declared that any immediate method would be better than the present system adopted by the Government, which only promoted immorality, and permitted the existence of slavery in the coast strip under our administration, and the buying and selling of slaves in the Hinterland of the East African Protectorate. He had in his hand a letter from Bishop Tucker of Uganda . . . in which he said that the statement that neither in theory nor practice slavery existed on the coast strip or the island was not an accurate description. The buying and selling of slaves was, the Bishop was convinced, very far from extinct in the East African Protectorate. . . ."

Seeing, then, that for centuries England, among others, has been one of the most active abettors to the practice of this detestable deed of slave-raiding, and in this very part of Africa (*i.e.* the West), seeing that her abhorrence now of slave-raiding has not been of sudden fruition, but of gradual growth, and seeing also that in the East of the African Continent she still throws around slavery and slave-raiding the shield of her protection, why, then, should there be on the part of the British Government, supported by a missionary society and its agent, this eagerness to punish those in the

West whom she formerly encouraged in the perpetration of these very acts, and to punish them even with death and the confiscation of their country ?

#### THE SIERRA LEONE PROTECTORATE

Continuing the subject of the manner in which coloured subjects are brought into the British Empire, we pass from the example of the "Protectorate" of Northern Nigeria to that of the "Protectorate" of Sierra Leone. In immediate proximity to the Colony of Sierra Leone, lying northward and eastward to it, is the tract of country that is known as the Hinterland. Its boundaries have been defined by a joint agreement between Great Britain and France, that was concluded in January, 1895. The estimated area of this territory is that of over 30,000 square miles, or about the size of Ireland.

This country, in some parts, is described as low and swampy ; but in other parts it is described as high and mountainous, rising to an elevation of three or more thousand feet. In many districts the soil is fertile, and is well adapted to producing tropical fruit. Among these are bananas, pine-apples, and oranges, besides such other exportable products as cocoa, arrow-root, pepper, ginger, kola-nuts, pea-nuts, palm-kernal, palm-oil, gum-copal, cotton, and rubber. Unlike other parts of West Africa, this territory is also well watered. Its population has been variously estimated as being from 750,000 to 2,000,000.

It is upon this region that the Sierra Leone Colony, of which we shall speak hereafter, almost entirely depends for its support.

The largest part of the goods that are imported into the Colony of Sierra Leone finds its way into the interior or Hinterland, and there, in exchange of its products, which are spontaneously yielded by nature, it is disposed of. The products are brought to the coast, are exported, and the profits that are derived from their sale in Europe enable the merchants of the Colony to pay the customs duties, whence the bulk of the revenue of the Colony is procured.

The territories that form the Hinterland are ruled over by a large number of kings and chiefs. The portion of the country that is under the jurisdiction of each ruler is well



ascertained and well recognized by the other native rulers and their subjects. The chiefs are subordinate to the kings, and are more or less in strict subjection to them, whom all regard as the ultimate owners of the soil.

At the time of the Anglo-French agreement in 1895 there subsisted between the British Crown and the native rulers whose territories were adjacent to the Colony of Sierra Leone certain treaties of cession, "and treaties directed to definite objects of amity and good offices." In addition to these treaties there had sprung up through usage a limited consensual and advisory jurisdiction, under which native rulers, as well as private persons, would bring their disputes—usually about boundaries—before the Governor of Sierra Leone. The awards, as if they were those of an arbitrator, were implicitly followed.

This jurisdiction, however, has not been exercised over any specified area, but has been regulated rather by distance, as allowing or disallowing the journey to Sierra Leone. Hence, whereas by usage this jurisdiction was freely established in the countries nearest to Freetown—the capital of the Sierra Leone Colony—in the remoter places it has not existed. But after that the system of travelling Commissioners was introduced, this form of jurisdiction was extended over a wider area. In this manner, at the request of both contending parties, and with their promise to abide by his decision, the Commissioner, as had been the wont of the Governor, adjudicated disputes that were brought before him. Of course, the agreement at which England and France arrived in regard to the delimitation of their respective "sphere of influence" imported no new element into the relations that previously existed between the former country and the native rulers. For they, the kings and chiefs, were not parties to the Anglo-French agreement.

And now, from these facts we learn that the native rulers of these territories, that are comprehended under the title of the "Hinterland," were free and independent sovereigns, sovereigns whose independence and ownership of their land was acknowledged, not only by their own subjects, but also by Great Britain.

This territory, in August, 1896, was proclaimed as a British Protectorate; and, for purposes of administration, it was

divided into five districts, with the intention that they should be of equal size, as far as the areal boundaries of the native states would permit. The five districts are Karene, Ronietta, Bandajuma, Panguma, and Koinadugu. In anticipation of the government that should be established in the Protectorate, an Order of the Queen in Council was made in August, 1895, "whereby, on the recital that Her Majesty had acquired jurisdiction within divers foreign countries on the West Coast of Africa, near or adjacent to Her Majesty's Colony of Sierra Leone," the Legislative Council of Sierra Leone would be empowered, "by Ordinance or Ordinances, to exercise and provide for giving effect to all such jurisdiction as Her Majesty may from time to time, before or after the passing of the Order in Council, have acquired in the said territories adjacent to the Colony of Sierra Leone."

In connection with British jurisdiction over this region, previous to and since it has been formally declared as a Protectorate, I wish to allude to two sets of conditions. One set as being directly related and the other set as being indirectly related to the recent serious insurrection, of which the Hinterland unhappily has been the theatre.

One of these two sets of conditions relates to what is known as the Frontier Police. Sir Francis de Winton, a special service officer, suggested at the close of the expedition of which he was in charge in 1887, against the Yonni tribe, between whom and some other tribes there had been a vendetta, that, both as a means of securing peace on the borders of the Colony (Sierra Leone) and of providing against incursions into it from the interior, certain advanced posts should be occupied. Sir Samuel Rowe, who was then Governor of Sierra Leone, had previously recommended an increased police force, and the opening of a road, that should connect the navigable portions of the river from the Great Scarcies in the north-west to the Manoh River on the south-eastern, or Liberian boundary of the Colony.

Therefore he concurred in Sir F. de Winton's recommendation, and was in course of providing the means for giving to it effect, when on account of ill-health he was forced to leave the Colony, dying shortly after. Sir James Hay, who succeeded Sir Samuel Rowe, approving of this scheme of his predecessor, and of Sir Francis de Winton, recommended

that a Frontier Constabulary force should be established; that a line of posts should also be instituted from Kambia on the Great Scarcies to the Manoh River; that it should be connected by a frontier road, and that the duty of the constabulary should be to keep up a constant patrol between the posts.

Further, the scheme of Sir James Hay, as did likewise the scheme of Sir Samuel Rowe, included a provision for the appointment of travelling commissioners, who should supervise certain districts.

The aim of this scheme was in order that certain territories that are in the vicinity of Sierra Leone might be protected from inter-tribal wars, and outside aggression; and also that the Colony might be surrounded with tribes which, without the assumption of direct control, would yet be amenable to British influence. However, the measure was a tentative one; hence, in concluding his dispatch upon the subject to the Secretary of State, Sir James Hay said: "I am compelled, whilst advocating the policy submitted, to admit that it is in a measure experimental, the value and importance of which time alone can prove." The proposal having in a general way received the sanction of the Secretary of State, the Frontier Police was created.

The number with which it was started consisted of four senior officers, four junior officers, and two hundred and eighty non-commissioned officers and men. But during the interval the force which at the beginning stood at these figures went steadily on increasing, until it was represented in 1898 by seventeen officers and six hundred non-commissioned officers and men. There is no room to doubt that by its system of outposts and patrol, through which it checked inter-tribal broils and secured some concord among the inhabitants, the Frontier Police was calculated to exercise a salutary influence over the country. The practice, too, of slave-raiding received from the force hostile attention; although the means that were more directly responsible for the repression of slave-raiding are traceable rather to the punishment which the offence received prior to the creation of the force.

But to the good side of the force of the Frontier Police there has been also an adverse side, that has been very repellent. According to this adverse side the Frontier Police, rather than

as a terror to the doers of evil, has appeared as a terror to the doers of good. Hence, from time to time there had been heard in the Sierra Leone Colony loud and bitter complaints against the doings of the force.

As early as December, 1894, the following lamentation appeared in the "Sierra Leone Times" :—

"It ought not to be tolerated; that the very body of men sent into the interior for the purpose of impressing the natives with a sense of the protecting power of the local government, that the very force located in the country to pacify and restore the old confidence, and open up the trade routes, should degenerate into a band of lawless desperadoes, ill-conditioned rogues and plunderers, terrorising over their own kith and kin, and sending the trade further and further away from the colony."

A year or so later the same journal declares :—

"From the very first month that the Frontier corps was organized, and sent up to the interior, complaints began to come down as to their illegal thieving and cruel conduct towards their former masters. That is to say, at the same time that the head of the Executive was assuring their chiefs that the Government only desired to exercise a paternal supervision over them in order to save them from themselves, and to prevent their territories being absorbed by the French, the corps sent for the ostensible purpose of securing those objects, were subjecting the native kings, chiefs, and all to a species of despotism and terrorism worse than they had ever experienced before, even in their own tribal disputes."

The last quotation that I shall make regarding this part of the subject proceeds thus :—

"Not only have the Sierra Leone traders in the interior sent down reports of the behaviour of truculent borderers, but the connections of the missions, stationed in one or two districts, have vouched for the correctness of the complaints.

"Sierra Leonians of respectability and repute have told of lawlessness in Sherbro, Port Lokko, Sulima, and Kwaia districts, and both local journals"—the 'Sierra Leone Weekly News' and the 'Sierra Leone Times'—"have published authenticated reports of several cases. Allegations were made against the men and their officers that they compelled the

aborigines, with kicks and blows, to carry their loads without wages, that they levied blackmail upon them, imprisoned, and fined them without any cause ; that they entered their houses, plundered them, abducted their daughters, and ravished their wives ; that the chiefs were insulted, belittled, and disgraced in the presence of their subjects. . . ."

The following comments were made by the Royal Commissioner, Sir David Chalmers, whom the Imperial Government in the year 1898 appointed to investigate the circumstances of the rising in the Sierra Leone Protectorate. And the comments of the Commissioner will be seen to bear out the charges that are made by the Sierra Leone Press against the Frontier Police :—

" There was forgetfulness of the tendency which is very commonly characteristic of the lower orders of West African—the tendency, when placed in authority, to use their power to domineer over and oppress those towards whom their position give them advantage.

" In this point of view, the system adopted was . . . radically faulty. Their knowledge of English—in which language alone can their officers as a rule communicate with them—was very defective, and almost absent. In knowledge, intelligence, or discretion, they were hardly above the lowest of the population among whom they were sent. The men had the fullest opportunities to indulge their most objectionable tendencies. The organization was very slack. There were no districts, no companies, men were out of touch with their officers, hidden away, large arrears of pay due, the paymaster not knowing where the men were. Their supposed duties were to stop slave-raiding, to prevent inter-tribal fighting, and to watch the country. They were practically little judges and governors. Thus situated many of the police egregiously abused their position and powers."

" Whenever an officer went up into the country he was inundated with complaints ; some were three years old." The Commissioner further states that " a very unfortunate feature of this matter was that in not a few instances the chiefs had been insultingly treated by the police ; that there were cases in which these native rulers were handcuffed and forcibly taken before a District Commissioner for reasons that were

utterly worthless." In one case which is mentioned the offence which was committed was nothing more flagrant than that the chief who was thus outraged had been tardy in obeying the summons of the Commissioner to receive his staff of office.

Even Mr. Chamberlain, as Secretary of State for the Colonies, was obliged to make the following admission, although a very guarded one, concerning this shameful abuse of power by the Frontier Police :—

"It is a fact," the right hon. gentleman affirmed in the House of Commons, August, 1899, "that bodies of District Police were sent out without white officers to control them, and they were guilty occasionally of offences . . . at all events, their presence was most irritating to the chiefs and to the natives ; and that was to some extent the cause of the trouble."

Of the recent rising, then, in the Sierra Leone Protectorate, of which we are now more particularly to speak, this, viz., the condition that the Frontier Police had created, was the indirect cause.

In accordance with the Order in Council, which was referred to already as empowering the Legislative Council of Sierra Leone to frame and pass ordinances for the government of the Protectorate, "an Ordinance to determine the mode of exercising Her Majesty's jurisdiction in the territories adjacent to Sierra Leone" was passed on the 16th of September, 1896, by the Sierra Leone Legislature. The measure contained some excellent provisions ; such, for example, as those that emphasized the importance that should be attached to the collecting of rubber ; that discouraged slavery, that afforded facilities to slaves to purchase their freedom, and that restricted the importation of spirits by an increased duty.

But the good which these clauses of the Ordinance were fitted to yield was entirely neutralized by the evils which the other clauses produced. Among the latter are the clauses which relate to the judicial management of districts, the tenure of land, and what is known as the hut-tax. The first clause of the Ordinance directed that the Protectorate shall be divided into districts, of which there are now five ; that each district shall be under a District Commissioner, and shall be supplied with one hundred Frontier Police ; that three courts shall be

established ; that one of these courts should take cognizance of minor offences, in which natives only were concerned, and be presided over by the chiefs ; that the second court, of which the function shall be to apply English law to natives that were charged with serious crimes, shall be presided over by the District Commissioner, assisted by chiefs ; and that of the third court, in which Europeans, and all who were not natives, were to be tried, the District Commissioner shall be the judge.

Under special conditions, and always after sentence of death, appeal shall be made, by the second and third courts, to the Supreme Court of Sierra Leone. By investing the District Commissioner with powers so extensive as that, for example, of expelling or of forcibly deporting from the district persons whose presence may be objectionable to him, including chiefs and even kings, subject to the Governor's approval, the Ordinance left open a wide door for abuse.

If even the Commissioners had been legally trained, the fact that they are usually young and inexperienced men would itself have constituted a danger of legal miscarriages ; how much more, then, is that danger enhanced when the consideration is added that they were also ignorant of the law. But, as a matter of fact, serious miscarriages of justice did occur under the District Commissioners in connection with the execution of the Ordinance. Thus, take the following cases which are given in the Report of the Royal Commissioner.

An order had been issued to the native rulers in December, 1897, by the Acting Commissioner of the Ronietta District, Dr. Hood, directing that in January, 1898, in accordance with the provisions of the Ordinance that had recently become law, they should pay taxes for their huts. By virtue of this order a charge of intimidation was preferred against Bai Kompah, a paramount chief of Kwaia, and Pa Nembana, who was next in rank to Bai Kompah, upon the accusation of another chief named Smart.

This chief who, according to the description of the Royal Commissioner, " desired to stand well with the Government," had been lately convicted of suborning false evidence in cases that had been tried before Deputy-Judge Bonner, and was sentenced to twelve months' hard labour. Whereas the paramount chief Bai Kompah " had been a very loyal

chief, and had been considered by his countrymen as being a special friend of the English." Well, upon the charge that was made against these two chiefs by Chief Smart they were summoned by the District Commissioner to appear before him; the chiefs having failed to appear immediately, they were apprehended by an Assistant-Inspector of Police (Captain Warren), with about twenty policemen.

Handcuffed, Pa Nembana, who was first taken into custody, was brought to Bai Kompah's residence. Bai Kompah, an old man, who was sick in bed with a cough, was dragged out of his bed and from his room by the officer and two or three of his men. The old man, as well as a native witness, also avowed that he was kicked, and that a revolver was held over his head. Captain Warren admitted that he had shoved the aged and sick chieftain with his knees; and Chief Smart, who was an unwilling witness of the incident, stated that on being brought out from the room, Bai Kompah complained that he had been kicked.

Objecting to be taken to Kwalu, Bai Kompah, after a long contention with Captain Warren, was allowed to proceed to Freetown, to lay his complaint before the Governor; but being in charge of two Frontier Police, his journey to Freetown was as a prisoner rather than a free man. He saw the Governor, Sir F. Cardew, laid his grievance before him, and requested that the stipend which the Government was wont to pay him should be retained in payment of the hut-tax that it claimed from him. In reply, the Governor referred him to the District Commissioner of Kwalu, and threatened him with arrest if he should remain at Freetown. Bai Kompah wrote to the late Sir Samuel Lewis, passionately setting forth his troubles, and entreating him to intercede with the Governor on his behalf and on the behalf of his people.

A charge having been made against him by the District Commissioner of Ronietta that he had resisted the authority of the Government with arms, the Governor informed him (the 10th of March, 1898) that he would hold no communication with him, that he should surrender himself to the District Commissioner at Kwalu, and that otherwise he would be arrested. Bai Kompah returned to his country, and died soon after. Captain Moore, who as District Commissioner at Ronietta had succeeded Dr. Hood, in January, 1898, proceeded with



the case of Pa Nembana. It will be remembered that this chief was arrested with the unfortunate Bai Kompah of Kwaia, to whom he was next in rank, upon the information of Sub-Chief Smart, who also was of Kwaia, he was taken to Kwalu, where he was put upon his trial. The charge preferred against him was (1) that of "intimidating Chief Charles Smart, in that he unlawfully conspired with other chiefs to prevent Chief Charles Smart in paying his lawful dues (hut-tax), and using his influence with other chiefs to do the same. (2) Not obeying the orders of the Acting District Commissioner, contained in a letter of 31 December, 1897."

For these alleged offences the punishment which Captain Moore awarded was (1) deprivation of chieftainship; (2) twelve months' hard labour, and thirty-six lashes. The comment of the Royal Commissioner, who himself as Chief Justice had spent several years in West Africa, is that the deprivation of chieftainship as well as imprisonment with hard labour were outside the jurisdiction of the District Commissioner. The Royal Commissioner further says:—

"It will be seen, on looking at the evidence printed in the appendix of his report, that there is no evidence of conspiracy, nor intimidation; what was said by Pa Nembana not being a threat, but a warning of danger."

Continuing his comment, the Royal Commissioner adds:—

"The second count in the charge expresses no offence; the duty of paying the Hut Tax is, under the Protectorate Ordinance, a civil liability (Section 43.49). No order of warning to pay could convert the non-payment into a crime. The District Commissioner's letter is simply in the position of a tax-gatherer's notice."

And yet, by these illegalities, the Paramount Chief, who was reputed as being "a special friend of the English," was hounded to death, and the chief who in rank was next to him was degraded and humiliated by a bitter persecution. Nor do these cases represent the exception, but rather the rule. Such, then, are some of the miscarriages of the law, and such are the abuses to which the Ordinance gave rise by conferring so much power upon the District Commissioner.

We pass now to the subject of the tenure of land. The Ordinance, stripping the native kings of their right of ownership of the land, vests it in the British Crown; ordaining that it shall be "lawful for the Governor, from time to time, to assign land within the Protectorate to the native chiefs, for the use and occupation of their tribes within the Protectorate," and empowering the authorities "to define or alter the boundaries of such lands." Besides this provision for the confiscation of the land from its original owners to the British Crown, the Ordinance further ordained that a tax of five shillings per annum, and in case of "houses with four rooms, or more, ten shillings shall be imposed on every 'householder,' the same to be paid in sterling coin," on or after the first of January in each year. In default of payment on demand, distraint should be made, with such additions as will defray the cost of removing the property to the nearest market, and of disposing of it at the current price. Many of the dwellings upon which this ban, in the shape of a house-tax, had fallen, were the merest hovels, valuing even less than the half of the tax that was imposed. Besides, the "sterling coin" in which the tax was to be paid is not a currency with the natives, they having no medium of exchange, but dispose of their goods by means of barter.

Of the five districts that comprise the Protectorate, the northernmost, which lies between Sierra Leone and the territory of the French, and which is known as Karene, consists of several tribes that were under the nominal headship of Bai Bureh, of Port Lokko. Until lately this chief Bai Bureh had been recognized by the British Government. South of Karene, and east of Sierra Leone, is the Ronietta district, and still further south, extending down to the Liberian frontier, is the Bandajuma.

The people of Bandajuma are said to include some of the most degraded members of humanity that are to be found anywhere in West Africa. In the remote east there are the two other districts—Pangoma and Koinadugu. Of these two districts little was known of their inhabitants, and over them little control has been attempted. To the three former districts commissioners were appointed in October, 1896, and in them the operation of the hut-tax began in January, 1898.

Now, how was the promulgation of the Ordinance received by the people of these districts of the Protectorate? We learn that for a little time the real drift of the measure was not understood by the people. However, it was not long after the promulgation that the voice of disapproval began to be heard. Written petitions against the Ordinance were also presented to the Governor. Of these, the earliest which the Royal Commissioner saw, and which had come from Bai Simera, dated October 26th, 1896, possesses peculiar interest. For of all the paramount chiefs, he was the single instance who in a measure had committed himself to accepting the Ordinance.

What, then, has he to say now? He declares himself to be apprehensive "that the slaves would become free by going before the Commissioner, that the chief's power of holding court would be taken away, that wives would leave them," "and, worse than all, in 1898, tax must be paid on every house from five shillings to ten shillings, which would bring down a heavy burden on us, when we consider our poor state in which we live." "This plea of disability from poverty," the Royal Commissioner remarks, "was much dwelt upon, afterwards."

On the 20th of October, 1896, the Chief of Bumpe, in the Mendi country, sent in a petition, saying that they were unable "to abide by the new instruction, such as the paying of a land and house tax," and they gave poverty as the cause of their inability. Following this petition, a year or so afterwards, the same chief, along with some others, sent a representative to the Governor, and they stated that "the most principal is the house-tax . . . we are not opposing, but we are really too poor, and not in a position of paying; therefore we humbly pray that His Excellency will pity our case in this respect."

On the 19th of November, 1896, Paramount Chief Bai Kom-pah of Kwaia (whom, as we have seen already, was afterwards in the name of law illegally dragooned to death) asked, as a special favour, and as the oldest friend of the Government, that his people might be allowed to take their complaints to Freetown—which his country adjoins—in accordance with former usage, instead of having to go sixty miles to the Ronietta District court at Kwalu. We know the fate, not only of this modest request, but also of him who modestly made it.

Madame Yoko, Paramount Chieftess of the Lower Mendi country, wrote to Governor Cardew, on the 3rd of November, 1896, expressing her acceptance of the Protectorate Ordinance, but as accepting it provisionally and tentatively, "as this being a new Ordinance, which we are not accustomed with, we shall make a trial of it, for we do not know yet what it is . . ." The Royal Commissioner's remark upon this communication is that it "is the only one I have seen, in which the Ordinance has been commented upon by a native authority in deprecatory expressions." On the 17th of December, 1896, a petition was sent to the District Commissioner by six important chiefs, the representatives of six different districts, for presentation to the Governor. In the document the petitioners complained of the clauses of the Ordinance, which vested in the Government the power to dispose of waste lands ; of the clauses by which their power in the native courts would be gone ; of the clauses relating to trade licences, to domestic slaves, and to the hut-tax.

The Governor was asked to allow the petition, "and not to be so hard." Passing over the very large meeting of December, 1896, which resulted in the drawing up of a letter that was signed by sixty-four chiefs, a letter which the Royal Commissioner described as expressing "very strong feeling," a letter signifying that the people were too poor to pay the hut-tax, a letter that was delivered to the late Sir Samuel Lewis, with the request that, "in constitutional way," he would put it before the Governor ; passing over these events, we come to a petition that was presented to Acting-Governor Caulfield on the 28th of June, 1897, with the wish that it should be transmitted to Her Majesty Queen Victoria.

From the highly representative character of its signatories, who had gone to Freetown, where the document was drawn up, in order to celebrate the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Victoria ; from the evident saneness of its requests, and from the obvious restraint and moderation that attend the putting forth of those requests, this petition possesses especial importance. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to describe the features of the said petition, which I am about to delineate, as the key to this chapter on the subject of the Sierra Leone Protectorate. Hence I make no apology for reproducing the petition here so fully.

Setting out with their expressions of loyalty and their hearty desire to remain under Her Majesty's Government, the petitioners passed on to narrate the subject matter of the petition, of which the subjoined points are an epitome :—

" (a) That the chiefs being deprived of the power of hearing lawsuits regarding their lands, this is equivalent to taking from them all power over their country. (b) That the country is unsettled, and the hut-tax will hinder people from returning to their homes ; that the people are too poor to pay the hut-tax, the burden of which must, therefore, fall on the chiefs, and that they have not the means of paying, and that their town and villages will go to ruin. . . . (c) The petitioners call attention to a provision of the Ordinance by which a chief is declared guilty of an offence if he hears any case in which he is not given jurisdiction by the Ordinance, and adverting to the responsibility which by their office laid on them for the conduct of their people, deprecate the severe punishment to which they believe they may be subjected in case they exceed the new statutory jurisdiction. (d) They deprecate the restraint on trade arising from licence duties, and point out that a large share of the import duties falls upon them. (e) They allude to the bad quality of cheap imported spirits " (" a remark," the Royal Commissioner observes, " that is illustrative of the paternal character they ascribed to the Government "). (f) The petitioners repudiate emphatically all desire to revert to slave buying and selling, but ask that family slaves should not be encouraged to leave them, and ask the Government to consider the exodus of their slaves into Free-town which is taking place. (g) They deprecate the power given to District Commissioners (Section 83 of Ordinance) of recommending at his discretion the deportation or banishment of persons without the accused person being informed of any charge against him, or opportunity given him of being heard, and without judgment. (h) They deprecate the building of gaols in the Hinterland. And the petitioners pray Her Majesty's Government—(1) To grant them the full enjoyment of their country, their ancient manners and customs, except such as may be deemed inconsistent with the laws of God. (2) To save them from the ruinous consequences of a tax in the present poor condition of the country, stating their willingness in any way in their power to contribute towards the maintenance of peace. (3) That they may be granted freedom of trade without licence duties. (4) That the ancient privilege of appealing to the Governor of Sierra Leone without

legal process or formality may not be withdrawn, and there is a further reference to the sentence of deportation, without open accusation and without the accused person having opportunity of defence. (5) That chiefs and sub-chiefs should not be subjected to the disgrace of being flogged and of being handcuffed where there is no resistance."

Well, to the requests of this petition, which are as reasonably put as they are in nature reasonable, what was the reply? In a word, it was unfavourable. Received through Mr. Chamberlain, who was then Secretary of State for the Colonies, the reply was to the effect that the hut-tax was necessary for the improvement of the country. On the 18th of September, 1897, the same petitioners upon the same subject sent a further appeal to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, and in the interval addressed a petition to the Legislative Council of Sierra Leone. Thus, in the individual communications that were made to the local authorities in the first instance by paramount chiefs, then these communities merging themselves into great representative assemblies, in order to increase the volume and weight of their protests and entreaties; in the absence of tribal jealousies and antipathies from the conduct of these assemblies in the petitioning of the local representative of the Crown, and then the petitioning of the Crown itself, in the repetition of this petition, and the petitioning of the local Legislature, in all these, together with the unanimity and persistency that attended the various representations, communications, and assemblies, there is the evidence of a community that is widely and deeply moved. Yet, conscious of the sovereignty of its heritage, this community is dignified in the restraint of moderation.

But let us proceed to notice next the action of the Government in relation to what may be regarded as the chief topic that was treated in all the conferences, communications, and petitions; that chief topic being the hut-tax. On the advice of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, the collection of the hut-tax was limited to the districts of Ronietta, Banda-juma, and Karene. It began on the 1st of June, 1898, and was preceded by augmenting the Frontier Police with fifty men, the force being thereby raised to the strength of five hundred and forty-eight non-commissioned officers and men, exclusive of the commissioned officers.

Captain Moore, who had succeeded Dr. Hood as District Commissioner of the Ronietta district, and by whom, as we saw, the chief Pa Nembana was tried and condemned to imprisonment, thereafter summoned a meeting of chiefs of the district. In answer to the summons some sixty or seventy paramount and sub-chiefs attended at Kwalu (the headquarters of Ronietta), about the 24th or 25th of January, 1898. But one of their number before they came together had made a statement to the District Commissioner that all the other chiefs had taken an oath that they would resist the Government in the collection of the tax.

According to the evidence that he gave before the Royal Commissioner, Captain Moore, at this meeting of the chiefs, demanded of them, with their arrest as the alternative, that they should furnish a definite promise to pay the tax, allowing them until the following day to give their reply, and they on that day having demurred to give the reply, it was ordered by Captain Moore that ten or twelve of their number, all of them being paramount chiefs, should be arrested.

Upon the day which followed their arrest the chiefs agreed to pay the tax, and it was paid after the interval of a month or so.

But this promise to pay the tax does not appear to have secured their immediate release, for according to the Royal Commissioner "they were told that they should have to remain at Kwalu until they should pay a certain amount to show that they intended to agree to pay the tax." It is added by the Royal Commissioner, that upon taking charge of the Ronietta district on the 17th of March, Captain Fairtlough found the chiefs, or several of them, there.

From the Ronietta district we go on to the district of Bandajuma, in order to notice some further incidents concerning the collection of the hut-tax. Having announced that the time had arrived for the payment of the tax, the District Commissioner of Bandajuma, Captain Carr, at Mafwe, on the 3rd of January, 1898, called together a meeting of influential chiefs. The meeting assembled and adjourned until the 10th. At the second meeting, besides sub-chiefs and country people, who were estimated to be from four to eight thousand, there were present also four paramount chiefs; of these paramount chiefs, two were members of the Wesleyan Church at Mafwe. Asked by Captain Carr whether they were ready to pay the

tax, the paramount chiefs replied that five shillings per house was too much—that they could not pay it. Thereupon, by the order of the District Commissioner, the four head chiefs were arrested and detained in the police “lock-up”; thence, afterwards, they were transferred to Bandajuma.

The chiefs behaved submissively; they admonished the people, through the “Santiggis,” or speaker, not to make a disturbance, but to return quietly to their homes. However, angry mutterings were heard among the people; they were even heard to say, some days after, that as the paying of the tax would mean that their country was taken from them, they would rather die than pay it. And they greatly resented the arrest of their chiefs. Commenting upon the meeting, Captain Carr himself, in an official report, declared that the attitude of the people might have been regarded as a warning against the impending danger.

And after stating that, in the intervening week between the first and second meetings he learned from spies that the chiefs had had several conferences together, at which “they all agreed not to pay, or attempt to pay for their own country,” he continued thus:—

“To-day at the meeting there were between four and five thousand men. After arresting the chiefs, I dispersed the crowd, and assembled them in an open space outside the town. I stayed with them about an hour, taking things very quietly, walking amongst them, etc. The slightest wavering or half-heartedness would have acted like a spark, although, of course, I was fully prepared. . . . At the same time, I am, I regret to say, not one inch nearer the collecting of the tax. I am writing officially to ask how I am to deal with the chiefs.”

The chiefs being removed from Mafwe to Bandajuma, under police escort, were detained there, until Chief Bongo had borrowed ten pounds, and of it had paid five pounds for his own town and five pounds for Berri’s town, and had at the same time given some sort of understanding for the payment of the tax by the other chiefs. Returning to Mafwe, and calling a meeting of his sub-chiefs, and the people of Sierra Leone that resided in his town, chief Bongo recounted the sufferings of his imprisonment.



At the meeting it appears that it was agreed by the sub-chiefs that, under the pressure that had been used, although with reluctance, they would pay the tax. The Ronietta and Bandajuma districts, in which we have been noticing the mode of procedure that was followed in the collection of the hut-tax, are situated in the country of the Mendi people.

Therefore, for the same purpose as that for which we have visited Ronietta and Bandajuma, we will go from the country of the Mendis to the country of the Timinis; this country to which we go is designated, according to the division of the Protectorate, as the district of Karene. Karene is one of the three districts that Mr. Chamberlain, the late Secretary of State for the Colonies, selected as those in which the hut-tax should be collected, and it was the last of the three in which the experiment was begun. Port Lokko, which is a town of considerable commercial importance, that is situated on a creek, a tributary of the Loquelle, and that is within reach of Freetown in six hours by steamer, was the place in the district of Karene where the collection of the hut-tax actually began.

At Port Lokko there are some fifty or sixty Sierra Leone traders. The premises which they occupy as stores and dwellings, and for which they pay rent, are owned by the aboriginal inhabitants. Captain Sharpe, the Commissioner of the Karene district, on his way from England to the headquarters of his district, passed through Port Lokko, and he intimated there that he would return in a few days to collect the hut-tax. The traders thereupon raised the question as to whether they, as tenants, should be held responsible for the tax, or whether it should be their landlords.

The Commissioner promised that an answer should be given them on his return. On Saturday, the 5th of February, 1898, he returned to Port Lokko, and upon meeting the traders he ordered that they should pay the tax. They expressed themselves as being willing to pay the tax, but referred to the threats of their landlords, who had forbidden them to pay the tax. They pointed out further that they, as tenants, should not be made to pay the tax, but the landlords, for payment by them would give them the right of the houses.

The responsible ruler of Port Lokko, being too unwell to attend to public business, his deputy, Bokary Bamp, was

summoned by Captain Sharpe. Asked by Captain Sharpe concerning the threats of which the traders had spoken, Bokary Bamp, who, on the one hand, was doubtless aware of the existing compact between the Timini chiefs that the tax should not be paid, but who on the other hand was unwilling to oppose the District Commissioner, took the middle course of assuring Captain Sharpe that he did not wish to interfere between the traders and their landlords, "with whom the matter really rested"; that it was his intention to say nothing definite until he should consult his chief, Bai Forki. For this statement Captain Sharpe made Bokary Bamp a prisoner, and kept him in custody until Monday morning. On Monday the Sierra Leone traders were again summoned before the District Commissioner, and when they repeated the objections which they had previously raised, he ordered that they should be taken into custody. On the charge of refusing to pay the hut-tax these men were imprisoned from Tuesday until Wednesday; other witnesses, according to the report of the Royal Commissioner, alleged that they were imprisoned for a longer time. During their imprisonment a sergeant of police was sent to distrain on their goods. Some of the traders whom Captain Sharpe said had given no trouble were released on Tuesday after that they had paid the tax. The others were released on Wednesday after that they had paid the tax and fines, the fines ranging from five pounds five shillings, and upwards, with the alternative of varying terms of imprisonment with hard labour; and in violation, according to the Royal Commissioner, of the Small Penalties Ordinance. Hearing of the arrest of the traders, Bokary Bamp, who himself had been released on Monday, went with four other chiefs to the District Commissioner, to ask that he would "pity the poor traders." Captain Sharpe, asking Bokary Bamp again "if he was ready to let the people pay the tax"; and the chief answering again: "If I get an order from Bai Forki, I will order the people to pay," he was accused by the Commissioner on the charge of "refusing to pay the hut-tax"; the four other chiefs were also charged with aiding him. To this accusation Bokary Bamp replied: "I do not say I will not pay; I say I want to consult the other chiefs." The other chiefs also denied that they were aiding Bokary Bamp.

The proceedings of Captain Sharpe against the chiefs were determined by the answers that they should give to these questions: (1) "Will you do your best to order all your people not to molest the Sierra Leoneans for paying their tax?" ; (2) "Will you undertake to start collecting the hut-tax due from you at once?" And the answers that were given by the five chiefs to these questions, having been in the negative, the chiefs were handcuffed, they were taken under police escort to a boat that had been already prepared for conveying them, they were carried to Freetown, and there, for terms of imprisonment varying from a year to fifteen months, with hard labour, they were imprisoned.

When the chiefs were about to be taken to the boat Bokary Bamp admonished the people (who had gathered in large numbers, and were acting as if they would attempt to rescue the chiefs) to refrain from causing any breach of the peace; at this the people became more calm. And at Freetown, until the remonstrance of the Secretary for Native Affairs had procured some relaxation in rigour of their prison discipline, the chiefs as felons were made to labour.

The following are the remarks of the Royal Commissioner upon the subject:—

"Apart altogether from the law of the matter, the broad fact that these chiefs were arrested, sentenced, and afterwards dealt with as malefactors, in connection with the attempt to collect the hut tax, was of the gravest significance. It aroused wonder and bitter indignation. I am tempted," he continues, "to quote a few of the very expressive words used by Bai Bamp himself in reference to his position."

And here are a few of the quotations that the Royal Commissioner gives:—

"Since the time of our ancestors up to the present time there has never been such disgrace to one of our chiefs as this prison dress which I wear. You can find our character in the records. No chief crowned by the Queen has been put in prison without disobeying the law, except this year. . . . We have had to break stones. As I am telling you my heart is bleeding with tears. . . . We have been brought to prison through the hut tax, and our country is being destroyed."

"Feelings of the kind," the Royal Commissioner remarks

further, "are widely spread among a great many people, who, looking on as sympathetic spectators, knew that they also were liable to treatment of the same character."

Captain Sharpe himself was forced to admit that Bokary Bamp would be looked upon as a martyr.

But, passing from the political ground of these arrests and imprisonments, which, merely in regard to their expediency or in expediency, will generally be approved or disapproved; passing to the more stable ground of their legal or illegal bearing—and we are fortunate in the transit, for as our guide we have a man that was not only able, experienced, and conscientious, and that possessed a personal knowledge of West African affairs, but who, as Chief Justice in West Africa for a number of years, was also versed in English law. What, then, has this learned Royal Commissioner to say on the legal phase of the arrests and imprisonments of these chiefs? Upon the two questions whereon the alleged guilt of the five chiefs was made to culminate, the Royal Commissioner has this to say:—

"I need not point out that the not giving the promise not to molest is not an offence; a chief is not by the Ordinance under any obligation to collect tax, but to pay it; he may collect, if he chooses, but the Ordinance is silent on the subject, and provides no machinery for his doing so. There might, moreover, be cases—as, for instance, where a village or small town consisted only of the houses of a chief's immediate retainers, in which case not only is it not his duty, but he would have no right to collect them."

Again, as illustrating further the muddle that there was in connection with the executing of the provisions of the Protectorate Ordinance, the Royal Commissioner observes in regard to the monthly returns that were sent to the Governor by the District Commissioner, giving an account of these proceedings, and of trade, etc., that "there is found a statement of three charges against all the chiefs, purporting to have been duly pleaded to, tried, and determined, viz.: (1) inciting others by threats to defy the law, offence against section 67 Protectorate Ordinance; (2) refusing to collect the house-tax due, offence under section 68 Protectorate

Ordinance ; (3) overawing by force public officer in the execution of his duty, section 68 Protectorate Ordinance."

Now come the remarks of the Royal Commissioner :—

" If the charges had really been as stated in the return, it would, of course, have been bad for multiplicity ; the District Commissioners being bound by the Protectorate Ordinance to observe as nearly as possible the law of Sierra Leone, which is English law. The sentences, which are in three cases imprisonment with hard labour for twelve months, and imprisonment with hard labour for fifteen months in two other cases, are bad in respect of the offences stated (assuming they had been duly laid and proved), which are not punishable with hard labour by any law in force in the Protectorate. When the warrants on which the chiefs were imprisoned were looked at, I found that they stated a different offence from any of the three mentioned by Captain Sharpe in his return, viz., ' resisting and conspiring with others to resist a public officer in the lawful exercise of his duty.' Upon questioning Captain Sharpe, it appeared that he left such matters to his clerk, upon whom he ' relied for legal points.' "

We have now come to consider the insurrection itself, that occurred in the Protectorate in 1898. Soon after the arrest of the five chiefs of Port Lokko, an attempt, relating to the collection of the tax, was made also to arrest Bai Bureh, chief of the Kassi country. This attempted arrest led to a collision between the Frontier Police and some of Bai Bureh's " war-boys." And the collision was the spark that ignited the insurrection in the Protectorate. On account of the extraordinary successes he had achieved as a war leader during the war between the Timinis and Susoos, from 1873 to 1876, when he fought under the standard of the former, Bai Bureh attained to great fame; he had also fought as an ally of the British, though his subsequent relations with them have not been uniformly cordial. Thus on one occasion he declined to proceed to Port Lokko to meet the Governor unless he were guaranteed against arrest. On the guarantee being given, he went, but was fined. However, at the time of the collection of the hut-tax in 1898 there does not appear to have been any outstanding dispute between him and the local Government. Captain Sharpe testifies to having had a friendly interview

with Bai Bureh at about the beginning of 1897. The proposal to arrest this chief originated with Captain Sharpe, but, like all the other exploits that made up this tangle of illegalities, Captain Sharpe's proposal had been submitted to, and was endorsed by the Governor, Sir Frederick Cardew. The immediate cause which determined Captain Sharpe to take this step, according to his own admission, was that he had sent a letter to Bai Bureh, that it was returned to him unopened, and that it was accompanied by a contemptuous and defiant message.

Therefore the collision between British troops and Bai Bureh's "war-boys" which followed the attempted arrest of the chief was the direct outcome of the alleged insolent conduct of the chief to one of Her Majesty's District Commissioners.

Now let us see how far this charge of gross insubordination is borne out by facts; for it is upon the validity or the invalidity of this charge that the deplorable consequences which followed the collision are justifiable or culpable. With that conscientious care and legal acumen that has rendered his report at once illuminating and convincing, the Royal Commissioner investigated the circumstances of the rebellion. Having gathered evidence from a variety of sources, he sifted and compared them, and then proceeded to draw from them judicious conclusions. Thus, about the letter that was said to have been returned to the District Commissioner unopened, and attended by a contemptuous and defiant message, the Royal Commissioner says:—

"There is very clear evidence, however, that the letter never reached Bai Bureh, and that he sent no message."

Here, too, is the statement of a person of no less weight (as regards this matter) than the messenger himself who had been entrusted with the letter to Bai Bureh by the District Commissioner. As the Royal Commissioner observes, this witness, evincing in his statement every sign of straightforward honesty, declared that when on his way to Chief Bai Bureh he was met by the "war-boys" of Bai Bureh at a place called Katinki, that they told him they had had orders to permit no police nor Government carriers to pass, and that being thus unable to proceed, he brought back the letter to Captain

Sharpe, and informed him of what had happened. This evidence was corroborated by another witness who had met the messenger on the way, and also by Bai Bureh. For, later, in an interview with the Rev. Allan Elba, upon the subject, Bai Bureh stated that he had never been asked to pay the tax. So then, as far as the insubordination of Bai Bureh was a reason for attempting his arrest, and as far as the attempted arrest led directly to the war, there was certainly no justification at all for the war.

After Captain Sharpe had become imbued with the idea that Bai Bureh had insulted him, and after that he had resolved upon the arrest of the chief in consequence, he informed the Governor of his intention, and Sir Frederick Cardew, under the Inspector-General of Police, Major Tarbet, sent him a reinforcement of Frontier Police. Upon joining the force that was already with Captain Sharpe, this reinforcement brought up the number of troops to forty-six non-commissioned officers and men.

With this force Major Tarbet and Captain Sharpe went to a place called Romani, at which they expected to find Bai Bureh; but the chief was not there, or, at any rate, he was not seen; but in and about the approaches of the town the force encountered a large number of "war-boys." The town was surrounded by a wall, and sentinelled by wooden gates, of which, the one that afforded to the party a passage into the town had been shut, but it was easily opened.

Entering the town through this gate, the force, without opposition, marched through it. Halting just outside the town, Captain Sharpe, attended by a bugler, and followed by Inspector Crowther and two Frontier Police, re-entered the town to inquire for Bai Bureh. In the course of the inquiry they seized a man, and drew him aside, in order to ascertain from him the whereabouts of the chief. The man struggled, was wounded on the head, was bleeding, and made a great outcry. The wound was said by Inspector Crowther to have been inflicted by Captain Sharpe, a statement which, according to the Royal Commissioner's report, was not denied by Captain Sharpe. The wounding of this man produced among the "war-boys" great excitement. They pressed about the invading party, threw stones and tufts of grass at it, and jeered; but none of its members was hurt.

At this point it became apparent that the intended arrest could not be made ; and in regard to the safety of the luggage, which was considerable, the invaders began to be apprehensive. Order was therefore given to march to Karene ; and apparently it was obeyed, with some confusion. The retreating force was followed by the " war-boys," who were jeering and throwing stones. After that the force had proceeded some distance—of which the account that is given varies from a hundred yards to several miles from Romani—rifles were discharged among the " war-boys." The witnesses differ about the number of rifles that were discharged, but, according to two of the three witnesses, both the main body and the rearguard joined in the fire. A number of the " war-boys " were seen to fall, but the rest returned the fire, and rushed for the baggage. It is not clear whether this rush preceded or succeeded the fire of the retreating force, but none of its members was wounded. Still, it was this encounter that precipitated the insurrection.

And with the opening of hostilities the Governor dispatched a company of troops from the garrison at Freetown to reinforce the Frontier Police. The main object of the reinforcement was to garrison Karene, in order that a larger force of police may be available for the renewed attempt to arrest Bai Bureh. It was further intended that if the augmented force of police fail in this second attempt to arrest the chief, it should be assisted by the troops. The passage of the united force of troops and police through the country was now opposed.

And the scope of the more serious operation that was inaugurated has been given by Captain Sharpe in this sentence : " The impression I had was that, being unable to arrest him " —Bai Bureh—" we destroyed his country, and that of other chiefs also whom we were unable to arrest." After that Bai Bureh had begun to resist the troops and police, other chiefs, recognizing in him their champion against a common oppression and a shameless tyranny, joined their forces to his.

Upon these lawless proceedings of the authorities regarding the attempted arrest of Bai Bureh, the following are the caustic comments of the Royal Commissioner :—

" It ought to be emphasized that *the arrest of Bai Bureh which was intended, and the attempt to effect which led to the*



*collision, was aggression pure and simple on the part of the authorities.*"<sup>1</sup> "Even if it were right," he continues, "that refusal to pay tax would justify arrest, the evidence clearly shows that when Captain Sharpe marched against Bai Bureh no demand had reached him, and that he had not refused to pay."

In Sir F. Cardew's minute of the 15th of February there are allusions to charges against Bai Bureh, whilst as yet he had committed no offence.

The attitude of the natives in the collision that initiated the war is summed up by the Royal Commissioner in this manner:—

"The character of the war, as on the side of the native forces, except in two attacks upon Port Lokko and another upon Karene, was defensive. . . . It is well to remember the fact that they waged no warfare except against the troops and police. There were missionary and trading stations absolutely at their mercy; but there were no plundering raids, and not a trader or missionary was killed, with the exception of the missionary Mr. Humphreys, who lost his life through persisting in pressing upon a journey along a particular road against the warnings of the war-men, who told him that they could not permit him to pass. And it even appeared that in killing him the men acted of their own accord, and not by anyone in authority. Mr. Elba, narrating his interview with Bai Bureh, said that he appeared to be sorry for the occurrence."

By the Royal Commissioner, we are also supplied with some facts relating to Bai Bureh's anxiety to bring hostilities to a close. He says:—

"Bai Bureh made repeated overtures for a termination of the war. Once, in March, he made another through the Rev. Mr. Elba, who had an interview with him by invitation, apparently with the purpose that he should be medium of communication with the Government. Again, in March, through chief Saluku of Bumban. Again, in June, Alimami Baba of Robaba and some other chiefs addressed Sir Frederick Cardew, expressing a desire to effect peace.

"Probably this communication was known to and was prompted by Bai Bureh. The last overture that I am aware

<sup>1</sup> The italics are the Royal Commissioner's.

of was communicated to myself on the 3rd of October through the chief of the Moslems of Sierra Leone. . . . I believe a similar overture reached Sir F. Cardew about the same time. . . . A reward of £50 was offered on 14 March for the capture of Bai Bureh, which was afterwards increased to £100, without result—evidence of the fidelity of those who were about him.”

But as an outcome of this war, which the Royal Commissioner has designated as an *aggression, pure and simple, on the part of the authorities*, Bai Bureh, the chief victim of its malice, and whom the Commissioner also declared, to have committed no crime, has been deported into exile, and the country of its operations has been laid waste. The area of desolation that was embraced by this war in the country of the Timinis around Karene, up to the time of the withdrawal of Imperial troops, at the beginning of the rainy season of 1898, covered a radius of about thirty miles.

Of this country ninety-seven towns and villages, having an aggregate population of 44,000 souls, were destroyed. And into what depth of suffering, men, women, and children, and also the infirm have been plunged by these vicissitudes! Nor does the recital of the sombre tale, even end here, for whereas in the Karene district the war wrought this havoc of wholesale devastation, in the Mendi country, whence the five chiefs were sent to prison, and where the aged Bai Kompah was hounded to death, punitive expeditions terrorized the inhabitants into a sullen obedience, and made other regions the scenes of their blighting operations.

Let me here indicate the methods and certain of the effects that attended the course of this plague. For this purpose I take the territory of Kwaia, that is inhabited by the Timinis. This region alone in 1898 was overrun three times, viz., in February, March, and April, by these expeditionary bands. Thus, on the 19th of February Dr. Hood, Deputy-Commissioner of Ronietta, with a force of ten Frontier Police and a sergeant, started for Kwalu, in order to arrest Bai Kompah. The expedition was unsuccessful in the object of its undertaking, but apparently it returned to Kwalu without having had any hostile encounters with the aboriginal inhabitants.

The second expedition, consisting of a force of Frontier Police, under Captain Moore, and joined by a contingent under

Captain Fairtlough—the entire force numbering about forty—set out on the 1st of March.

In his report to the Governor about the doings of this expedition, Captain Moore mentioned that he had had seven engagements with the natives. Thus:—

“(1) Exchanged shots with the natives at Robia. (2) An attack on his baggage, at Makompa, repulsed with the slaying of the leader and ‘numerous others.’ (3) An attack on his party by natives. Rokonta repulsed with ‘considerable loss.’ (4) Considerable opposition on his march to Ro-Mangeh by war-boys in the bush effectively disposed of by the Frontiers. (5) Continued attack on march to Maketti, considerable numbers of natives ‘knocked over by rapid volleys by police.’ (6) An attack at Robia repulsed with loss. (7) Night attack at Robia, determined attempt to rush the town, natives driven off after three-quarter hour’s firing, leaving a large number on the field.”

Finally, having burned Robia and Makompa, the gallant band, on the 11th of March, returned to Kwalu.

It may be mentioned that Robia, being one of the sacred places of Kwalu, contains the sepulchres of deceased kings and chiefs. In all these slaughters of natives that lasted over a week, the loss which the invading force sustained was the wounding of a boy, and that slightly.

Upon the information that was supplied him by the chief, Charles Smart, whose disinterestedness and veracity, as we noticed before, merit strong suspicion, Captain Moore, on his own responsibility, it would appear, planned and executed this expedition. But, in his evidence before the Royal Commissioner, Captain Moore stated that it was from the Governor that he had “heard they were arming.”

And Sir Frederick Cardew, on being asked by the Royal Commissioner whether outside of Captain Moore’s report there was any evidence or information for undertaking the expedition, replied:—

“Not that I am aware of; I should always act upon a report of a District Commissioner. If the District Commissioner makes a report, I should act upon it.”

Therefore, since the information which alone led to this series of massacres, proceeded originally from a source so

vitiated as the Chief Charles Smart, there is furnished for us a fresh proof of the small value in which the lives of the natives of the Protectorate are held by the authorities.

Under Captain Fairtlough, accompanied by Captain Warren, the third of these expeditions, which consisted of fifty men of the Frontier Police and a considerable number of native levies, that one Fulla Mansa had supplied, starting from Kwaia on the 5th of April, returned at about the 25th. Captain Fairtlough, upon the rumour that trade on the Rovell River had been blocked, was instructed by the Governor of Sierra Leone to proceed to Forodugu, in Kwaia, in order to ascertain.

Besides the rumour on which the Governor's instruction was founded, Captain Fairtlough was also acting upon the information that he had received from Chiefs Fulla Mansa of Yonni, and Charles Smart. According to the report which Captain Fairtlough submitted to the Governor upon his return the following are among the incidents which attended the visit of the expedition to Forodugu :—

“(1) Being attacked at Mafuluma, dispersing assailants with loss of six killed, and several wounded; (2) another attack by a further force of natives, driven off with a loss of seven killed, no Frontier Police hurt, but two of Fulla Mansa's natives killed and one wounded; destroyed Mafuluma and Maseracanti; (3) met war-boys at Batipo, dispersed with loss of several men; (4) attacked at Mayumera by natives in the afternoon, and again in the night—repulsed mainly by Fulla Mansa, killing the leader and several followers.

“(5) Marched on Fondo, meeting natives in ambush nearly all the way firing from the bush; (6) natives in force at Fundo, dispersed with loss of chief, and several followers wounded; (7) a village close by was destroyed, a large party dispersed, nine natives killed, one friendly wounded; (8) night attack on Fundo, dispersed with loss; (9) drove rebels from Roquta and destroyed village, Fulla Mansa losing two killed; (10) dispersed a gathering at Marifa, where there was a strong mud fort; (11) dispersed a large party close to Romabong, which was destroyed; (12) drove rebels from Robia and destroyed the town—dispersed war-party at Forodugu with five killed and many wounded; (13) attack on Forodugu, repulsed and followed to Magbene, a headman and twenty-five men killed; (14) chief and fifteen followers put off in a canoe, killed six of

the crew and upset the canoe, the rest only saved by swimming if they could; (15) party near Majackson repulsed with loss, and destroyed Majackson and Ropolong; (16) at Masengli several boats full of people endeavouring to escape across the river sunk, and fugitives intercepted—destroyed town of Robamp."

A catalogue of pitiless and rank brigandage, in which are reproduced some of the worst features of Spanish South American conquest. Concerning this last table of slain inhabitants and demolished towns and villages, the Royal Commissioner has well pointed out that "*there is no report of any of the Frontier Police having received so much as a scratch during this series of fights and ambushes extending over a period of three weeks.*"

But with the Royal Commissioner's report there is bound up the reply of Sir Frederick Cardew. I have examined this reply, with care, but have failed to discover that the substance and even the details of the report are invalidated by the reply. Thus, take for example, Sir Frederick Cardew's answer to the comment of the Royal Commissioner upon the last series of massacres at Kwaia. Sir F. Cardew says:—

"The Royal Commissioner makes light of the opposition that was met with on the grounds that 'only one boy belonging to the Police was slightly wounded in the first expedition,' and that 'there is no report of any of the Frontier Police having received so much as a scratch' during the second."

Captain Moore, of whom I have made inquiries since receiving the Royal Commissioner's report, informed me that in the first one native and two carriers were wounded, and it appears, from Captain Fairtlough's report, that in the second expedition there were three killed and two wounded among the friendlies who accompanied the expedition, and did the fighting."<sup>1</sup> From the numbers of people slain, and the numbers of towns destroyed, the impression is naturally produced that the natives had been stubbornly aggressive.

Therefore, considering the great advantage they possessed over the invaders of selecting their own points for attack, considering that those points of attack were invariably from

<sup>1</sup> *Accounts and Papers*, vol. ix. p. 42.

within the fastnesses of thickets that were almost impenetrable, and that they, as compared with the expeditionary forces—which in the second series of operations were forty Frontier Police, and in the third series fifty Frontier Police and the native allies—were overwhelming in their numbers, we should have expected to find among the invading forces—chiefly among the untrained levies, but also among the Frontier Police—casualty lists of some dimensions.

Yet, on actual examination, what do we discover? Upon the statement of Sir Frederick Cardew himself, we discover that in the first expedition one native and two carriers were wounded, and that during the second series of operations there were casualties of three killed and two wounded among the mercenaries, none of the Frontier Police were killed, but only one was wounded, and that slightly.

We further discover that this second set of military engagements was of a nature so trivial as to make it unnecessary for even the small staff of trained Frontier Police who were responsible for the execution of the expedition to take any part in them, but that instead of taking part in these engagements they left them entirely to the untrained "friendlies," whom we are told, "did the fighting," and of whom three only were killed and two wounded. I ask, then, whether the validity of the Royal Commissioner's statement upon this subject has been impaired by Sir Frederick Cardew's contribution?

It is notorious that while there were so many towns destroyed, and so many natives killed, there should have been at the same time an entire absence of killed among the Frontier Police. And this fact conclusively shows how unprovoked, how wanton, and how reckless have been these military expeditions. The statement of the Royal Commissioner's report is by no means impaired by Sir Frederick Cardew's rejoinder. And as for the extremely trivial difference in detail that there is between the Commissioner's statement and Sir Frederick Cardew's rejoinder (and Sir F. Cardew's rejoinder is directed only to this trivial detail) it is conceivable that the facts which relate to it have appeared in the report in the same manner as they were communicated to the Royal Commissioner. Under these circumstances, Sir F. Cardew's attempt to conceal the enormity of his administration as it

is revealed by the whole report, beneath the gauzy rejoinder that he has woven from this extremely trivial difference in detail, has served only the more strongly to fasten attention upon the iniquitous régime that he developed in the Protectorate.

I pass to another answer of Sir Frederick Cardew, which he made in reply to a statement that occurs in the report of the Royal Commissioner, combating the opinion that he had expressed in a letter to the Secretary of State for the Colonies upon the subject of the revenue that the Sierra Leone Colony and the Sierra Leone Protectorate, respectively contribute. The letter of Sir Frederick Cardew said :—

“ It is obvious that a poor colony like Sierra Leone . . . cannot spare any portion of her revenue for the needs of the Protectorate, so either taxation must be enforced or the Protectorate left practically to its resources, merely under police control. . . .”

The Royal Commissioner opposes this opinion by the following remarks :—

“ Here it appears to be assumed that all duties upon goods imported into Sierra Leone are paid by the people of the Colony. This will be seen to be quite incorrect when it is considered that only a small percentage of the goods on which duties are paid remains in Sierra Leone for consumption. There are no statistics ; but taking the average of five estimates by mercantile authorities, 82·4 per cent of the whole imports go into the Protectorate, leaving 17·6 per cent in the colony. Hence, instead of the Protectorate being entirely a charge upon the colony of Sierra Leone, as assumed, it contributed in 1897 to the colonial revenue . . . as much as £71,765 out of a total customs revenue of £87,093, of which the inhabitants of the colony only paid . . . £15,328.”

And the subjoined is Sir Frederick Cardew's answer to the Royal Commissioner's remarks :—

“ Taking the Royal Commissioner's figures, and estimating the population of the colony at 100,000, and that of the Protectorate at a million, the proportion of the revenue paid respectively appears to be £15,328 and £71,765, which is the rate of a little over three shillings a head for the colony, and a little under one shilling a head for the Protectorate, that is to say, the Sierra Leonian pays more than three times as

much as the native of the Protectorate; but I venture to think that practically the proportion is even higher than this on the side of the Sierra Leonian. . . .”

The estimating of the Sierra Leone Colony as 100,000, and of the Protectorate as 1,000,000, and then computing the relative revenue-paying power of the two places upon these estimates of population is utterly fallacious. And it is utterly fallacious, because the population of the one place is free and is monogamous, and the population of the other place is under the régime of domestic slavery and is polygamous. Thus, whereas in the attempt to estimate the fiscal-producing power of the former place the individual unit should be taken as the basis of computation, in the attempt to estimate the fiscal-producing power of the latter place the group unit should be taken as the basis of computation. Under such a means of computation I believe that in a polygamous community, at least two persons in every hundred should be taken as the basis of fiscal assessment. Thus, with a million of a population in such a community the revenue-bearing portion would be only 20,000, and so, whereas a hundred thousand people of a monogamous community may be roughly taken to represent that amount of revenue-producing power, a million people of a polygamous community may be roughly said to be represented by a revenue-producing power of twenty thousand.

And the reasonableness of this method of computation is borne out, I think, by the following extract that I have taken from the evidence of Mr. Macaulay, J.P., of Freetown, Sierra Leone. Asked by the Royal Commissioner whether he considered the chiefs too poor to pay the hut-tax, this witness replied that :—

“The situation is this, a town is owned by only six or eight chiefs, and of these chiefs perhaps each has about six wives and ten slaves, and each slave may have two wives. This chief has to build a house for each wife, each slave, and each slave’s wife. Altogether it makes about fifty houses for one man to pay for.”

From these facts the fallacy in estimating the revenue-yielding power of the Protectorate on the basis of the aggre-



gate of its population will, I think, be apparent ; for the individuals of the population do not represent that power, but the groups, or houses as they are called, that are owned by chiefs—they represent it. Thus, taking these groups or houses, instead of individuals, as the basis of fiscal computation, it would be found that the figures of £71,765 (or 3s. per head, to borrow and reverse Sir F. Cardew's figures) which the Royal Commissioner gives as the revenue that is contributed by the Protectorate, and that the figures of £15,328 which he gives as the revenue that is contributed by the Sierra Leone Colony are much more nearly correct than the adverse application of these figures which Sir F. Cardew gives. Taking then, these two examples as demonstrating, on the one hand, the strength of the arguments that support the statements of the Royal Commissioner's Report, the report upon which our discussion upon the Protectorate is so largely founded, and taking these examples as demonstrating, on the other hand, the feebleness of the arguments that support Governor Cardew's replies to the arguments of the Report, I repeat that the validity of the Royal Commissioner's Report has not been discounted by the reply of Sir Frederick Cardew.

Now, concerning the observations we have been making about the Sierra Leone Protectorate, I wish to particularize the following facts : (a) that England was not the owner of the country ; (b) that when she entered it, the country was in an undeveloped condition ; (c) that nothing was done by her to develop the country ; (d) that her object in settling in the country was for purposes of trade and of revenue. If there be one thing more than another of which the un-Europeanized African is exceptionally jealous, it is his ownership of his country. To a stranger he will lease or feu his land, but will never sell it.

Hence, as in the present case, when he finds the Government to whom he had given trade concessions, in return for friendship and protection, ordaining by means of a resolute and far-reaching Ordinance, that it shall be "lawful for the Government from time to time to assign to native chiefs, for the use and occupation of their tribes, lands within the Protectorate," that the Governor shall also be empowered "to define or alter the boundaries of such lands," he was filled, and was naturally filled, with the direst alarm. This alarm,

as we have observed, has expressed itself in a series of petitions, of which one of the two which the native rulers sent to Queen Victoria, as will be seen from the words that I have italicized in the subjoined extract, specifically refers to their ownership of their country. "That the chiefs being deprived of the power of hearing lawsuits regarding *their lands*, this is equivalent to taking from them all power over *their own country*." Indeed, in reading through the evidence which was given before the Royal Commissioner, one has been forcibly impressed by this idea of "their ownership of their country," as that which is ever present in the minds of these people. Thus, it was not as if the people who were the owners of the soil had been indifferent to their right of ownership.

Well, England was not the owner of the country. And in proof that the Protectorate was undeveloped when the British entered it, I need only cite the description that was given of it in a speech in the House of Commons, on the 7th of August, 1899, by Mr. Chamberlain, who was then Secretary of State for the Colonies. The right hon. gentleman, on that occasion, described this territory as a "wild, savage, and almost untrodden country." As to the motive that impelled England to establish herself in this "wild, savage, and almost untrodden" region, and that justified the hut-tax, the burning of towns, and the ruthless slaughter of their inhabitants, etc., according to Mr. Chamberlain, in the same speech to which reference has just been made, it was to suppress domestic slavery.

Here are the words of the right hon. gentleman:—

"The colony of Sierra Leone is practically little more than a coast strip. . . . Behind that there is a huge Hinterland with a very considerable though scattered population, and in that district for centuries there has been going on what is usual in wild, tropical parts of Africa—that is, the brutal customs of slavery, slave-raiding. Is that to continue? . . . It is certainly the duty of the British Government to take all possible steps to secure a moderate amount of peace and order in the Hinterland, and, above all, to put down the abominable practice of slave-raiding and endless tribal wars."

A cure that produces an injury that is as great and as serious as the malady that it professes to remove is itself a malady.

Thus, if the quartering of the Frontier Police among the tribes of the Hinterland—some of these men having been slaves of the princes over whom they now exercise authority—if their unlimited power, their exactions, their tyranny, their humiliation of their former lords, their seduction of wives and their violation of daughters, if the incessant military bands that roamed the country of Qwaia and other places, burning towns, destroying crops, slaughtering the people; if these all be the cure for the malady, "domestic slavery," "slave-raiding," and the "endless tribal wars," then it must be conceded, I think, that the injury that has been wrought by this cure has been as great as the malady which it was purposed to remove, and that thereby itself is a malady. But was the suppression of "domestic slavery," "slave-raiding," and "endless tribal wars," the real reason why England settled in the Hinterland of Sierra Leone?

Upon the subject of slave-raiding this is what the Royal Commissioner affirms in his report:—

"Repressive measures have been assiduously and successfully followed by successive Governors, so that when the Protectorate Ordinance came into operation" (in 1898) "slave-raiding had practically ceased."

Sir Samuel Lewis—who has since died—who himself was a native of Sierra Leone, and who had travelled in the Hinterland, stated in his evidence before the Royal Commissioner that since 1890 slave-raiding had been practically stamped out.

Another witness—Mr. Parkes, the Secretary for Native Affairs—declared that in 1896 slave-raiding had not wholly passed away, but that then the backbone had "been completely broken." This united evidence of witnesses who have had special knowledge of the country and of its people makes it most manifest that such practice of slave-raiding as existed was in a state of impotent decline, rather than of vigorous activity.

Thereby measures so drastic as the destruction of towns, the slaying of their inhabitants, and the laying waste of harvests had been rendered quite unnecessary to secure the extinction of slave-raiding. The suppression of slave-raiding, therefore, could not really have been the reason, though Mr.

Chamberlain affirmed that it was the reason, why England established herself in the Hinterland.

The real reason why the British Government established its power in the Hinterland is supplied by a witness no less authoritative than Sir Frederick Cardew.

In the course of his replies to the questions of the Royal Commissioner regarding the hut-tax he made this pertinent statement :—

“ I accept the full responsibility of the imposition of the hut tax, and deeply deplore the loss of life and property which has been concomitant with the collection of it ; but the raising of additional revenue was imperative in view of the railway and other developments.”

This additional revenue, which was rendered “ imperative, in view of the railway and other development,” was raised by increasing the import duties of the Sierra Leone Colony.

The Protectorate, being the section by which the largest part of these imports were consumed, naturally felt the rise of the import duties more keenly than did the Colony.

The result was that the chiefs having perceived that the amount of European goods which they now obtained in exchange for their palm-kernels and other produce was less than formerly, they refused, as was their right to do, to trade at all. But by the District Commissions their refusal to trade was met by force as well as by threats.

Thus the interest of trade for private advantage was the real reason why the British Government directly established its jurisdiction over the Hinterland. This answer, however, represents only the economic side of the case ; there is also another side, and that is the political side. Under the earlier Governors of Sierra Leone, such as Sir John Pope Hennessey and Sir Samuel Rowe, nothing beyond the promotion of trade in the “ protected ” countries was aimed at.

To that end a yearly revenue of £2000 was disbursed among the chiefs, who were expected to live peaceably with one another, and not to molest the traders or missionaries who should visit or settle in their country. But later, through the activities of the French, who, by means of their military posts, were cutting off the coast settlements of the British from their interior markets—such settlements, for

instance, as Gambia and Sierra Leone—the policy of direct control over the Hinterland was substituted for that of indirect control.

Thus, it was in order to check the inroads of the French that England in 1889 assumed active jurisdiction over the territory which is north of Freetown, and that extends up to the Skarcies River ; that she claimed in 1884 the southern seaboard down to the Monno River, and that she undertook in 1887 the subjugation of the Yonni and other tribes to the east of what were then the boundaries of Sierra Leone. But the object of the British in preserving these territories being to promote trade, it may still be said that the reasons why she has settled in them are those of trade and revenue.

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

So then trade, or self-interest, and not the putting down of slavery, was the exclusive reason why England settled in the Sierra Leone Hinterland. In consideration of the friendship that she professed for the natives, and the protection which she promised to give them, the natives consented that she should settle in their country. But a feature of this country was that it was undeveloped ; so that the articles of trade that yielded subsistence to the native were products that nature produced unaided by the skill and industry of man. The country being undeveloped, its inhabitants were consequently very poor. This state of things was found by the British to exist in the territory. The country is capable of producing much more than has been its wont. And the Imperial authorities at the Sierra Leone Colony require an increase of revenue. So, then, the natives have placed themselves and their country under British protection. The country is capable of yielding a larger revenue, and the British authorities need this larger revenue. Well, what did they do to secure it? Nothing. Did they instruct, or attempt to instruct, the native how to develop his country, that from its increased yield he may dispense an increased revenue? No. In speaking of the achievements of the French on the Senegal, Dr. Blyden has supplied us with the following facts relative to his visit there in 1902. In the course of his address before the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce in 1903 Dr. Blyden said :—

“ I visited last year, in my capacity of Director of Moham-  
medan Education at Sierra Leone. . . . the Colony of Senegal  
to study the French system of education for their vast Moham-  
medan population.

“ Their chief instrument for this purpose is the College for  
the education of sons of chiefs and of interpreters, founded at  
St. Louis by that enlightened statesman General Faidherbe,  
fifty years ago. It is a most interesting Institution, which the  
Governor-General, M. Roume, informed me, was admirably  
fulfilling its purpose.

“ I learn that since my visit the buildings I saw have been  
taken down as not adapted to the increasing necessities, and  
a magnificent up-to-date structure is now in course of erection.  
They have also endowed schools in all the towns. So that,  
with all the vast preparation they are making for material im-  
provements—for railroads, and docks, and wharves—they  
do not neglect the fundamental necessity of the people—  
education.”

And Viscount Mountmorres, who had just returned home  
in 1906 from a visit to West Africa, where he had gone to in-  
form himself of the commercial possibilities of its coastal  
region, in the course of an address to the Liverpool Chamber  
of Commerce shortly after his return made the following  
timely remarks :—

“ Foreign countries had realized far better than we had  
the enormous commercial possibilities of West Africa. The  
French had displayed a vital energy and enterprise that  
were wholly lacking in British Colonies. He contrasted the  
sanitary condition of British with French Colonies, greatly to  
the disadvantage of this country, and said the trade of French  
West Africa had doubled in ten years, and several French  
Colonies now provided annual surpluses. He criticised the  
large expenditure in the British colonies on military establish-  
ments, contrasting those sums with the miserable amounts  
spent on road-making and the like, and said that if the Chamber  
of Commerce of Liverpool wished to see any successful de-  
velopment of West African colonies they must use their  
influence to put an end to costly and unnecessary punitive  
expeditions, and to insist that the Government shall provide  
the necessary funds for Colonial Administrations that foster  
and develop the agricultural pursuits of the tropical posses-  
sions.”

Of course the settlement of the French at St. Louis goes back to as far as the middle of last century, whereas the establishment of the British Protectorate of the Sierra Leone Hinterland was not until 1896.

But, on the other hand, there is Sierra Leone, which has been a British possession for more than a century, and yet it has not even a Government high school, much less a Government college and Government endowed schools. However, in view of what is to follow as regards the Protectorate, I only wish to call attention to the fact that nothing had yet been done, that not even a beginning had been made by the British to remove the prevailing inertia.

That instead of a movement forward toward the betterment of the native's condition, the movement rather appears to have been backward. For example, take the engagement that was entered into with the native princes by the Sierra Leone Government in 1896 to allow an annual grant of £100 for the education of their sons—a sum that is by no means too magnanimous—at the very next year after the agreement we see that the sum was reduced to £75, and in 1898 we see that it was still further reduced to £50; so that very probably the engagement now survives merely as an historic curiosity. I venture to think that it was not by such a process, a process of gradual reduction, that the French have founded their college at the Senegal, for the education of the sons of chiefs.

Well, then, we have had a glimpse of the situation that prevailed in the Protectorate when the British Government entered it. It entered the Protectorate as a protector and a benefactor. In this latter capacity we have observed that the benefactor did literally nothing to develop the country that he had entered in order to benefit.

Well, as a protector what did he do? He inaugurated his régime of protection by letting loose upon his wards a swarm of mercenaries; these mercenaries, who are known as the Frontier Police, were to a large extent the former slaves of the chiefs over whom they were now set; they were the scum of savagedom, and so girded with a power that was well-nigh absolute; they proceeded to wreak upon their former lords the most abominable indignities, indignities of which their coarse and brutish natures were only too well capable. To •

this intolerable yoke the protector added an Ordinance; this Ordinance provides for the transference to himself of the territory that he had entered to protect. And, notwithstanding the undeveloped condition of the estate or Protectorate of his wards, notwithstanding the poverty of the wards themselves, the protector, by means of this same rude instrument, i.e. the Ordinance, imposed upon his wards the burden of a hut-tax—a tax that was designated by the Royal Commissioner as “unsound in policy, and unsuited to the situation of the people of the Protectorate.” And in the Protectorate itself, whilst the scanty subsistence of the wards were being subjected to the strain of this ponderous tax, at the other end, namely, the Sierra Leone Colony, through which they obtained their foreign supplies, those supplies, by means of the increase of import duties, had also become more costly.

The wards deeming it unprofitable to trade under the altered conditions, reduced their trading operations; but for this, certain agents of the protector that are called District Commissioners employed force as well as threats to coerce the wards to proceed with their unprofitable trade. In regard to the hut-tax, and the confiscation of their lands which the Ordinance had ordained, the natives were greatly alarmed; they were deeply moved, yet with admirable self-restraint they eschewed all measures of desperate import.

Regulating their protests against the outrageous tax within the limits of constitutional formularies, they convened meetings, sought interviews with the local representative of the Crown, drew up and presented petitions to him, to the local Legislature, and to the Crown itself, this latter petition being repeated. Yet after all this loyalty, all this patience under great provocation, without being guilty of any crime—according to the Royal Commissioner—princes were arrested, were handcuffed, were condemned to be flogged, and were imprisoned as felons. The attempted arrest of one of these princes—the arrest which the Royal Commissioner described as “an aggression, pure and simple”—precipitated the so-called “native rising” of 1898, and resulted in the depredations that were committed by the authorities. A tract of country, with a radius of thirty miles, was laid waste, ninety-seven towns and villages, with an aggregate population of 44,000, were destroyed; whilst the chief, Bai Bureh, a



victim of this "aggression," has until recently, languished in exile.

Again, in order to "promote trade," military bands, with famine and death marching in their train, roamed the country. This, then, has been the conduct of the protector to the protected. Its details are dissimilar, but its principles are similar to those that were observed concerning the Nigerian Protectorate. There, as in the Sierra Leone Protectorate, uninvited, England enters. She protests the most solemn and sincere friendship for the native, promises to him protection, receives from him concessions, and then after that she firmly establishes herself in his confidence and in his country, repudiating her promises to, and her covenants with him, she seizes his country, taxes, imprisons, and slays him.

In the case of Sokoto, it is seen that, without reason, explanation, or notice, the annual payment of the Sultan is stopped; then partly by imagination and partly by rumour, it is concluded that he is angry, as he should well be. Upon this conclusion the British garrison is strengthened. And when rumour and imagination make the further announcement that, following the British example, the Sultan, too, is strengthening his garrison, his action is made a crime, the British march against him, slay his people, put himself to flight, and seize his country.

But as a reason for seizing the country in the case of the Sierra Leone Protectorate there is not even this pretext of anger. For there the protector merely passes an Ordinance that henceforth the land belong to the Crown; that therefore, should any tribes, in the future require land, they must apply to Her Majesty's local representative. And when the inhabitants complained or resisted the arbitrary, unjust, and unjustifiable seizure of their lands, they were imprisoned and slaughtered. But this picture of friendship betrayed and of covenants violated, succeeded by subjugation, subjection, and suppression, that is exhibited by the Nigerian and the Sierra Leone Protectorates, is that also of which the decade of the wars that are tabulated on an earlier page is the complement. And this completed picture is the demonstration of the way, the chief way, by which coloured British subjects are brought into the Empire. That there should be this perennial effusion of innocent blood—mainly in Africa and

on the frontiers of India—is not inexplicable, when certain facts are considered—certain facts of which one undoubtedly is—and I allude particularly to Africa—that promotion or recognition of the services of the heads of local administrations almost invariably follow the slaughter of some native tribe and the annexation of their territory. Every official, of course, desires to win recognition; and conflict with the native, followed by the incorporation of his country into the British Empire, being the quickest, if not the surest way to secure the prize, it will be at once perceived how very strong must be the temptation to embark upon these piratical raids.

But in the name of that justice which is thus flouted, of that humanity which is thus outraged, of those sacred native rights which are profaned, of those indescribable sufferings with which timid and delicate women, helpless and innocent children, infirm and decrepit old age, are thus overwhelmed, yea! in the name of God Almighty, the common Maker and Father of us all, I solemnly and most emphatically protest against these military expeditions, and the system by which they thrive.

## IV

# The Manner in which Coloured British Subjects are Treated within the Empire

### (a) CERTAIN POPULAR FALLACIES

**F**RIENDSHIP at first, then subjugation, then subjection, and then repression, or, to put it in one word, force, is the way by which the coloured races are brought into the British Empire. This method of force is our first illustration of what I have called the Rhodes' Law, or the law of eliminating the "unfit." And now we proceed to the second consideration, viz., the manner in which these coloured races are treated within the Empire. We shall consider this subject under the three heads of (a) certain popular fallacies; (b) the treatment of coloured British subjects politically and economically; (c) and the treatment of coloured British subjects socially.

Concerning popular fallacies, I begin with the designation "our subjects," by which one sometimes hears Englishmen allude to coloured British subjects. This designation, perhaps, is a fruit of that innate modesty which would share with His Majesty Edward VII the kingly prerogative. However, I may be allowed to remark that the coloured members of the British Empire are not the subjects of the colourless members, but subjects of the King of Great Britain and Ireland, Emperor of India, and fellow-subjects of Englishmen.

Also British Ethiopians are sometimes reminded that they had been slaves, and that it was Englishmen who gave them their freedom. But to this superfluous piece of information, which is as wrong as it is superfluous, it may be rejoined that the fact that British Negroes had been British slaves casts no stigma whatever upon the once enslaved, but rather upon the once enslavers.

Some four years ago (1903) an American lady sojourning in the Turkish dominions was kidnapped by brigands, and held in bondage for several months. The cause of this lady's captivity, as was also the cause of the Negro's captivity, viz. gain. During the time of her captivity this lady was as much a slave as any African or person of African descent who had been sold from the auction block. For she was deprived of her liberty, and was subject to the will of her captors. That she was not compelled to work, or that she was not flogged, or in any way misused, are mere details and accidents. The main features of slavery were present, namely, deprivation of liberty and subjection to another's will. Happily the lady was eventually released, but I cannot imagine that her enforced servitude deserved the opprobrium whereby she or her descendants would be reminded that she had been a slave; nor can I conceive of the existence of the insanity or the malignity that would delight to brand her thus. For she was the victim, and not the perpetrator, of an infamous crime. The same is true of the thousands, probably, of Europeans who in the Middle Ages were captured and sold into slavery by the pirates of the Barbary States; so likewise is the same true in the case of the Ethiopian; but he, however, when he was captured was not a sojourner in a strange land, nor a traveller on the high seas, but a dweller in his own land. Thither, for the purpose of gain, and with the deliberate resolve to kidnap him, that carrying him across the seas they might sell him into bondage, Englishmen, yielding to an ignoble passion, resorted.

For centuries, callous of the miseries, the groans, the tears and the griefs of the oppressed, they gloated, gloried, and increased in the gains of the unholy trade, until the awakening of those nobler spirits—the emancipators of the oppressors no less than of the oppressed—who, rousing the nation to a sense of its shame and its guilt, quenched the flames and the fumes of the accursed Gehenna. In these circumstances, when Englishmen so far betray the lack of the sense of proportion as to remind the British Ethiopian that he had been a slave, they lay themselves open to the retort that they were the enslavers. And if the man who steals another's purse or another's liberty be he upon whom the stain of stigma fastens, rather than upon him who has been

robbed, then the Negro at whom this cap of gibe is thrown may, with the silence of contempt, pass it by that the head for which truth has designed it may wear it.

And as for the statement that the Ethiopian was given his freedom by Englishmen, it is false. The Ethiopian could never have been the recipient of this boon from those who themselves were but recipients of it. The same hand whence Englishmen obtained their freedom is that from which the Ethiopian at the same time obtained his freedom. Therefore, what was done at the time of the emancipation of the slaves throughout the British dominions was not to give, but rather to restore what had already been given, but had been wrongly taken away.

Intimately related to the restoration of freedom to the British Ethiopian was the great movement of which it was the result—a movement which the abolitionists began and consummated; also the compensation of twenty millions sterling that were paid to the slave-owners. And as the founders and guides of the abolition movement—a movement that achieved one of the greatest of moral victories that the world has ever witnessed—the names of Clarkson, Sharpe, Wilberforce, Buxton, and their brave and catholic-minded associates will ever by the Ethiopian be accounted as being among his most treasured bequests.

But the sentiment of deep and abiding gratitude which is thus cherished by the Ethiopian to the memory of those heroic spirits, is cherished not as to those whose advocacy and intercessions had brought him a great boon that he had never possessed, or that having possessed he had justly forfeited, but as to those rather who had recovered and had restored to him from their brethren his heritage and birthright, of which they had impiously deprived him. This being the case concerning the emancipation, the British people, no less than the Ethiopian, owe to the abolitionists for having delivered them from the unrighteous traffic in human flesh, a great debt of gratitude.

And with regard to the compensation of twenty million pounds that were paid to the slave-owners, and for which the emancipated and their descendants are exhorted to manifest to the donors the consciousness of a sense of profound thankfulness, I would notice that in May, 1903, I saw

in a daily paper that the lady (Miss Stone) who had been captured by brigands in the Turkish Empire had applied to her Government, the United States', with the request that compensation should be demanded from the Turkish Government for her seizure.

As is known, a ransom for her release was paid to her captors; but no one would justly or intelligently contend that that ransom obviated the claim that was now made by the lady. The payment of twenty millions to the slave-holders for the release of the captive Ethiopian is like the payment of the ransom to the brigands for the release of the captive lady. And as no one could successfully contend that the claim of the released lady to compensation is inadmissible, so no one could successfully contend that the claim of the released Ethiopian would be inadmissible. Therefore, rather than the fact that the Ethiopian owes a debt of gratitude to Englishmen for this ransom of twenty million pounds, it is Englishmen who owe the debt of compensation to the Ethiopian for his compulsory captivity and his unrequited toil.

But looking at the matter from a purely economic point of view, and apart altogether from the arrangement that was come to with the slave-holders, I am bound to say that had the Ethiopian population—in the West Indies, for example—been given a substantial compensation at the time of their manumission, and had such a compensation been employed for settling that population upon the land and in establishing among the group of colonies an agricultural college, there would have been to-day in the British West Indies an absence of that paradox, by which one of the most fertile sections of the globe subsists, in a state of chronic poverty, upon loans and doles.<sup>1</sup>

But in pursuance of the claim which some allege that the governing people of the Empire have upon the gratitude of the Ethiopian section governed, that claim, I admit, may be urged upon the ground of the moral and intellectual benefits which have accrued to this section of the governed as a sequence of slavery. However, seeing that the value of an action lies in the intention that prompts it, rather than in the quality of the action itself, I would ask in reply whether

<sup>1</sup> This is quite apart from the visitations of hurricanes, cyclones, and earthquakes.

the intention of the Englishmen who kidnapped and sold the African into slavery, was even in part, to secure his moral elevation, his intellectual enlightenment, and his material advancement? If this was not their intention, but that it happened in spite of and contrary to their intention, then, clearly, as benefits that have followed, but not derived from slavery, the traffickers in human life, as such, have had no title to a title of claim upon the gratitude of the emancipated.

Concerning the relations that exist between the coloured and colourless races of the Empire, let me say at once that it is in the missionary or philanthropic sense alone, and not in the political sense, or the economic sense, that the claim of the white upon the gratitude of the dark races is conceivable. Let me also add that this missionary or philanthropic sense reveals nothing that is irregular or singular, but is a continuation or a repetition of a well-known historic precedent. Thus it is that, as in obedience to the command of the Saviour the missionary band, led by Augustine, gave the Gospel, and with it literature and other adjuncts of civilization to Britain, so in obedience to that same command, Britain now transmits that Gospel and its adjuncts to the coloured races. Therefore, the philanthropic element being excluded, the relations between the coloured and colourless peoples of the British Empire are those of reciprocal obligations. If there be indebtedness, it is not the coloured section that is the debtor, but the colourless section.

In the preceding chapter we saw that, both directly and indirectly, the coloured British subject is brought into the Empire by means of force. And the territories of the peoples which in this manner are brought into the Empire may be given under the three representations of cession, of conquest, and of colonies that have been colonized by liberated and emancipated slaves. Cession denotes those territories that have been ceded to the British Crown by the native ruler; conquest denotes those countries, which as the result of military operations against them, have been incorporated with the British Empire. The peoples which occupied the ceded and conquered territories, continuing to occupy them after that they had been brought into the Empire, are made to defray all the expenses that are connected with the ma-

chinery of the new methods of governments that have since been established.

The last of the three classes of countries or territories are those—for example, the British West Indies—in which the freed men or their descendants, after the emancipation, bought lands upon which they settled. Like the peoples of the two former classes of territories, the peoples of this third class, constituting the majority of the population, are chiefly responsible for defraying the costs of the governments of their several communities. From these facts it will be seen in regard to the inhabitants of the territories of the first and second classes that as the original owners of the soil they brought a very large amount of capital into the firm that is known as the British Empire, and it will be seen in the next place that all the coloured subjects of the Empire contribute liberally to the working expenses of the firm. As partners, then, a very large portion of the land which comprises the chief asset of the Empire, and a very large share of the working expenses that are devoted to the management of the Empire, are contributed to the firm by the coloured races. The rules which safeguard, or which should safeguard, the vast interests of these coloured members of the firm, and which have been framed and promulgated by the senior members—the colourless race—are given in the two following memoranda. The first of these memos, appearing as a report that was made by a Parliamentary Committee that was appointed in 1865 to inquire into “the state of the British Establishments on the Western Coast of Africa,” with a comment thereon by an English gentleman, states this:—

“That all further extension of territory, or assumption of government, or new treaties offering any protection to native tribes would be inexpedient, and that the object of our policy should be to encourage in the natives the exercise of those qualities which may render it possible for us more and more to transfer to them the administration of all the governments, with a view to an ultimate withdrawal from all, except probably Sierra Leone.”

Expounding the principles of this minute an English gentleman observed “that the ambition of Great Britain in these days is to see her Colonies attain, one by one, to the position



of wealth and power, and to form themselves into nations. It is her desire to have independent nations, once her feeble offsprings, associated with her in the great work of the world's natural development and the spread of Christian civilization."

## V

# The Manner in which Coloured British Subjects are Treated within the Empire

### (b) THEIR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

IN the year that the East India Company was dissolved —1858—the Imperial Government, assuming direct control over Indian affairs, issued a proclamation from the Queen in Council which contained the following pledge: “And it is our further will that as far as may be our subjects, of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability, and integrity duly to discharge.” The first of these two minutes refers to a time when the senior member of the Imperial firm shall retire from the active control of certain branches of the firm, and shall be succeeded by certain junior members of the firm. And the second minute, anticipating this change, directs that in the interval provision should be made for the filling of important offices of these branches by those junior members, so that they may be qualified for ultimately assuming the direction of those branches.

In other words, these minutes direct that the coloured communities of the British Empire should proceed politically upon the same lines of development as the white communities.

That first they should be governed directly by the Home Government; that during this interval their members should be eligible to fill high offices connected with their respective governments, and that, finally, the Home Government withdrawing, they should severally become self-governing states.

Now from this sketch, in which the coloured communities of the British Empire appear as partners, rather than as mendicants, as those that have a stake in the Empire, rather than as those that have in it no claim, but that depend upon

the goodwill and benevolence of the colourless race, in which moreover they appear according to the explicit pledge of the senior partner, as those that are being trained for self-government—from this sketch we pass to consider in the next two divisions of this chapter how far these pledges have been redeemed.

## INDIA

In this consideration we shall employ British India as our first illustration. Look at this city; it is girt about with a belt of mountains. Behold its spacious and regular streets, its costly mansions, and stately palaces. Look at its magnificent stores, laden with every description of the world's manufacture. Its sanitary arrangements, too, of open spaces, parks, drainage, and dwellings for the working classes, are perfect. Its police and other organizations for the maintenance of public order are models. And its public conveniences, its electric light, its airy and luxuriously-furnished electric cars, its drinking fountains, public baths, telephone, telegraph, post offices, free libraries, colleges, schools, gymnasiums, churches, hospitals, museums, and fire stations are among those other things that help to confer upon this city the measure of comfort which it appears to enjoy. Its government likewise, municipal and political, the latter in its legislative, judicial, and executive departments, represents the most equitable and liberal systems of procedure. But this city, notwithstanding its benefits, suffers from a serious and an even fatal disadvantage. Walled in by its belt of mountains, it ever lies in a pool of moisture, which, converted by the tropical heat into a nursery-bed for noxious germs, foment disease and circling epidemics, that scatter death in their courses, and leave behind the jaundiced and washed-out people that form the bulk of its citizens.

Turning from this picture to India we are confronted there by a like spectacle, a spectacle that differs from it only by the more stupendous form of its gravity. Turning to India, we are confronted with great and historic cities, that are alive with all the activities and energies of Eastern and Western cultures. Viceroy, governors, judges, magistrates, and their retinues of subordinates, as the representatives of politics and law; bazaars, stores, ships, railways, telegraph, as the representa-

tives of commerce ; forts, barracks, encampments, soldiers, as indicating military defence—actual and prospective—churches, chapels, temples, mosques, schools, colleges, missionaries, and priests, as the heralds of religion ; herds, flocks, ploughed fields and crops, as representing agriculture ; and structures, with chimneys towering to the skies, and stocked with machinery, as the emblems of manufacture. All these, each on its own lines, speed forward to fulfil the allotted task. But around and overhanging this mighty network of human activity and industry is a huge wall of mountains, a wall of mountains terrible in its consequence as well as in its aspect ; mountains whence, death-spreading germs emanating, slay, in ten successive waves during the last forty-two years, some fifteen millions of the Indian people.<sup>1</sup> The name of this citadel of destruction and woe is, famine.

Fifteen millions, then, is the estimated number of the Indian people that have perished from famine since the assumption of direct control over the affairs of India by the British Government. As a result of this frightful mortality, the prolific Indian population has become stationary. In Bengal, Madras, and Northern India there has been a slight increase in the population ; but in Bombay, the Central Provinces, and Native States, through recent famines there has been an actual decrease of some millions of the population. That is to say, that through the three famine visitations of the last ten years the population of India has been less by some thirty millions than it would have been had the nominal increase of one per cent. per annum, taken place.

And in these startling facts the most apprehensive feature is the increasing severity of the later visitations. Thus, if the last famine, viz., that of 1900, be taken as an example, it will be seen from the havoc which it wrought in the Punjab, Rajputana, the Central Provinces, and Bombay, to have been the most widespread and the most severe that had ever been witnessed in India. During the worse months the number of persons that were relieved rose to six millions.

In Bombay the sufferers from this famine, according to the description of Sir A. P. Macdonald, President of the Famine Commission, "died in the famine-camps like flies." And the

<sup>1</sup> According to Mr. Digby the total admitted mortality from famine in India during 47 years—from 1854 to 1901—or since the imperial rule has been established, is 28,825,000.

victims in all were believed to be scarcely less than a million. In the frequency of their recurrence, and the ever-widening sweep of their devastations, these famine outbreaks, whether viewed with the humanitarian, the political, or the historic eye, are full of the very gravest peril. Viewed from the humanitarian standpoint, and apart from the overwhelming numbers that the famine-cataclysm carried away, how unspeakably horrible are the scenes that attend the onrush. Here are two examples that are supplied to us by Mr. Wm. Digby, C.I.E.; the first is taken from the "Englishman," Calcutta, and the second is furnished by a correspondent of the "Bombay Gazette," a journal that is by no means pro-Indian in its policy:—

(1) "The sights I saw on my way into B—— will haunt me my life through. Two women, one lying in the middle of the road, and the other about fifteen feet further off on the side of the road, had both evidently died during the night. The one on the road was untouched, but the jackals had been busy at the other. A little further on there lay a young man on whom the crows had gone, and then—but, no, I must stop or I shall be sick. The recollection of some of the sights turns me up. When I got to B—— I could not touch my breakfast, the horrors I had seen kept recurring to my mind."

(2) "I have witnessed countless little ones in skin and bone carefully picking up every single grain and every cotton seed perchance lying in the dust of the street, or savagely licking up spilt milk or curd; and such is the case in places where they delighted to say that relief measures are careful and plenteous. Why, the wail in almost every village, of particular descriptions, is—'Our cattle, sir, are all gone; and it is now our turn to go!'"

And this lament is true in every word of it.

"Nearly everywhere in India," adds Mr. Digby, "such incidents are occurring. Among the Christian communities things are as bad as among any other section of the people. One missionary in Southern India, belonging to the London Missionary Society, in a non-famine year was told by a member of one of his congregations that if the people could get a meal once in two days they had to be satisfied with that!"

The scourge that led to this devouring of offal from off the streets by starving *children*, that strewed the carcasses of

the young man and the two women along the highway, even refusing to them burial, and that delivered them up to the rapacity of vultures and wild beasts, has, I repeat, visited India ten times during the last forty-two years; that at its last advent (1900) those whom it slew outright were said to have been a million, and that each time its ravages become more terribly intense, and more alarmingly widespread. Such is the humanitarian side of the case.

Politically, we have seen that during the forty-two years of direct British rule in India, fifteen millions of its people have perished from famine; that its population is now stationary; and that later famines have been more extensive and severe than had been their wont earlier. But how long will the population be able to endure such a strain without the collapse of its body politic?

Historically, whether it be a concern or an indifference of the governing people—and it appears to be rather the latter—regarding the character of its Indian rule, the fact remains that the character of that rule, fixed by the increase or the decrease of the governed, by their contentment or their discontentment, by their prosperity or their poverty, shall greatly determine posterity in its award of condemnation or of commendation, to the imperial work of the British people. Therefore, on behalf of that humanity, which the death of these famine-slain millions has shocked, in view of the political anarchy that is threatened by the impoverishment and wholesale decimation of the great dependency, and in view of that verdict of commendation or condemnation that posterity shall award to their rule, can Englishmen forbear a candid discussion of the momentous subject of Indian famine?

A candid discussion of the famine-malady is the pre-requisite to its prevention. Such a discussion, therefore, should aim, not merely at the cure of famine, which cure is the scope and function of famine relief works, but it should aim rather at the prevention of famine. Thus, when the Viceroy, Lord Curzon, discoursing upon the Indian famine in the Legislative Council, in the year 1900, said “. . . that he spoke with the object of demonstrating to the Indian public that in the administration of the late famine the Government had not been unworthy of their trust, and that this year of strain and suffering would not have passed without their profiting by its

lessons ; that if a special characteristic can be attributed to our campaign of famine relief in the past year, it has been its unprecedented liberality ; there is no parallel in the history of India, or of any country of the world, to the total of over six million persons who, in British India and the native states, for weeks on end, have been dependent upon the charity of the Government," he was touching the minor, and not the major key ; for he was discussing the curatives of Indian famine, instead of the prophylactics.

Full meed of praise must be accorded to the Indian Government for the energy, courage, and promptitude with which it grappled with the famine-foe. The highest commendation must be likewise given to the army of officials, who, as the deputy of the Government, amidst scenes that were at once distressing and depressing, carried out the work of relief, nor must the public liberality which so generously sustained the work of relief be omitted from this meed of eulogy. Yet the fact must not be forgotten that these means have been simply palliatives ; they were the opium that was administered to the cancer-stricken patient, to allay the virulence and the ravages of his pain ; they were not the remedies that were directed to the prevention of the disease. And so, discarding the palliatives of famine relief, our discussion shall be confined to the subject of the prevention of famine in India.

As furnishing data that are full, that are well arranged, and that are conclusive, in regard to the subject, I shall reproduce an article here that originally appeared in "The New England Magazine" for September, 1900, and that contains a summary account of an investigation into the causes of Indian famine, by Rev. T. S. Sunderland. Mr. Sunderland's long residence on the Indian Peninsula gave him extensive knowledge of Indian affairs, thereby he has been rendered peculiarly well qualified to discuss the subject of Indian famine. The article is quoted here from the work of Mr. Wm. Digby, C.I.E., entitled, "Prosperous British India—A Revelation from Official Records," that was published in 1901. Upon this subject of Indian famine Mr. Sunderland says :—

'Such a state of things naturally awakens the sympathy of the world. But it ought to do more. It ought to compel a far more careful inquiry than has yet been made as to the causes of the

famines, with a view to ascertaining whether these causes can be removed or not, and thus whether such scourges as now visit India with such appalling frequency are or are not preventable.'

Proceeding then to discuss the two most frequently alleged causes of Indian famines, viz., the failure of rains, and overpopulation, he continues thus :—

#### 'FAILURE OF RAINS IS NOT THE CAUSE

'The great monsoon rains which supply most of the moisture for India vary greatly from year to year. These rains, of course, man cannot control. If they are abundant over the whole land, the whole land has abundant crops. If they fail in parts, those parts have agricultural scarcity. Three things, however, should be remembered. One is, that there is never failure of water everywhere ; when drought is severest in certain sections, other sections have plenty. The second is that India is a land where there is much irrigation, and easily might be much more ; and wherever irrigation exists failure of rain does not necessarily mean failure of crops. The third thing to be remembered is that transportation is easy between all parts of the land. On two sides is the sea ; navigable rivers and canals penetrate large sections ; there is no extended area that does not have its railway. Thus food can readily be conveyed from areas of abundance to areas of scarcity.

'Under these circumstances it is easy to see that, even if we admit to the fullest extent the uncertainty of rains in many large areas of India, it does not follow that there need be famine or loss of life in those areas. It should not be forgotten that the aggregate of rainfall in India, taking the country as a whole, is large. The heaviest recorded precipitation in the world is found there. The only difficulty is that of distribution ; India's mountains and rivers furnish such facilities as are seen in few other lands of the world. . . . Thus, India has two sources of water supply on a large scale : one is her rains, which fall in abundance in many parts ; the other her mountains, which send down numerous and in some cases vast rivers to afford opportunities for almost limitless irrigation as they travel on their long journeys to the sea.

'As a result, the agricultural possibilities of India are greater than those of almost any other country in the world. Wherever in India water can be obtained for irrigation, crops are certain. From time immemorial there has been much



irrigation. Since India came under the control of the British, the Government has interested itself, to some extent, in promoting irrigation works. But unfortunately it has also been guilty of much neglect. Not only have important opportunities for supplying extensive areas with water for irrigation purposes been allowed to go unimproved, but irrigation canals and storage reservoirs that were constructed in earlier times have been permitted to fall into decay. An enormous amount of water goes to waste that ought to be saved.

‘Great numbers of new canals ought to be dug; old canals ought to be reopened; canals now in use ought to be deepened and widened. In regions where water cannot be obtained for the supply of canals more wells ought to be sunk, and old wells in many cases ought to be deepened. New tanks and reservoirs ought to be constructed, and old reservoirs ought to be enlarged to store more adequately the surface water. In these ways the certainty of India’s water supply, and therefore the certainty and abundance of her food supply, might be greatly increased.

‘But even under present conditions, with irrigation as imperfectly developed as it is now, India is one of the food-producing lands. No matter how severe the drought may be in some parts, in others there is always sufficient water, and are therefore abundant crops; so that there is seldom or never a time when India, as a whole, does not contain food enough for all her people.

‘Three years ago, when the famine was most severe, there was no difficulty in getting food if one only had money to buy it with; and the same is true in the midst of the terrible famine that is prevailing at the present time. Thus it becomes evident that, if we would discover the causes of the periodic starvation of such vast numbers of the Indian people, we must look deeper than mere failure of the rains.’

We have now come to the second alleged cause, namely, that of over-population.

#### ‘OVER-POPULATION IS NOT THE CAUSE OF FAMINES

‘A very little study of the facts shows that it is not. The population of India is not so dense as in a number of the states of Europe which are prosperous, have no difficulty in supporting their people, and in which famines are never dreamed of. Nor is the birth-rate high in India. It is less than in England, and much less than in Germany and several

other Continental countries. Indeed, it is 75 per 1000 less than the average birth-rate of all Europe. India is not over-populated. As already pointed out, even under present conditions, she produces food enough for all her people. But if her agricultural possibilities were properly developed, she could easily support a greatly increased population.

'There are enormous areas of waste land that ought to be subdued and brought under cultivation. . . . Another, larger still, is the extension of irrigation in those regions where there is danger of lack of water. In these two ways alone all possible increase of population for a hundred years to come might easily be provided for. But beyond this is another resource even greater. Indian agriculture is for the most part primitive and superficial. The Indian rayat is industrious and faithful, but he tills his soil according to methods that are two or three thousand years old.

'The result is, he raises crops which are only a fraction of what they would be with improved methods of tillage. Sir James Caird pointed out to the Indian Government long ago that a single additional bushel an acre raised by the rayat would mean food for another 22,000,000 of people. But the addition of a bushel an acre is only the mere beginning of what might be done. Mr. A. O. Hume, long connected officially with the agriculture of India, declared that "with proper manuring and proper tillage, every acre, broadly speaking, of the land in the country can be made to yield 30, 50, or 70 per cent more of every kind of crop than it at present produces."

'Here is a resource that is practically inexhaustible. Add this to the other two named, and we see at once that the suggestion that population is outstripping agricultural possibilities, and that famines are inevitable for that reason, becomes hardly better than ludicrous.'

Having disposed of these, the two very popular allegations, that purport to account for Indian famine, Mr. Sunderland now asks: 'What, then, is the cause of famines in India?' And he answers that—

'THE REAL CAUSE IS THE EXTREME, THE ABJECT, THE AWFUL  
POVERTY OF THE INDIAN PEOPLE

'The cause of Indian famine,' he avows, 'is the extreme poverty of the Indian people—a poverty so severe,' he continues, 'that it keeps a majority of all on the very verge of

suffering, even in years of plenty, and prevents them from laying up anything to tide them over years of scarcity. If their condition were such that in good years they could get a little ahead, then when the bad years came they could draw on that as a resource; this would not save them from hardships, but it would save them from starvation.

‘But, as things go, the vast majority have no such resource. Even in the best years they have all they can do to live and support their families in the barest possible way, without laying by a rupee for a rainy day. The result is, when their crops fail they are helpless. For a while they manage to keep the wolf of famine from the door by selling their cow, if they have one, their plough bullock, such bits of simple furniture from their poor dwellings, or such cooking utensils or such articles of clothing as they can find a purchaser for at any price.

‘Then, when the last thing is gone that can be exchanged for even an anna or a handful of millet, there is nothing left for them except to sit down in their desolate homes, or wander into the field and die. This is the history of hundreds of thousands and millions of the Indian people in times of drought. If the poor sufferers are so fortunate as to be received by the Government at the famine relief works, where in return for continuous hard labour they are supplied with the smallest amount of food that will sustain life, the hardiest of them survive until the rains come; then with depleted strength they go back to their stripped homes, and, barehanded, begin as best they can the task of raising a new crop and supporting such members of their families as are left alive.

‘Here, then, we have the real cause of the famine in India. It is simply the extreme poverty of the Indian people which keeps them living absolutely from hand to mouth, with no chance to make provision beforehand for any kind of contingency; so that, if such a disaster as the failure of a crop comes, they are at once undone. The truth is, the poverty of India is something that we can have little conception of unless we have actually seen it, as, alas! the writer of this paper has.’

To meet the not unnatural charge of exaggeration which these appalling statements may cause to be made against him, Mr. Sunderland cites some facts and figures from authorities of unquestioned eminence, such as Sir William Hunter, Mr. A. O. Hume, Sir Auckland Colvin, Sir Charles Elliott, Lord Cromer (Major Baring).

“These statements would indeed” “seem incredible did they not come from men whose knowledge and character we cannot doubt, and who could have no motive for exaggeration”— ‘officials of the Indian Government, who are trained and careful men, and whose interest it is to understate and not to exaggerate.’

‘Is it then,’ “he asks,” ‘any wonder that the Indian peasant can lay up nothing for a rainy day, and, therefore, that he finds starvation invariably staring him in the face if any disorder overtakes that little crop which is the only thing which stands between him and death?’ ‘The real cause of Indian famines,’ “he concludes,” ‘is *the extreme, the abject, the awful poverty of the Indian people.*’ “The italics are Mr. Sunderland’s.”

‘And now we come to the final, the deepest, the crucial question of all: Why this terrible poverty? Is it necessary? Is there no remedy for it? What has produced it?’

#### ‘THE ENORMOUS FOREIGN TRIBUTE

‘India is a land rich in resources beyond most other lands in the world. It would seem as if her people ought to live in plenty, comfort, and security, with ample and more than ample provision made in her many fat years against any possible lack in her few years of comparative leanness. Why does not the fatness of her fat years prevent suffering and starvation in the lean? Fortunately here, too, an answer is not difficult to find when once we begin really to look for it. John Stuart Mill saw the answer plainly in his day. John Bright saw it in his. The real friends of India in England very generally see it now. The intelligent classes in India see it. It is found in the simple fact that India is a subject land, ruled by a foreign Power, which keeps her tributary to itself, not only politically, but commercially, financially, and industrially, and drains away her wealth in a steady stream that is all the while enriching the English people, and, of course, correspondingly impoverishing the helpless people of India.

‘A farm may be naturally very rich, but let its products be carried away and consumed abroad, and let nothing be put back upon the soil, and no intelligent farmer will wonder if in two or three hundred years the farm becomes impoverished. The Indian people are much in the condition of such a farm. India is an orange which England got possession of by the sword, and holds firmly in her grasp by means of a big army, and has long been industrially sucking. It is not strange if

what is left after the sucking process has gone on all these years is not very life-sustaining to the Indian people.

'Again and again has attention been called to the effects of this heavy and constant drain of wealth from India to England. . . . This drain from India has been going on and steadily increasing for more than two centuries. There is no country in the world that could endure such a steady loss of wealth without becoming impoverished.'

"Mr. Sunderland, like the rest of us, finds it difficult to estimate the amount of the drain," 'because the streams through which the tribute flows are many, and constant efforts are made by the British and Indian Governments to hide them out of sight.' "But taking it at from twenty-five to thirty millions sterling a year," 'it is to be borne in mind,' "he points out," 'that all this is in *addition* to the regular and very heavy *home* expenses of the Indian Government'—'a *foreign tribute*, paid to a nation on the other side of the globe for the privilege of being a subject people.' 'Is it,' "then," 'any wonder that India is poor?'

'WHERE DOES THE ENORMOUS TRIBUTE COME FROM?'

'Of course, from the tax-paying Indian people. Who are the tax-paying Indian people? More than ninety per cent of them are the people who have been described, who with their utmost endeavours are able to obtain only the barest possible subsistence, who have to support families of five on incomes not amounting all told to more than thirty or forty dollars a year.

'The people, many of whom often go months at a time, even in reasonably good years, with only one full meal a day, are yet compelled to pay a tax of 500 per cent on imported salt, or 4000 times the cost of manufacture if the salt is home made; and of their little crops they have to pay to the Government as taxes from one-sixth to one-third of all they raise. The attention of both the Indian and British Governments has been called again and again to this excessive and crushing taxation, and every possible means has been tried to secure some amelioration, but without result.

'For many years the settled policy has been not to lessen the burden of taxation upon the peasant, but constantly to seek new pretexts and opportunities for increasing it.'

“Again Mr. Sunderland cites authorities, all of them well known to the readers of this journal, including Sir William Wedderburn and Mr. Romesh Dutt. He then considers the home expenses of the Government.

‘THE MOST EXPENSIVE GOVERNMENT IN THE WORLD—  
BIG SALARIES AND BIG PENSIONS

‘It has often been pointed out that the British Government in India is the most expensive Government in the world; the reason is, it is a Government of foreigners. The foreigners, having it in their power to fix their own salaries, do not err on the side of making them too low. Having to exile themselves from their native land, they naturally want plenty to pay for it. Nearly all the higher officials throughout India are British. The Civil Service is nominally open to Indians, but it is hedged about with so many restrictions (among others, Indian young men being required to make the journey from India to London to take their examinations) that as a fact only one-fiftieth of the places in the service, and these generally the lowest and poorest, are occupied by Indians; although there are thousands of well-educated and competent Indians who would be glad to get the places, and who would fill them well if they were allowed.

‘The amount of money which the Indian people are required to pay for the salaries of this great army of civil servants and appointed higher officials, and then, later, for pensions for the same after they have served a given number of years in India, is enormous. That as good service could be obtained from the Government at a small fraction of the present cost by employing Indians (who much better understand the needs of the country) in three-fourths, if not nine-tenths, of these positions is no doubt true. But that would not serve the purpose of England, who wants these fat offices for her sons. Hence the poor Indian rayat must sweat and bleed and go hungry, and, if need be, starve, that an ever-growing number of Englishmen may have big salaries and big pensions. Of course, much of the money paid for these salaries, and practically all paid for the pensions, goes permanently out of India.

‘The large military establishment that England maintains in India (of course, primarily for the purpose of keeping the Indian people in subjection) is very costly, and is paid for out of the Indian taxes. Nor is the Indian Army proper all the military expense that India is required to pay. During

the century just closed the Indian and the Imperial Governments have carried on wars in Afghanistan and other regions beyond the North-Western frontier, involving a total expense of 500,000,000 dollars. Who has paid this vast sum? All but 50,000,000 dollars (one-tenth of the whole) has been charged to poor, overtaxed India.'

"Mr. Sunderland is really too liberal; he should have said one-twentieth, not one-tenth, of the whole—Mr. Gladstone's contribution of five million pounds to the cost of the second Afghan War. But that is a detail. Mr. Sunderland does not omit to consider the claim that "' England has done much for India, and conferred upon her substantial advantages.'

#### 'THE ADVANTAGES OF BRITISH RULE

'This is true; but in all cases India has paid the bills, and in many cases the advantages have been small compared with the heavy cost. Much is said about education. How much does the Indian Government spend annually for education? A little less than a penny per person of the population. Compare this with the enormous sums spent for military purposes; and then remember that the whole expenditure, whether for education or the Army, comes from the pocket of the Indian tax-payer. We are pointed to the railways of India as a striking illustration of what England is doing for her dependency. Yes, whatever lack of money there may be for education, or for sanitary improvements, or for irrigation, or for other things which the people of India so earnestly desire and pray for, the Indian Government always seems to have plenty for railways. Why? Because the railways of India help the English people to wealth.

'It is true that the Indian people make some use of them and derive certain advantages from them; but they also suffer from certain very serious disadvantages. The railways have broken up many of the old industries of India, and thus have brought hardships and suffering to millions of the people; but they enrich the ruling nation, and they give her a firmer military grip upon her valuable dependency, and so money can always be found for them, whatever else suffers. If half the money that has been spent on railways had been spent for irrigation, droughts would to-day have little terror for the Indian people. What a commentary it is upon British management in India that more than eight millions are spent on railways for every million spent on irrigation!'

## ' BRITISH INDIAN " IMPERIALISM "

' America stands appalled at the magnitude and tyranny of her Standard Oil Company. But the Standard Oil monopoly is a pigmy compared with England's monopoly in India. The world has no other such monopoly as this. England holds not only the government, but virtually the commerce, the finance, and the industries of 250,000,000 people in her hand, to shape them as she will, responsible to nobody but herself. She claims to manage Indian affairs with India's welfare in view. I believe that the Standard Oil Company makes a similar claim. The answer to make to both is, "By their fruits ye shall know them." The fact that at the end of two hundred years of commercial dominance, and of more than forty years of absolute political sway, we are confronted with such indescribable poverty of the people, and with famine after famine of such magnitude and severity as to make the world stand aghast, seems to prove beyond answer that England in all these years has not made the welfare of India her first aim, but has subordinated India's good to her own enrichment.

' We denounce ancient Rome for impoverishing Gaul, and Egypt, and Sicily, and Palestine, and her other conquered provinces, by draining away their wealth to enrich herself. We denounce Spain for robbing the New World in the same way. But England is doing exactly the same thing in India, and on a much larger scale; only she is doing it skilfully, adroitly, by modern and "enlightened" modes of procedure, under business and judicial forms, and with so many pretences of "governing India for her advantage, and enriching her by civilized methods," that the world has been largely blinded to what has been really going on. But probe down through the surface of fine words and legal forms to what lies below, and we have the same hideous business that Rome and Spain were engaged in so long, and for which in the end they paid so dear. Called by the right name, what is this treatment of India by England? It is parasitism. It is the stronger nation sucking the blood of the weaker. It is "Imperialism"——'

Mr. Sunderland, I understand, is a foreigner, an American, and so his article is that of an outsider. Further, he has been a missionary in India for many years. As an outsider, then, he was in the position to be easily impartial in the treatment



of the subject. As one who had long resided in India, he had had the opportunity of making himself well acquainted with the system of government in that country. And as a missionary in India for a long term of years he had had large opportunities for knowing the lives and condition of the native population. Therefore, as an authority upon the subject of the cause of famines in India, Mr. Sunderland, as an outsider, is probably impartial. As an outsider, or an onlooker, who had long resided in India, he is probably well acquainted with the system of government in the country. And as an outsider who was engaged in the work of missions in India for many years, he is probably well acquainted with the condition of the Indian native.

Now, I venture to say that both the facts which Mr. Sunderland has presented in his article, and the manner he has presented those facts, unequivocally prove his impartiality, the fulness of his knowledge of the system of British rule in India, and also the condition of the Indian people. But besides these eminent qualifications, Mr. Sunderland's article is supported by the utterances of leading statesmen, and by specialists in Indian affairs. Of these two classes are the names of Sir William Hunter, Mr. A. O. Hume, Sir Auckland Colvin, Sir Charles Elliott, Lord Cromer, John Bright, John Stuart Mill, Mr. Romesh Dutt, and Sir William Wedderburn.

So upon this most vital subject of the cause of Indian famines Mr. Sunderland's article is entirely authoritative; and, as such, it possesses thereby the greatest weight. The article may be said to have a negative and a positive side. By the negative side, what are not the causes of famine in India are shown; and by the positive side what is the cause of famine in India is shown. Thus the negative shows that (1) "failure of rains," and (2) "over-population," are not the causes of famine in India; and the positive shows that the abject poverty of the Indian people is the cause of famine in India.

Failure of rains, the article shows, is not the cause of famine in India, because there is never a cessation of the rains, at the same time, all over India.

In the severest drought in certain sections, there are rains at the same time in other sections, and the aggregate rainfall in India, as a whole, is very large. Indeed, it is the largest

recorded precipitation in the world. Further, even if it were the case, which it is not, that sometimes in every part of the country there is a simultaneous absence of rain, there would still be no reason why famine should be the result. For in India, wherever water can be obtained for irrigation, crops are abundant. And although its use might be increased with advantage, yet it is a fact that irrigation is much practised in India. This is feasible by means of the great mountains of India, the wombs of her mighty rivers, which, in their progress to the seas, afford to irrigation an illimitable scope.

As a result of this single means the agricultural possibilities of India are almost greater than those of any other part of the world. And not only is irrigation feasible, which, if it be employed in the absence of rain in India, is certain to produce crops, but it is employed. It has been employed by the native Indian from time immemorial. And, since its advent, the British Government has, to some extent, interested itself in promoting irrigation works. But it has likewise been guilty of culpable neglect. It has allowed opportunities for the supply of vast areas with water, to go unimproved. On the other hand, canals and storage reservoirs which were constructed in earlier times have been allowed to fall into decay. Thus an enormous amount of water runs to waste that could, and that ought to, be saved.

A large number of new canals should be dug, old ones should be repaired, and canals that are now in use should be deepened and widened. In regions where it is impracticable to supply canals more wells should be sunk, old wells in many cases should be deepened, new tanks and reservoirs should be constructed, and old tanks and reservoirs should be enlarged. In these ways there would be an abundance of water, and with an abundance of water there would be an abundance of food. India's food supply thereby might be greatly increased.

But even under present conditions, from the facts that rain does not at any one time fail throughout India, and that irrigation is practised by the native husbandman, it happens that however severe the drought in some parts may be, there is always sufficient food in other parts to feed the entire population. Thus, in the year 1898, for example, and also in 1901, when the famine in India was very severe, there was no difficulty

in supplying the famine area with sufficient food from the areas of abundance. Lastly, by means of its system of canals, its navigable rivers, its seaboard, and its network of railways, India is not without the facilities for distributing its food supplies throughout the country. For these reasons, therefore, that in no single year is there a failure of rainfall throughout India, that the system of irrigation, which is a substitute for rain, is employed in India, and that in consequence there is always sufficient food in the country to feed the population, it cannot be true that "failure of rains" is the cause of Indian famines.

Regarding "over-population," which is the other reason that is assigned, the article shows that the population of India is not as dense as are the populations of many prosperous European states, that are famine-proof; that the birth-rate of India is not high; that it is not as high as that of England, and is much less than the birth-rate of Germany and of several other countries of Europe. That of the population of India, the birth-rate is less indeed by 75 per 1000 than is the birth-rate of all Europe. That therefore India is not over-populated. But it has been shown already that, under present conditions, India produces sufficient food for her population.

Besides, if her agricultural possibilities were sufficiently stimulated, she could easily support a population that is greatly increased. Such stimulation, for example, as the bringing of her immense tracts of waste land under cultivation, the extension of irrigation works to places where water is scarce, and improvement in the methods of husbandry. These three possibilities, then, viz. that there are great stretches of waste lands that are available for an increase of food supply, that an increase of water supply for irrigation would further increase the food supply, and that improved methods of agriculture would still further increase the food supply, prove the statement conclusively that if her agricultural possibilities were stimulated, India could support a population that is greatly increased.

As to the effects of improved methods of agriculture, it has been shown that the present and prevailing methods of the Indian rayat are primitive and superficial: that as a result he produces a mere fraction of what he would produce under an improved system of tillage. Thus Sir James Caird

pointed out to the Indian Government that a single additional bushel an acre, raised by the rayat, would be an increased food supply for another twenty-two millions of people. And Mr. A. O. Hume, who officially was long connected with Indian agriculture, declared that "with proper manuring and proper tillage, every acre, broadly speaking, of the land in the country can be made to yield thirty, fifty, or seventy per cent more of every kind of crop than it at present produces."

Thus from the fact that the birth-rate of India is less than that of many European states, states which from famine are immuned, from the fact that the population of India is less dense than that of any of those European states, that her present food supply is sufficient to feed her people, that an improved method of tillage, and even an extension of the prevailing method to her waste lands would feed a population that is greatly increased, from these facts the conclusion is reached that over-population is not the cause of Indian famines. And so the negative side of Mr. Sunderland's article disposes of the second reason that is alleged as one that accounts for famines in India.

The article having shown from the negative side that neither "failure of rains" nor over-population is the cause of Indian famine, it passes on to the positive side and there it asserts that "the extreme, the abject, the awful poverty of the Indian people is the real cause of famine." The poverty which binds the Indian people to the edge of a chronic suffering prevents them even in the years of plenty from laying aside a surplus—however small—for the years of scarcity. So that in the years of plenty the majority of the people being able to procure for themselves and their families the barest necessities of life, in the years of scarcity (which are ushered in by the failure of the rains and the shortage of water for purposes of irrigation) being unable to procure even the barest necessities of life—after disposing of the cow, the plough-bullock, the scanty furniture of the wretched dwelling, the cooking utensils, and even their modest raiment (the last article having been exchanged for an anna or an handful of millet), sitting down in the desolate homes, or wandering in the open fields, they pass down into the darkness of death. And this fate is the lot of hundreds of thousands, and of even

millions of the Indian people. As an absolution for the criminal negligence of which famine in India has been the result, the argument is sometimes used that India had been visited by famine before that British rule there was imposed. But this argument is as sound as if one should say, concerning the plague (supposing that it had visited London), that no blame is attributable to the sanitary authorities, because London had been visited before by the plague.

If the hypothetical visitation of London by the plague should be judged by the laws of sanitation, rather than by the laws of heredity, the reply to this argument would be that whereas at the time of the first visitation of the plague in London, in the sixteenth century, there were no means of preventing it, owing to the prevailing ignorance of sanitary science that then existed, now, by reason of the knowledge of that science, there are means for preventing the plague. That, therefore, the past and present visitations must be judged in separate categories, for the plague of the past, owing to this absence of the knowledge of preventable means, was unavoidable, but the plague of the present, owing to the presence of the knowledge of preventable means, has been avoidable.

And so, that whilst the authorities of the past who would have been held responsible for the use of those preventable means are blameless, because of the absence of the knowledge of those means, the authorities of the present who are responsible for the use of those preventable means are blameable, because of the presence of the knowledge of those means and because of their failure to employ them. Similarly, in regard to Indian famine—pre-British and post-British—they must not be judged in the same category, but separately; for whereas in the pre-British period the means of preventing famines, viz. the distribution of food through the agency of the railway and the telegraph were absent, in the post-British period these means have been present. And so, whereas the authorities of the pre-British periods, by not having the means to prevent famine in India, were blameless in the occurrence of those famines, the authorities in the post-British period, by having the means to prevent famine in India (the means which include the prevention of the impoverishment of the people, the impoverishment of the people being

the only cause of Indian famine), and yet failing to use them, are blamable for the famines of this period.

Excessive taxation is the cause of the poverty of the Indian people. Of the tax-paying class of the people of India that was just now referred to, more than ninety per cent are made up of the abjectly poor. That is to say, that it is made up of those who by the utmost endeavour during the years of plenty can manage to eke out the barest possible subsistence ; of the class of which the members, in order to support themselves and their families, are frequently compelled, for months together, and these in fruitful years, to subsist upon one full meal a day. As taxes, this abjectly poor class that constitutes the bulk of the Indian tax-payer, pay five hundred per cent on imported salt, or four thousand times its cost of manufacture, if the salt be home-made.

Upon their crops they pay as taxes to the Government one-sixth to one-third. It is concerning this tax-avalanche that the late Marquis of Salisbury, who at the time was Secretary of State for India, recorded in a minute, on the 26th of April, 1875, that :—

“ So far as it is possible to change the Indian fiscal system, it is desirable that the cultivator should pay a smaller proportion of the whole charge. It is not in itself a thrifty policy to draw the mass of revenue from the rural districts, where capital is scarce, sparing the town where it is often redundant and runs to waste in luxury. The misery is exaggerated in the case of India, where so much of the revenue is exported without a direct equivalent.”

And this system of mangle-taxation is the demand of “ the most expensive Government in the world.” A Government of foreigners who despise the native population ; a Government of foreigners consisting of a vast army of officials ; a Government of foreigners who themselves fix the salaries that they are to be paid for their terms of service, and the pensions they should receive at the close. Of the 250,000,000 of the native population, they are responsible to none, and they consult none. The price that India pays to England for this, “ the most expensive Government in the world,” is estimated as being between 25,000,000 and 30,000,000 pounds annually. However, this tribute is in addition to

the heavy home expenses of the Indian Government. Let it be also remembered that this stream of tribute, more or less, has been flowing to England from India for nearly a century and a half. And that, unlike those streams, which, draining a country, aided by their oceanic outlets and by means of evaporation, make to it compensation for the tribute that they have taken away (thereby redressing the balance between suffusion and depletion), the Anglo-Indian stream makes to the country that it drains, nothing that approaches to an adequate compensation.

Nor have we even yet reached the limit of the system by which India is drained by England. For, inasmuch as the safety of that system requires the protection of force, there is in India in consequence and for the purpose, the presence of a gigantic military establishment. And in connection with this military establishment the Indian taxpayer is called upon to meet extraordinary, as well as ordinary expenses. Thus, besides supporting the Indian army in India, in order that it may keep the iron collar of a despotic Government tightly drawn to his neck, the Indian taxpayer has to meet such extraordinary expenses as those of wars that are waged by his army beyond his own frontier, be that extra-territorial zone, Somaliland, China, or Afghanistan. Hence it was that of the wars which Britain waged against Afghanistan and other states beyond the North-Western frontier during last century, whereas the share of the expenses that fell to England was five million pounds, the share which fell to India was ninety-five million pounds.

And here is a straw that shows still further, if that be necessary, the course and activity of this wind of extravagance, a wind of extravagance which arises from irresponsibility. After that the taxes are wrung from the hand of the dying rayat, we have the spectacle of the following extract :—

“Lord Kitchener has issued a remarkable order dealing with military expenditure, in which he points out that heavy waste of the public funds occurs through officers of all ranks spending budget allotments at a forced pace towards the end of each financial year, in order to prevent the allotments from lapsing. The Commander-in-Chief forbids this hurried squandering of unspent balances. Lahore, September 19th, 1906.”

Seeing that of the people there is no representative to inquire how the hard earnings which they contribute in taxes are spent, it is not by any means surprising "that heavy waste of the public funds" should "occur through officers of all rank spending budget allotments at a forced pace towards the end of the year." And proceeding as this heavy waste of the public funds must have been, for nearly a century and a half, how enormous must be its aggregate figure! But if it were possible to tabulate this colossal sum of wasteful expenditure, the fact would still remain that it indicated the waste of one branch only of the Indian Government. How appalling, then, in the awfulness of its magnitude must be the sum total of wasteful expenditure that has occurred in all the branches of the Indian Government during the nearly one century and a half since the collection of Indian revenue was undertaken by the British! Thus this system of government, in which the governing people are foreigners, and foreigners who despise the governed people, in which the governing people are absolutely irresponsible to the governed, furnishes a soil for the most reckless and perverse extravagance. Such extravagances, in the following excerpt, are inveighed against by eminent Englishmen.

Montgomery Martin, an historian who wrote upon the subject of the British Colonies, writing in 1838, said :—

"So constant a drain even on England would soon impoverish her; how severe, then, must be its effects on India, where the wage of a labourer is from twopence to threepence a day?"

John Stuart Mill, in the petition which he prepared for the East India Company, and which was presented to Parliament in 1858, said :—

"The Government of a people by itself has a meaning and a reality; but such a thing as government of one people by another does not and cannot exist. One people may keep another for its own use, a place to make money in, a human cattle farm to be worked for the profit of its own inhabitants."

He also says, in his work on "Representative Government":—

"It is an inherent condition of human affairs that no intention, however sincere, of protecting the interests of others,



can make it safe or salutary to tie up their own hands. By their own hands only can any positive and durable improvement of their circumstances in life be worked out."

Again, it was in this same sense that John Bright, in his memorable speech of June, 1858, on the India Bill, declared that—

"There are but two modes of gaining anything by our connection with India. The one is by plundering the people of India, and the other by trading with them. I prefer to do it by trading with them; but in order that England may become rich by trading with India, India itself must become rich."

Were further proof necessary to show that the Indian Government is notoriously extravagant and expensive, the following facts had been sufficient, namely, that, although there are in India thousands of natives who are well educated, and who are competent to fill any of the public offices of the country, yet that only "one-fiftieth" of these thousands have been given the opportunity, and that the offices to which this "one-fiftieth" have been appointed have generally been those of the lowest and poorest grades. Whereas, on the other hand, thousands of the more remunerative offices, with high salaries and high prospective pensions, involving thereby huge sums that are permanently lost to the country, are held by Englishmen.

But the incompetence of the native to govern himself is the excuse that is offered by Englishmen in justification of this "benevolent despotism." Thus, commenting upon Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's reference, in his address as President of the Indian Congress, 26th December, 1906, to the saying of the Prime Minister, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, "that good government could never be a substitute for government by the people themselves," an influential London journal observes that—

"Though good government may not be a substitute for autonomy, it does not follow that, in certain circumstances, it is not far preferable. If there were the least shadow of foundation for the belief that any system of autonomy which human ingenuity could devise would give India more content and more prosperity than she enjoys at present, we should at once admit that no time should be lost in initiating it. But

nothing is more certain than that if the experiment were tried, India would be plunged in the horrors of internal strife, and that the progress made during the last century would be obliterated within a twelvemonth."

Yes, but what of bad government? Can a system of government, which by means of a torturing form of taxation strips the people of the means with which to buy even food, and causes thereby three famines in ten years, famines of which each succeeding one has been more terrible than its predecessor, the people "dying like flies," and famines by which the population in that time has been reduced by thirty millions, can such a system of government, I ask, be called good? And if there be circumstances in which good government is preferable to autonomous government, are there any circumstances in which bad government is preferable to autonomous government? And could any form of native government have produced results more disastrous and deplorable?

Finally, is Natal able to govern itself, and India unable to govern itself?

As for the view that the journal has expressed that if the experiment of autonomous government were tried in India, the country "would be plunged in the horrors of internal strife, and that the progress made during the last century would be obliterated within a twelvemonth," it is evident that the author's self-interest is too morbidly pronounced to allow that he should view the subject with a stable mind. An exorbitant system of taxation demanded by an extravagant system of government impoverishes the great bulk of the Indian people. And, found destitute of the means with which to provide themselves with the barest necessities, in such conditions, if the rains should fail, the people, through the rise in the prices of food and their want of means with which to buy, die "like flies." Having then disproved the assertions that "failure of rains" and "over-population" are the causes of Indian famines, Mr. Sunderland's article has also proved that the poverty of the people, which is the result of excessive taxation, and this again the result of an unreasonably expensive government, is the cause of Indian famines. Thus, like the vulture upon the carcase, concerned

only about its own satiety, is England upon India. But of the shades of those millions of the famine-slain, flitting about the market-places, about the mansions and palaces, the banqueting-halls and bedchambers of the rich, and about the dwellings and the haunts of the poor, of the English nation, how horrible is the vision. Posterity! With what judgment shall it award the appalling holocaust! Of the political reflex, what? And the humanity! Where?

#### THE BRITISH WEST INDIES

For the purpose of illustrating further the political and economic conditions of coloured British subjects I pass on now to speak of the British West Indies, and of one or two of the West African Colonies.

Of the group of islands of the Caribbean Sea that owes allegiance to the British Crown, Jamaica, as is well known, is the largest and the most important. And Jamaica at the same time being politically and economically identical with the other members of the group, is selected by me for my remarks upon the British West Indies.

The population of Jamaica may be described as consisting of three classes, the white, the brown or mulatto, and the black. These three classes were respectively estimated, in 1891, as 14,692, 121,955, and 488,624. Economically these classes of white, brown, and black may be sub-divided again into two parts; one part representing agriculture and the other part representing commerce. The agricultural section is divisible further into the class that consists of the large planters and the class that consists of the small settlers. The planters of the island are the great landowners; many of their landed possessions run into hundreds of acres each, many more into thousands of acres each, these last in their areal range extending from two thousand to seven thousand acres each. And one person is frequently the owner of two, three, or more of these huge runs; these plantations are used for either cultivating canes, for grazing purposes, or for growing such articles of export as coffee, pimento, cocoa, cocoanut, and bananas.

The small settlers, for the most part, live in villages or towns, and the bulk of them are agriculturists. The lands

upon which their dwellings are built are insufficient for cultivation ; hence, they must perforce rent land from the planter, in order to follow this pursuit. Such land is generally miles away from the home of the cultivator, the journey thither often requiring a half day or even a whole day. The land which the small cultivator thus rents may be half an acre, an acre, or more, but the extent of land that is cultivated by the majority of this class is, on an average, under five acres. For his land the small settler usually pays the proprietor an annual rent ; he holds the land under an uncertain and unsatisfactory tenure, being liable, at any time, to be turned off the land by the mere caprice of the proprietor.

Nor is the small settler able to command the best land for his tillage ; lands that are rented to him are not those of the plains, but those of the hills. Yet this is not because the great ranches of the landed proprietors are required by their owners for the products that may be grown on them, for if we take sugar as our example—which until recently was the staple industry of the West Indies—we should find that of the thousands of acres which make up the largest number of each of the sugar estates, only a small fraction is actually under cultivation. Thus one estate of 2,398 acres has had only 324 acres in canes, another of 4,699 acres has had only 15 acres in canes, a third of 6,240 acres has had only 241 acres in canes, and a fourth of 7,482 acres has had only 150 acres in canes.<sup>1</sup> The bulk of the rest of the land in each case lies in absolute idleness.

Besides the roots and vegetables that he grows for his own consumption, and the sugar-cane that he grows, and from which he manufactures sugar for his own use, disposing of the surplus of his sugar and of his roots and vegetables at one of the markets nearest to his home, the small settler also cultivates such articles of export as arrowroot, ginger, coffee, pimento, bananas, pine-apples, and oranges ; and these products are purchased from him in small quantities by the merchants, and are exported abroad. But the method which is generally pursued by the small settler in his cultivation of the soil is rude and primitive. In addition to his plantation, the small cultivator usually owns also one or more horses or mules, or a donkey ; these he employs to take his produce

<sup>1</sup> *Jamaica Handbook*, 1897, pp. 411 and 412.

to market. So much, then, in this connection for these two classes of agriculturists of the British West Indies, the large planter and the small settler.

We come now to the commercial class, a section that represents the other of the two original divisions. It is recruited largely from the people of mixed blood, and from Jews. Its members are the middlemen; purchasing the produce in small lots chiefly from the small cultivator, they ship it abroad in bulk, and in return, import for the small cultivator the goods that he needs; food such as herrings, mackerel, cod-fish, flour, rice, and kerosene oil, materials for his clothing, and implements for his field work, are among the things which are imported.

Now, I would pause here, in order to ask this question, viz. How is the revenue of the Colony raised, or in what proportion does each of these classes, of whites, mulattoes, and blacks, contribute to the fiscal equipment of the Jamaica Government? To the question I reply that ideally the planters, proportionately, make the largest contribution. For are they not the great landowners? Does it not necessarily follow that from their vast acreages a substantial revenue flows into the public coffers? Their grazing "pens" or estates, with their great herds of cattle, horses, mules, houses, are they not all taxable property? Their sugar estates, with their enormous acreages, and their appurtenances of wains and carriages, horses, cattle, and houses, their numerous articles which are imported for, and which are connected with the manufacture of sugar and rum—articles which, commercially, are dutiable; from all these sources, then, how could it be otherwise than that the great landowning class in proportion to the other classes should make the largest contribution to the revenue? For be it remembered that the West Indies are not a manufacturing centre, but are essentially agricultural states, so that the land there is necessarily a chief asset for taxation.

Next to the planters in wealth, personal or real, as well as in position, is the commercial class; hence, answering to the natural order of economics, we should expect that this class, following the planters, would bear proportionately the larger share of the fiscal burden. Well, in practice let us see how this forecast works out. We begin with the revenue which the great estates yield. How are those establishments taxed?

The following, which is culled from the "Annual" of the Jamaica Government for 1901-2, states the case :—

"The Holding Tax," it proceeds, "is a direct tax on land, assessed on the area of holdings, but decreasing in its average rate per acre as the size of the holding increases. Prior to the year of account, it was payable at the following rates: For every holding not exceeding five acres, two shillings; for every holding exceeding five, and not exceeding ten acres, three shillings and fourpence."

But in the subjoined letter from the Collector-General of Jamaica to the Colonial Secretary of that island upon the subject of a statement which the Governor had directed that he should prepare for him, in view of the approaching visit of the Royal Commission to Jamaica in 1897, these facts are stated even more cogently. The letter proceeds :—

"I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 11th inst., in which you invite my attention to paragraph (2), and request me to furnish the Governor with a report on the points indicated in that paragraph. In accordance with this request, I now beg to state, for the information of His Excellency, that it has been the policy of the framers of our tariffs for many years to favour the Sugar Industry as far as possible, and therefore the Sugar Estates contribute directly but very little in the way of custom duties. Export duties were finally abolished in 1891, and the Imports free list includes nearly every article imported for use in connection with the cultivation of cane and the manufacture or disposal of sugar and rum. . . .

"In support of the foregoing statement, I would point out that the following are exempt from import duties: Animals, bags, sacks, tierces, hogsheads, casks, shooks, staves, headings, and wood hoops, belting for machinery, bricks, carts, and wagons, coals, coke, and patent fuel, cotton meals and oil cakes, medicinal preparations for cattle, fertilizers, and manures of all kinds, hay and straw, implements, utensils, and tools for agriculture, iron roofing, doors and shutters, lime, lymph for use with stock, all materials and appliances for tramways, mills of all kinds, pans for boiling sugar, pipes for the conveyance of fluids, resin, tar, pitch, and turpentine, rock salt, slates, soda-ash and sub-soda, steam and power engines, and machinery of all kinds, steam boilers, stills, sulphurs, tallow and grease of all kinds, electrical apparatus

of all kinds, tiles, wire fencing and wire for fencing, with apparatus for fastening the same, zinc and tin and lead in sheets. . . . As regards local taxation, they again are not large contributors.

“ Parochial taxes are not collected in respect of the work ; and houses or barracks, for the accommodation of the labourers employed therein, when they are occupied by them and their families free of rent, are not subject to taxation. Some taxes are paid in respect of the houses occupied by proprietors, attorneys, overseers, and book-keepers, who also pay for any horsekind or wheels they may use on the road. The quit-rent of one penny an acre is payable on all lands which have not been redeemed, and also a property tax varying from threepence an acre on cultivated land to one farthing for land in wood and ruinate. A trifling holdings tax, in most cases about a halfpenny per acre, is also paid. Horsekind are charged 11s. each, horned stock 1s. each, and wheels, carts, and wains 6s., when used on a public road. Those not so used are not taxed.”

Put into another form, these statements resolve themselves into this, that relatively, the more land that is owned the less tax that is paid, but the less land that is owned the more tax that is paid. So that whereas the man whose estate of a thousand acres, and that is valued at two or three thousand pounds, pays a tax per acre that is a farthing, or that is less than a farthing, the man whose estate is a quarter of an acre, and that is valued at twenty or thirty shillings, is made to pay for that quarter of an acre a tax of two shillings. And the land for which the peasant pays a tax of two shillings for a quarter of an acre, whilst the planter pays a tax of less than a farthing per acre, is not of the best quality, as I have pointed out before, but is of the worst quality ; for it is not the arable land of the plain, but the stony land of the hills. Horned stock and horsekind, except those that are used on the public roads, as we have just read, are not taxed ; the same also applies to wains and carriages. In like manner the dwellings of sugar estates almost wholly escape taxation.

So far, then, as we have gone, what we have seen is that these estates, which in the value of their lands, the value of their stock, the value of their dwellings, and the value of

their canes represent a vast amount of capital, contribute to the direct taxes of the Colony, practically nothing. But what of indirect taxation? For example, the implements which are used in the cultivation of canes and for the manufacture of sugar and rum; articles which, as I have remarked already, are ordinarily dutiable in the island. Well, all these articles, which, if they be imported by the merchant, are dutiable, when they are imported by the estates, as we have also just read from the Collector-General's report, are duty free. Hence, instead of proportionately contributing to the revenue of Jamaica by direct and indirect taxation, the sugar estates and "pens" enjoy, with regard to these burdens, an enviable exemption.

Having arrived at this point, let me observe what taxes the small settlers pay. In the case of land, we have noticed before that whereas the large landowner pays a holding tax of a farthing or less than a farthing per acre for the land of his estate, the peasant pays for his holding a tax of two shillings per acre, and two shillings for even a quarter of an acre. Further, as the stock which the peasant owns are for use on the public roads—the same being also true of his cart, if he own one—these are all taxed; and until recently he has been taxed for his house as well. So that whereas all the taxable possessions of the planter are practically tax free, all the taxable possessions of the peasant are tax bound. That this very unequal form of taxation is not an accident, but a policy, and that the West Indian Governments believe that the chief function of the peasant is that of raising revenue, is evident from the following statement that occurs in the evidence which Sir Henry Blake, in his official capacity as Governor of Jamaica, gave before the Royal Commission in 1897.

Asked concerning the desirability of abolishing the house-tax, Governor Blake said:—

“At a time like this, when large properties and cattle pens have practically no income, and therefore no taxable capacity, it would be imprudent to yield to an agitation got up by a few of the elected members as an election cry, for the purpose of relieving of direct taxation people whose chief incentive to labour for wages either on estates or on public roads is the necessity to obtain ready money to pay taxes and church dues. In my opinion relief from direct taxation would not benefit



either the peasant or the community in general. I am of opinion that the incidences of the local taxation have very little effect, if any, in preventing improvement in the dwellings of the peasantry."

Further, that this very unequal form of taxation is not an accident, but a policy, and that it is not the local governments alone, but the Imperial Government also, believes that the chief function of the coloured British subject is that of raising revenue, is incontestably proved by the cruelly oppressive hut-tax of five and ten shillings per annum, according to the size of the hut, which the Sierra Leone Legislature, with the sanction of the Imperial Government, imposed in 1897 upon the Sierra Leone Protectorate (p. 82); a place so completely undeveloped that Mr. Chamberlain, when he was Secretary of State for the Colonies, described it as a "wild, savage, and almost untrodden country," and a tax so outrageously burdensome that it was referred to by the Royal Commission as "a tax unsound in policy and unsuitable to the situation of the Protectorate."

Again, that this very unequal system of taxation to which the coloured subject of the British Empire is subjected is the outcome of the belief by the Imperial Government, as well as by the local legislatures, that his chief function is to raise revenue, is incontestably proved in the case of the Indian rayat, for, as we noticed before, it is stated by Mr. Sunderland that "more than ninety per cent . . . are the people who with their utmost endeavours are able to obtain only the barest possible subsistence, who have to support families of five on incomes not amounting, all told, to more than six or eight pounds a year," that "these people, many of whom often go months at a time, even in reasonably good years, with only one full meal a day, are yet compelled to pay a tax of five hundred per cent on imported salt, or four thousand times its cost of manufacture, if the salt is home-made; and" that "of their little crops they have to pay to the Government as taxes one-sixth to one-third of all they raised."

The West Indian planter being to all intents and purposes exempt from direct and indirect taxes, the West Indian peasant, in consequence, is heavily taxed; and not only is

he thus taxed directly, but also indirectly. Hence it is that besides his land, his stock, his cart, and until recently his house, his clothing too, and his meat, his fish, and his bread are taxed. Nor does the payment of his own share of the expenses of the Government and of the planters' share as well, exhaust the fiscal obligations of the peasant, for in addition to these payments he is also made to contribute an annual grant for the importation of indentured labour for the sugar estates. In the case of Jamaica, this grant in 1900-1 amounted to £11,670.<sup>1</sup> And of this phase of the peasant's lot the anomaly will appear, I think, the more unique when it is known that whereas he is made to supply the sugar estates with cheap labour, himself, being unable to find employment on those very sugar estates, is forced to emigrate to Central America in search of work; that in 1901, or thereabouts, the number of persons who emigrated thus to Central America from Jamaica alone was five thousand. So, then, the peasant, who represents the lowest of the three social strata of the British West Indies, has not only to support the next, that is, the middle or merchant class, which exports his produce and imports his supplies, but he has also to pay the direct and indirect taxes of the planter, or uppermost social layer, and rejected as a labourer by this class, he is made to subsidize the importation of foreign labour for the sugar estates, while at the same time he emigrates to a foreign land to find the money. And how is the general lot of the peasant affected by this unequal mode of government? Upon the peasant the effect of this unequal mode of government may be inferred, to some extent, from the following description which is given in an annual report of the Jamaica Government (1901-2). Alluding to certain additional taxes that had been imposed, the report says:—

“When in addition to these direct results of the increase of taxation with which the Collector General's Department did not find itself immediately able to cope, there supervened a depression in trade and industry, due to bad seasons and fall in prices, the difficulty increased, and the taxes were in many cases a really oppressive burden.”<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Jamaica Handbook*, 1904, p. 271.

<sup>2</sup> *Colonial Reports Annual*, No. 373, p. 27.

When the taxes which a Government had imposed are described by that Government as "a really oppressive burden," there can be no manner of room for doubt that those taxes are "a really oppressive burden."

Upon the peasant the effect of this discriminating system of government may be gauged further by the following comment of a Jamaica newspaper, regarding the condition of the people of one of the fourteen parishes of the island, a parish with a population of 49,845 :—

"If the happiness of the people of Clarendon"—the name of the parish—"be measured by the fact that there are now 2500 summonses for non-payment of taxes, then they are not to be envied. What are we coming to?"

With reference to another parish, St. Thomas-in-the-East, we read from a publication that appeared at the same time as the above, in July, 1902, that "there are no less than 120 taxpayers to be tried before the R.M. on Wednesday, 23rd inst., for non-payment of taxes."

A further illustration are the subjoined resolutions which were passed unanimously at a public meeting in Kingston, Jamaica, on the 12th of March, 1903 :—

"Whereas, during the past year, for the first time in the history of the colony, persons in this parish"—viz. Kingston—"have been imprisoned for the non-payment of taxes, and among them have been some who, on account of absolute poverty, were not able to pay. And whereas there are many other persons who, under circumstances similar to those of the latter, are in danger of being arrested and imprisoned at any time, for no other offence than that of being too poor to pay their taxes. And whereas it is desirable, and accords with the spirit of justice, that this class of persons should be relieved of the fear, disgrace, and suffering of imprisonment: Therefore, Resolved, that except where the persons liable for such taxes are able but refuse to pay, or wilfully neglect to discharge their obligations in this respect, this meeting condemns as unjust, unreasonable, harsh, and cruel the imprisonment for the non-payment of taxes. And further resolved, that His Excellency the Governor be asked to take steps, during the present session of the Legislative Council, to repeal so much of Section 42 of Law 32 of 1867, and of amending laws that prescribe imprisonment for non-payment of taxes,

under any other conditions than those which are at present in the dealing of courts, with ordinary judgment debtors."

I close with an extract from a letter by Mr. J. M. Farquharson—a name which is well known in Jamaica, and whom I understand is a landowner; the letter whence the extract is taken appeared in the "Jamaica Gleaner," on the 23rd of May, 1902. Referring to the people of his district, Mr. Farquharson said:—

"I have never known such poverty among them. Many of them have not sufficient food, especially the poor little children. . . . Women often come to me and beg me to employ them, and that they would be glad to accept 1½d. a day."

Poverty, then, which in its character has become endemic; poverty, too, upon a soil that nature with fertility has lavishly endowed, is the outstanding feature of the condition of the British West Indies.

But of this poverty, as the preceding remarks show, fortuitous circumstances, such as drought, the fluctuations of trade, cyclones, earthquakes, etc., must not be regarded as the causes. For its causes, as we have noticed before—and are they not sufficient to account for the poverty?—are (a) scarcity of arable land; (b) ignorance of scientific agriculture; and (c) a vicious and tyrannical system of taxation. But of these three evils the greatest, the grossest, and the most malignant is the scarcity of arable land. As bearing out the assertion that the British West Indian peasantry is always under the scourge of a land famine, as well as showing the cause, and the urgent need that there is for reform, I will reproduce here an extract or two from the report in which the Royal Commission that was appointed in 1897 represented to her Majesty's Government the general condition of the British West Indies.

"The cultivation of sugar-cane," the report proceeds, "has been almost entirely carried on in the past on large estates, but both the negro and the coolie like to own small patches of land by which they may make their own livelihood, and take pride in their position as landholders; though in some cases they also labour at times on the larger estates, and are generally glad to have the opportunity of earning money occasionally by working on such estates and on the construction

and maintenance of roads and other public works. The existence of this class of small proprietors among the population is a source of both economic and political strength."

Further—

"The settlement of the labourer on the land has not, as a rule, been viewed with favour in the past by the persons interested in sugar estates. What suited them best was a large supply of labourers, entirely dependent on being able to work on the estates, and, consequently, subject to their control and willing to work at low rates of wages. But it seems to us that no reform affords so good a prospect for the permanent welfare of the future of the West Indies as the settlement of the labouring population on the land as small peasant proprietors; and in many places this is the only means by which the population can be supported."

Lastly, the importance of settling the peasantry upon the land was viewed by the Royal Commission as being so great that they actually suggested to Her Majesty's Government, in the case of St. Vincent, as will be seen from the following quotation, the bold and drastic course of expropriation, saying :—

"We have already made a general recommendation that the settlement of the Creole population of the West Indies as cultivating proprietors should be recognized as the settled policy of the Government of the different colonies, and we see no reason to depart from that policy in the case of St. Vincent. On the contrary, it seems to us that, whether the sugar industry is maintained or disappears, it is absolutely essential in the interest of the native population that their settlement on the land should be facilitated; in no other way does it seem to us to be possible to maintain even the most moderate degree of prosperity in St. Vincent.

"The attempts that have been made in recent years to settle cultivators on the Crown lands have not so far met with much success. A considerable number of plots were taken up, to be paid for in instalments, but the owners complain of the want of roads. They have suffered from the low prices of produce, and owing to the general depression they have found themselves unable to get work so as to earn the wages on which they relied in some degree to pay for their holdings. . . .

“ There are, however, round the sea-coast thousands of acres of fertile land in the hands of private owners, uncultivated and likely to remain so. The holders of these lands appear to be unwilling to sell them in small lots or at a reasonable price, and are unable to cultivate them. Under the circumstances, we have no hesitation in recommending that suitable portions of these lands be acquired by the State and made available for settlement in small plots. If suitable lands cannot be obtained by private agreement with the owners, powers should be taken by the Government to expropriate them on payment of reasonable compensation.”

Summarized, the salient points of our remarks on this branch of the subject, i.e. the West Indian peasant, are these. The peasant, who is of the poorest of the three classes in the British West Indies, in addition to supporting himself, in addition to supporting the class that is above him, that is, the merchant, and in addition to paying his own taxes, has also to pay the taxes of the richest or landowning class, and to contribute substantially to its labour bill. Tillage is chiefly the means by which he is enabled to discharge these obligations. Land—that is, the arable land of the plains—in thousands of acres is owned by individual planters; the individual planter, however, is able to cultivate only a few hundred acres, and so in the superabundance of strangulation this land abides.

But the peasant, who wholly supports the merchant class, and who partly supports the planter class, as well as the Government, is excluded by this very planter class from the arable land. Being thus excluded from tilling the profitable land of the plains, he perforce tills the unprofitable land of the hills; and this by methods which are primitive. Upon the peasant the effect of this series of disadvantages, the disadvantage of being made to pay the taxes of another class, in addition to paying his own taxes; the disadvantage, that although it is by means of tillage that he is able to render these services to the State, as well as to the other class, yet he is excluded from the most remunerative lands, and that being excluded from these lands he is forced to work upon the lands that are the least remunerative; and the disadvantage that the methods he employs to till the least remunerative lands are also the least effective.

From these disadvantages there arises a twofold result.

One is that every mouthful that the peasant takes, and every stitch of clothes that he wears, has passed between the millstone and through the mangle of an excessive and ruthless tax. The other result is that the peasant drags out his miserable lot in abject and chronic poverty. Now, can a system of government which, having relieved the richest class of a community from taxation, and having, in consequence, doubly taxed the poorest class, and which at the same time allows this poorest class to be prohibited from availing itself of the best means of meeting the exorbitant demands that are imposed upon it, can such a system of government be regarded as just ?

But I pass on. It comes about that after that the peasant, under the rigour of his hard fate, had passed many decades, there was heard a voice with bitter lamentation and strong crying. Surely it is the peasant, I said, who, overcome by the weight of his enormous burden, is imploring relief. But soon I discover that it is not the peasant, but the planter, who is thus overcome with grief. The planter who practically pays no taxes, either direct or indirect ; who, besides enjoying exemption from taxation, is supplied with cheap labour at the expense of the peasant.

It is this much misunderstood, this grievously ill-used planter, who, now in tears, is seeking relief. And what is the burden of his importunity ? It is that bounty-fed sugar which is entering the English market may be countervailed, that his sugar, in consequence, might receive better consideration. Of course it was this plaint of the planter to which, in response, the Royal Commission was sent to the West Indies in 1897. And it is this plaint to which the Royal Commission alludes when it says in its report to the Imperial Government that the planter "has special means of enforcing his wishes" and of "bringing his claims to notice." Well, in answer to the pathetic wail of the planter, the Imperial Government in 1897 deputed a Royal Commission to the West Indies, and the following are the chief recommendations of the Commission : (1) The settlement of the labouring population on small plots of land ; (2) the establishment of minor agricultural industries and the improvement of the system of cultivation, especially in the case of small proprietors ; (3) the improvement of means of communication between

islands ; (4) the encouragement of trade in fruit with New York, and possibly at a future time with London ; (5) the grant of a loan from the Imperial Exchequer for the establishment of central factories.

It will be observed that among these recommendations, that of the settling of the peasantry upon the land has the first place. And the quotations that are given on pages 132 to 4 are among the statements by which the Commission gave emphasis to the importance of this first recommendation. But how was this primary recommendation of the Royal Commission viewed by Her Majesty's Government ? It was received with enthusiasm by Her Majesty's Government. For the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, who at the time was Secretary of State for the Colonies, said in a speech which he delivered in the House of Commons in 1898 :—

“ Well, now, Sir, dealing with the question of the sugar industry, I will deal with what I may call the alternative suggestions which have been made by the Commission. Let me say at once that having most carefully considered them, I agree with all the recommendations. The Government purpose to adopt them, and, subject to the approval of the Committee, we ask for the means and power to carry them all to completion. What are these recommendations ? The first recommendation is that labourers should, as far as possible, be settled on the land in the position of peasant proprietors. Sir, I think that it is an excellent suggestion. In these islands subsistence is extremely easy to obtain. A very little cultivation would secure enough for a man and his family to live upon, and therefore, if we have to contemplate the worst, we should, at all events, do something to save the population from starvation.”

This extract expresses in 1898 Mr. Chamberlain's view of the Royal Commission's recommendation to the British Government ; and the next extract expresses in 1902 Mr. Chamberlain's view of the same recommendation of the Commission to the British Government :—

“ It has been suggested, and the Royal Commission carefully inquired into the matter, that in some of the islands which are worst off, in which the sugar industry appears to have the least prospect of success, a large experiment in the way of peasant proprietors should be made. The Commission, although pointing out the difficulties attending an arrange-



ment of this kind, did give it, to some extent, their countenance, and we have endeavoured to the best of our ability to secure a considerable amount of settlement upon the land by small proprietors.

“But what I want to point out, as the Commission found, is that if you establish a peasant-proprietary of this kind, all that you do for these people is to give them the means of obtaining what is absolutely necessary for their subsistence in the shape of food. But the productions of their industry are not exportable products, and accordingly they have no balance over and above the actual food that is required for their subsistence, which can be transmuted in gold and other necessaries, and no balance whatever for the provision of the ordinary administration of the island. Therefore by itself it is no remedy for the state of things which would occur if the sugar industry were entirely to fail.”

Now, according to Mr. Chamberlain's view that was expressed in 1898 regarding the Commission's recommendation that the peasantry should be settled upon the land, there is in the recommendation neither hesitation nor reservation; but according to Mr. Chamberlain's view that was expressed in 1902, regarding the Commission's recommendation that the peasantry should be settled upon the land, there is, in the recommendation, both hesitation and reservation. And so, whereas a tone of certainty is expressed in 1898 as the key-note of the Commission's recommendation, a tone of uncertainty is expressed in 1902 as the key-note of the Commission's recommendation. In these two quotations, then, the Royal Commission, according to Mr. Chamberlain, has contradicted itself. In addition to the contradictory nature of the extracts of 1898 and 1902, by which the Royal Commission is represented by Mr. Chamberlain as having contradicted itself, there are also in the second extract, two inaccuracies. These two inaccuracies appear in the statements in which the late Secretary of State for the Colonies says “that the Commission found that if you establish a peasant-proprietary of this kind, all that you do for these people is to give them the means of obtaining what is absolutely necessary for their subsistence . . .” “the productions of their industry are not exportable products, and accordingly they have no balance over and above the actual food that is required for their subsistence, which can be transmuted into gold . . . and

no balance whatever for the provision of the ordinary administration of the island." And these two inaccuracies are demonstrated by the facts that have been adduced already, first that the exports of the West Indian merchants are the products of the West Indian peasants, and second that practically the whole revenue of the British West Indies is contributed by the peasant.

The question arises, therefore, viz., What led to that change of front, by which the validity, if not the veracity, of the statement of one who was filling a great office in the State has been compromised, and the destinies of communities have been outraged? In the words of the Commission which I quoted before, I give the answer to this question: "The settlement of the labourer upon the land has not, as a rule, been viewed with favour in the past by persons interested in sugar estates; what suited them best was a large supply of labourers, entirely dependent on being able to find work on the estates, and consequently subjected to their control, and willing to work at low rates of wages." And "it must be recollected that the chief outside influence with which the Governments of certain Colonies have to reckon are the representatives of the sugar estates; that these persons are sometimes not interested in anything but sugar, that the establishment of any other industry is often detrimental to their interests, and that under such conditions it is the special duty of Your Majesty's Government to see the welfare of the general public is not sacrificed to the interest, or supposed interest, of a small but influential minority, which has special means of enforcing its wishes and bringing its claims to notice." The cause, then, that led Her Majesty's Government thus to stultify itself is that it had been overborne by "the outside influence" or by "the representatives of the sugar estates," which, desiring to have "a supply of labourers entirely dependent on being able to find work on the estates, and consequently subjected to their control, and willing to work at low rates of wages," do not, as a rule, view with favour "the settlement of the labourer upon the land."

However, this influence of the sugar-planter, which turned the feet of Her Majesty's Government, from the path of sanity wherein the Royal Commission had guided them, into the path of insanity, was merely the exciting cause of the digression.

For towards that digression there had been already existing in Her Majesty's Government a predisposing cause. That predisposing cause on the part of Her Majesty's Government, in common with the rest of their race, is a cherished desire to hinder coloured peoples from becoming or from remaining as owners of the soil. This statement is confirmed by the example of the British West Indies; for there, although, as we have seen, there are hundreds of thousands of acres of land that lie in absolute idleness, and that are owned by a class of persons that contribute practically nothing to the revenues of the Governments, the Negro peoples that contribute the revenues, and that do so mainly by the tillage of the soil, have been prevented, with knowledge and sanction of the British Government, from acquiring land.

In this same sense a measure was introduced into the Transvaal Legislature in 1905, with the proposal that no native within its jurisdiction should own land in his own name, but only in the name of the Commissioner of native affairs. And the following resolution, which was passed at a large meeting of natives of Johannesburg in the autumn of 1905, is an index of the apprehension of the native concerning the act:—

“We, the native inhabitants of the Transvaal Colony, emphatically protest against the class legislation of the Transvaal Legislative Council with regard to the registration of the title-deeds of landed property acquired by natives in the name of the Commissioner for Native Affairs, as it is uncalled for as well as unnecessary. We therefore ask His Majesty's Government's protection from such class legislation by not sanctioning the Ordinance. The meeting unanimously expressed the hope that His Majesty's Government would not sanction such a Bill.”

And the two subjoined extracts of January, 1907, are consequences, I suppose, of the Transvaal Legislative measure:—

#### GRIEVANCES OF BASUTO SCOUTS

“A party of Basuto scouts who served the British in the late war arrived in London on Thursday for the purpose of submitting certain grievances to the Colonial Secretary. Mr. Sylvester Williams, who has undertaken the care of the party while in England, explained the nature of their claim to a representative of Reuter's Agency. He said: ‘These Basutos in 1866 settled in the Transvaal, and as a reward for their services to the Boers in native warfare they were given land

in the Orange Free State. During the first Boer War the Basutos acted as scouts for the British forces, and were in consequence turned out of their homes by the Boers.

“ ‘The Basutos again assisted the British in the late war, and at the conclusion of hostilities they asked the Government of the Orange River Colony for permission to return to their former homes. They were informed, however, that under British rule natives were not allowed to own land. A number of people in South Africa, including Captain Dickson, the Adviser on Native Affairs in the Orange River Colony, recognize the justice of the Basutos’ claim, which is not to have land given them, but only to be allowed to buy land. The deputation will wait upon the Earl of Elgin, and will probably be received by the King.’ ”

#### CLAIMS OF BRITISH INDIANS

“ The Transvaal British Indian Committee is urging the Government to disallow the Vrededorp Stands Ordinance recently passed in the Transvaal. The facts of the case were explained to Reuter’s representative by a member of the committee, who said : ‘About twelve years ago permission was given by the late South African Republic to a number of “ poor whites ” to settle in Vrededorp, a suburb of Johannesburg. With the assent of the Government some of these whites sold or leased their land to Transvaal Indians. This Ordinance, which, we consider, goes further than any differential legislation yet introduced, proposes to grant leases with fixity of tenure to the white settlers only. This means that several hundred Indians who have sunk money in buildings, improvements, etc., will have to leave their property without compensation.’ ”

Further, this desire and endeavour to prevent coloured British subjects from becoming and from remaining owners of the soil finds a striking illustration also in the difference of punishment which was meted out to the Bechuanas and to the Boers for the crime of rebellion. Both crimes, of which that of the Bechuanas was committed in 1897, and that of the Boers between 1899 to 1903, are parallel ; so that if extenuating circumstances can be pleaded on behalf of the Boers, it can be pleaded on behalf of the Bechuanas. But notwithstanding this parallelism, the punishment which was awarded to the Bechuanas was the confiscation of their land ; while

in regard to the Boers the British Government declared that the confiscation of *their* land would be illegal. Then, too, there is the seizure of the lands of the natives in the Sierra Leone Protectorate by the British Government, after it had concluded treaties with the owners that in return for the privileges of trade which they had granted, it would protect the country.

There are also the seizures of the Mohammedan states of Northern Nigeria, after that the British Government had entered into a covenant with them, similar to that with the Sierra Leone Protectorate. Again, there are the seizures of Mashonaland and of Matabeleland, and the annexation of the kingdom of Ashanti; this last state having been annexed for practices not worse, if as bad, as those in which the Independent State of the Congo is allowed with impunity, and for decades, to indulge. These, then, are examples of the desire on the part of the British Government to deprive the coloured British subjects of the ownership of the soil.

And the racial extension and concomitant of this desire appears in acts such as that by which the Queensland Legislature deported 3000 native Australians from that Colony (vol. I., p. 367). It appears in the act which excludes the Chinese and Japanese emigrants from the United States, and in the sentiment of the following extract:—

“Lord Minto, the Viceroy, has given notice of a request he has received from Earl Grey, the Governor-General of Canada, asking that emigration from India to Canada should be discouraged, as there is no suitable employment in Canada for Indians, and destitute persons are liable to be deported.—Calcutta, 14 December, 1907.”

It must be borne in mind that the Indians whom in order to exclude from Canada this step has been taken, and that the Canadians who in order to exclude the Indians from Canada have taken this step, are all members of the British Empire. That the same is also true of the native Australasians who have been deported from Queensland, and of the Queenslanders by whom they have been deported. Indeed, a very united Empire is the British Empire.

Further, it must be borne in mind that the areal computation of Canada is 3,745,574 square miles, whilst its popu-

lation is only a little over five and a quarter millions. That the areal dimension of Queensland is about 80,000 square miles, whilst its population is only half a million. The language of this desire of the colourless man to exclude the coloured man from the ownership of the soil is "a white Australia," "a white South Africa," "America is a white man's country," "the supremacy of the white man," etc.

But as far as their fundamental idea is concerned, these shibboleths are old, and not new; for they were the watchwords of the great states of antiquity. Yet, to-day where are those states? Unless I have greatly misread the signs of the times, I will venture to predict that by the end of the present century the United States and Canada will be inviting to their shores coloured immigration. "A white Australia" is a white elephant. But, as if the coloured peoples of the East will always tamely submit to the indignity of their exclusion from a region of which the original inhabitants were coloured, five millions of Euro-Australians, in pursuit of this policy of the dog in the manger, sit in a continent of 3,000,000 square miles, like an infant in the habiliments of its grandfather.

And this is the latest record that we have of civilized and Christian Australia:—

"ADELAIDE, South Australia.—At the meeting of the Science Congress to-day Prof. Klaatsch, of Heidelberg, related the results of ethnological researches among the negroes of north-west Australia. He confirmed the reports that have been current of ill-treatment of the natives, and compared the relations between whites and blacks there with the state of affairs that prevailed in Tasmania in 1830, which resulted in the extermination of the blacks.

"Prof. Klaatsch said that he had witnessed at Wyndham the arrival of native prisoners who had travelled 300 or 400 miles chained together by the neck."

First the Dutch and then the English, by chicane and blood, obtained a footing in black South Africa. And now their descendants, by the same unrighteous means, having reduced the host of their fathers to a state of serfdom, contemplate in their dream of what they are pleased to call a white South Africa, driving out the blacks, the host of their fathers, beyond the Zambesi. Yet in this vile intent these modern Pharaohs will perish in the Red Sea

of their unscrupulous ambition. But than this desire of the white man to exclude the non-white man from the ownership of the soil nothing better illustrates the condition of the white man. And the condition of the white man, the Anglo-Saxon, the mental condition of the Anglo-Saxon, that this harsh, illiberal, cruel, impolitic, and uneconomic desire illustrates, is that which is vulgarly called a "swelled head."

From the empyrean height of his august superiority, were it possible for the Anglo-Saxon to hear the advice of a man that is not white, I would make to him the following suggestion. I would suggest that he call a conference at the Hague, and issue a decree somewhat after these terms:—

Considering that the white race, by election and predestination, are endowed with a superabundance of moral and intellectual powers, and also physical strength, as compared with the coloured races;

That as stewards who are thus entrusted with these ten talents, it behoves them to improve those talents by keeping themselves from the taint of everything that savours of "miscegenation."

That these egregious talents, in the first place, have been entrusted to the white race, in order that it might subdue the earth unto itself; and, in the next place, in order that it might subdue itself unto the earth.

That the first stage of the mission of the white race is approaching its consummation, and that the second stage of the mission is approaching its initiation.

That when the white race shall have entered upon the second stage of its mission, it shall be in a state of passivity.

That thereby the white race being then unable, by reason of its great humility, to slaughter the coloured races, as was its custom during the first stage of its mission, the accursed coloured races, taking advantage of this humility of the white race, will presume to bring about the reprehensible and detestable "miscegenation" by becoming land-owners.

Of the said white race, we, the delegates who are now assembled at the Hague, in this the twentieth century of the Christian era, by reason of the powers with which we are invested by the states of which we are severally accredited, do determine and decree that, except those of them that shall be required to cultivate cotton in the Southern States, and

to pay taxes in the British Empire, all the coloured inhabitants of this planet, that is known as the terrestrial sphere, within twelve calendar months after the promulgation of this decree—which shall be immediate—shall be deported to the moon.

That all necessary arrangements shall be made for the safe and speedy transit of the said coloured races.

That should the said accursed coloured races fail to comply with this decree, they shall become outlaws, and shall be dealt with accordingly.

“ (Signed) MACHIAVELLI,

“ *President.*”

THE HAGUE,

20th Century, Anno Domini.”

Such a decree, I apprehend, would be more effective, and yet quite as sane, as the effort that is being made by the Anglo-Saxon to exclude the coloured races from the ownership of the soil.

Of these West Indian communities, then, the poorest class, on its own behalf and on the behalf of the richest class, is taxed for the purposes of ordinary revenue; further, it is taxed to supply this rich class with cheap labour; but the land from which it is made to produce this triple tax is the least fertile, and the methods by which it produces the tax are the least profitable.

In response to the loud and urgent appeals, that this rich class makes to the Imperial Government for the redress of certain fiscal grievances from which it professes to suffer, a Royal Commission is appointed to inquire into the entire economic conditions of the British West Indies. The Commission, in the most emphatic and unqualified language, recommends the settling of the poor revenue-producing, peasant class of the British West Indies upon the best of the land, as the policy that is essential and indispensable to the progress of those states. The Imperial Government, with enthusiasm, accepts the emphatic and unequivocal recommendations of the Commission, and even begins to give effect to the recommendations. But thereupon, being seized with the spirit of jealousy and of self-interest, the rich class, upon grounds which are flagrantly false, forbids the Imperial Government to continue the work of the Commission's recommendation. And meekly



obeying the command of this rich class, the class that the Commission has described as the "small, but influential, minority, which has special means of enforcing its wishes, and bringing its claim to notice," the Imperial Government has abandoned the work of really improving the condition of the British West Indies.

Among the things that we have thus been noticing about the British West Indies there are these two: (1) that those Colonies are in a *chronic* state of depression; (2) that the main cause of that depression is that the people, viz. the peasantry—who constitute the great bulk of the population, and upon whom the development and the prosperity of the British West Indies chiefly depend—are systematically hindered by the ruling class in their endeavours towards progress. Concerning the first of these two points, I may remark that the moribund state of the British West Indies is so well known that I cannot conceive it possible that anyone with an ordinary knowledge of the present-day history of those Colonies would doubt this description. But should there exist this lack of knowledge, the author would respectfully recommend his pamphlet, "Sugar and the West Indies." 1897. Elliot Stock.

And with regard to the second point, one instance which illustrates the general methods of restriction that the ruling class pursues towards the peasant class in the British West Indies is supplied by the extracts which are furnished on pp. 132-4, from the report of the Royal Commission, and that are repeated on p. 138. Further, these general methods of restriction, or action of antagonism, are illustrated by the cases we have noticed before; cases such as the exclusion of the peasant from the arable lands; the imposition of a penal system of taxes upon him; the curtailment of his educational facilities, as we shall observe later on in this chapter; and his ineligibility to fill public offices of trust.

Now, it cannot be difficult to perceive that such methods, of which these are examples, are sufficient to hinder the mental, material, and moral welfare of the British West Indian peasant; and that since the prosperity of the British West Indian Colonies rests mainly with the progress of the peasant, therefore these restrictions account for the moribund condition of those Colonies. And since these restrictions

are sufficient to account for the moribund condition of the British West Indies, the blame for the presence of this condition must rest, not upon the victims of the condition, but upon the system of government that allows it to exist.

But for this condition who is blamed? Is it the Government that permits it, or is it the victims that endure it? As an answer to this question, listen to the following extracts. In regard to the depressed condition of the British West Indian Colonies, after mentioning that several schemes for their improvement had been prepared and tried, but that they were unsuccessful, and that to the same end the work of vigorous retrenchment had been undertaken by the West Indian Governments, a great London journal, in the course of a leader upon a book that had recently appeared (1901) on the West Indies, proceeds to account for the depression as being due, no doubt, partly to the nature of the native population:—

“The fewness of their wants,” it continues, “the comparative ease with which they can be satisfied, the lethargy of the negro and his tendency to fall to a lower level of civilization when not under strong white guidance and control.”

Under what guidance was the “white” when he, too, was on “a lower level of civilization”? It is in the same sense that the British West Indian Negro is referred to by a writer, whose impressions of the West Indies were recorded in the columns of the daily press, from which I made a quotation in the first volume of this work, p. 371, that “. . . in his happy, thriftless way,” he is “satisfied with any control that brings him just enough to keep the life in him,” that “he knows that he is a British subject, and that for a ‘quattie,’ or three-halfpence, earned in a cocoanut or banana walk, he may buy rum,” and that “he does not know much else.” Thus it will be seen that it is not the Government that is blamed; the Government which, contrary to the rigid impartiality that a Government should observe towards all the sections of a community, permits in the British West Indies the class that contributes the largest share of prosperity to the state to be exploited by the class that contributes the smallest share; and the Government which, in consequence, is responsible for the stagnation of those Colonies. I repeat that it is not this

culpable system of government that is censured by the British journalists, the British authors, and others, but it is the victims of the exploitation that are blamed.

And this noticeable method in the case of the British West Indies of shifting blame from the shoulder of the Government, that is blameworthy, to the shoulder of the governed, that is blameless, is also followed in regard to India. The large salaries that are paid to the higher officials, who, of course, are almost exclusively British, the similarly large pensions that are paid to these officials at the end of their service in India, the maintenance of a vast military establishment in India, wars—such as those of Afghanistan, and of the other regions beyond the North-West frontier—which in the last century cost the Indian taxpayer ninety million pounds, the maintenance of the Indian Office in London, these, on the one hand, with a comparatively imperfect development of the country on the other hand, continuing more or less for nearly two centuries, have been to the resources of the Indian people what a huge sponge is to the contents of a pail of water.

But of the terrible poverty that is thus caused, and that, like the darkness of a starless night, has enwrapped India, while the demon famine has rained upon her the desolation of death, what have the bulk of Englishmen to say? Like the case of the British West Indies, in which, as is shown by the extracts that are quoted above, Englishmen have misrepresented the cause of the depression of those Colonies, saying that it is the lethargy, thriftlessness, and inherent inferiority of the peasantry, so in the case of India, instead of frankly owning that the poverty, with its awful corollary of famines, is due to their own misgovernment, they affirm that *failure of rain and over-population are the cause.*

However, such a method is patriotism. Patriotism, as it is now practised, consists in saying what is nice, and in writing what is popular, rather than what is true. In order to obtain notice, or even distinction, as a patriot, a man or a woman need not contemplate an achievement that is more serious than that of purchasing an ordinary tourist ticket to Africa—East, West, or South—to the United States, to India, or to the West Indies. Having been to either of these places, their claim to expert knowledge in all that relates to the

coloured man—whether it be his ethnology, anthropology, origin, or destiny—attains an incontestable eminence. Of course, in having thus visited a home of the coloured man, the *traveller*, in order that his pronouncements may be invested with the attributes of infallibility, needs not necessarily to have seen, much less to have conversed with, a coloured person ; it is enough that he has been to one of the places where the coloured man dwells. Being thus equipped with this geographical fulcrum the *traveller*, by means of the lever which is furnished by the tales that he had imbibed in the nursery, and that is tempered by the heroics which he culled from the literature of the present day, is able, under the dictation of a riotous and unbridled imagination, guided by a facile pen, to launch upon the literary market a volume in entire accord with the public taste.

The spirit of the patriotism of the age which is itself the product of individualism is characterized by a strong aversion to individualism ; and as regards the British Empire, its normal elements are the three following : (1) abuse of the coloured man—be he within or without the Empire ; (2) praise of the white man, and (3) extolling the perfection of British rule.

Therefore, he who would be considered a patriot must resolutely aim at two things. First, he must aim at the studious avoidance of facts ; for facts are incompatible with the existence of these elements. Secondly, he must resolutely aim at making these elements the spring of his action. Thereby independent thought, the result of independent observation, and the converse of conventional thought being on the part of the would-be patriot excluded, his rôle is that of a reciter of a confession of faith. As such, his distinction as a patriot rests upon the freshness and the vigour with which he is able to invest his recital. Thus a British patriot is he who succeeds in confirming the British people in their predilections or their prejudices.

Still making the British West Indies our illustration, I proceed to remark upon two other grievances that assail the coloured subject of the British Empire, viz. deficient educational facilities and discrimination on account of colour.

For the dislodgment of ignorance—the most implacable foe of a state—the greatest lever is education. Hence a state

that neglects education, neglects to provide itself with the weapon of defence that is alone able to cope with its most formidable adversary. Admitting the truism of these propositions, I ask the question, What steps has Jamaica or the British West Indies taken against the arch-enemy, ignorance? The answer is trenchantly set forth in a memorial that was presented to His Excellency the Governor of Jamaica in July, 1903, by the officers of "the Council of Evangelical Churches," that represented the Wesleyan Methodist, the Baptist, the Presbyterian, the Congregationalist, the Free Methodist, and the Christian Church. And these churches in the aggregate consisted of 157 ministers, 450 day school teachers, and a membership, with adherents, of about 250,000 souls.

After referring to the interest that they had taken in the work of education in Jamaica, and calling attention to the fact that it was their predecessors who initiated that work in the island, immediately after the emancipation of the slaves, the memorialists proceeded :—

"Your memorialists are under the conviction that to the efforts thus made was to be traced the advance that had undeniably taken place in the intelligence of the people in the year 1868, up to which time the Government had done practically next to nothing in the work of popular education. Some of your memorialists who were at that time in the island hailed with much satisfaction the enlightened policy which was introduced by Sir J. P. Grant, whose wise dictum was that the continuance of any dark parts in the island where education was neglected was a danger and disgrace.

"Your memorialists who were at that time residents on the island, and those who have since come to take part in the work of the churches represented, have regarded with hopefulness the attention since devoted to the subject by the Government, the creation of a distinct Government Department to control the work, and the increasing sums voted by the Legislative Council from the public revenue to carry on its increased requirements. They have unstintingly given largely of their time and strength in the management of the day-schools and in superintending the erection of school buildings; and in order to supplement the Government grants they have raised sums of money, often in excess of the grants made for the buildings by the Government, and without which the buildings could not have been erected.

“Your memorialists refer to these things as furnishing practical evidence of their deep interest in the work. . . . Your memorialists desire very seriously to call your Excellency’s attention to the following facts: (1) From the inauguration of the giving of Government grants in aid to elementary schools in 1868 there was a steady increase in the number of schools, in their efficiency, and consequently in the amount earned and needed in accordance with the system in force for their support.

“The schools increased from 286 in 1868 to 962 in 1895. The number of scholars in attendance increased from 19,764 in 1868 to 104,149 in 1895—these appear to be the highest figures reached—showing a pleasing increase in educational work. And whereas the Government grants in 1868 amounted to £2978, in 1895 the amount was £52,395. While these figures show that there had been a somewhat rapid increase, the state of education among us was yet considerably behind that attained in more advanced countries.

“In Great Britain, for example, the proportion of the population which it is considered ought to be in the schools is one to five, and to attain this constant efforts are made, while here in 1895 it was only about one in eleven, showing a deficiency then of about 45,000. (2) In 1897, the finances of the country being in a low condition, it was determined that with a view to economy, reductions must be effected in all Government departments.

“A Commission was appointed to consider and to suggest such changes in the educational system as might appear calculated ‘to secure efficiency and economy.’ (3) Following upon the report of the commission and partly as the result, certain important steps were taken, as: (a) The compulsory amalgamation of certain schools; (b) the compulsory closing of certain schools as the result of the withdrawal of their grants; (c) The reduction of the age limit for the attendance of scholars; (d) the alteration of the Code so that the tendency was to reduce the grants payable to teachers; (4) since the introduction of these changes there has been a serious falling off in the educational work of the island as is indicated in the following facts.

“As stated above, the number of schools in 1895 was 962; in 1902 the number was 728, showing a falling off in the number of schools of 234. The children on rolls in 1895 were 104,149; in 1902, 84,799. The average attendance in the former year was 62,587; in the latter, 52,156. The grants to teachers in 1895 amounted to £52,395; in 1902 to £42,936.

“As the population had increased, according to the statement of the Acting Governor, in 1902 to nearly 800,000, the school attendance had gone down to only a little over one in nine, showing a deficiency of enrolled scholars of about 75,000, and of about 108,000 in average attendance. (5) Your memorialists consider that this general and very serious falling off in the educational work of the island is easily traceable to the changes already referred to.

“The process of amalgamation, involving the closing of schools deemed superfluous, has been carried too far; making the travelling of long distances in some cases over bad roads and mountain streams a necessity, and to an extent that is unreasonable, and imposing such hardships on many of the children, especially the younger ones—the schools being distant from their homes, in some cases as much as three to four miles. Also the age limit now prescribed shuts out from the schools large numbers of ages that were formerly found in them, while there appears to be an increased desire on the part of parents to send the children to school who are within the limits of age now in force.

“They feel that the result would have been quite different if with the introduction of an age limit compulsory attendance had been enforced. Your memorialists beg respectfully to remind your Excellency that the matter of school attendance has been one of much anxiety to the more thoughtful classes of the people. Three Commissions appointed by the Governor of the island for the time being—one in 1877, one in 1885, and one in 1897—have given expression of this anxiety by pointing to the need of compulsion in attending school, as in other countries, and earnestly recommend that such measures should be adopted here.

“Strong expression was given at a series of public meetings in all parts of the island to the same view in 1891, and this was embodied in 1892 in Law 31 of that year, by which power was given to the Governor of the island to put in force the compulsory clauses of that law, when this appeared to him to be expedient. The anxiety on the subject of school attendance is there seen not to be of recent date. The anxiety, however, has been much increased by the fact disclosed in the reports above referred to. The great declension which has taken place your memorialists attribute entirely to the changes which have been introduced chiefly to meet the demand for retrenchment in expenditure.

“They feel that the time has come, especially in view of the improved financial circumstances of the country, to re-

view the whole position. (6) Your memorialists beg most respectfully to suggest to your Excellency (a) that the process of closing schools should proceed no further; (b) that where it can be clearly shown that districts are suffering from the closing of schools, the children being practically unable either because of distance or from topographical difficulties to attend the nearest schools, the question of re-opening of the school that has been closed shall be open for consideration at the request of the people of the district; (c) that if the age limits continue, of which your memorialists partly approve, the compulsory clauses of the law already referred to shall be put in operation; (d) that where new schools are formed, or schools re-opened in order to popularize elementary education, such schools shall be conducted as Government schools. (7) Considering the seriousness of the present condition of the island educationally, and the grave importance of the subject as affecting the condition of the people in the near future, your memorialists respectfully urge that the matter should have your Excellency's early and earnest attention."

Such are the views of a company of gentlemen, who, indeed, are authorities on the subject of their memorial. The Archbishop of the West Indies, who is a member of the Board of Education in Jamaica, presiding in the summer of 1903 over a representative meeting at the Church House, at Westminster, London, made this declaration in the course of his remarks :

"It is not true that the Church in Jamaica failed to influence the lives of its own people, *but it is true that half the children in the island were not at school because the Government could not afford a complete system of education.*"<sup>1</sup>

In answer, then, to the question with which we started, viz. what steps has Jamaica taken to expel the arch-enemy, ignorance, from its borders, I reply, that on the plea of poverty its Government has surrendered one half of its children to be the bond-slaves of ignorance. The plea of poverty, I repeat. But in an issue of the "Times," London, of November, 1902, what do I read? This :—

"At a special meeting of the Legislative Council to-day, the Government was given power to grant advances up to

<sup>1</sup> The italics are mine.



£20,000 out of the Colonial Treasury to sugar estates requiring financial assistance. This is adding to the Imperial grant of £10,000."

Here, then, is a people so heavily taxed that even the Government that imposed the grievous weight described it to be "a really oppressive burden"; a people so poor that some of the members have been content to suffer the ignominy of imprisonment for the non-payment of taxes; a people whose lands are taxed, and this land the worst, whose houses, until the year 1903, have been taxed, whose stock are taxed, whose clothes, and whose very food are taxed, in order that they may, besides paying their own taxes, also pay the taxes of the richest class; a people who, after having suffered the miseries of penury and the humiliation of imprisonment, encounter the misfortune, and this the most serious of all, of having the education of their children, on the plea of financial embarrassment, disastrously disorganized. And after that comparative prosperity had returned, the Government that had prepared and that had administered these calamities, instead of devoting it to the education of the children of this people, or to the mitigation of their own "really oppressive burdens," as if to fill to overflowing the cup of their calamity, devotes the fruit of the returning prosperity, in the form of £20,000, to the same rich class, for whom the people pay taxes, and provide labour.

Did ever injustice exceed this one, did ever oppression surpass it?

The Jamaica Government, as we have seen, has expelled from the schools one half of the children of the peasantry, ostensibly from lack of funds; but at the same time it devotes to the tottering industry of sugar—that contributes practically nothing to its support—the revenue that is paid to it by the peasantry. Therefore we must infer that the dying interest of sugar is regarded by the Jamaica Government, and by the British Government as well—whose deputy the Jamaica Government is, and which sanctioned these grants—as being of greater importance than the education of the peasantry; and that in general such application of public funds is of more importance than is their use for the education of coloured British subjects.

This inference receives confirmation from the competent witness, Mr. Sunderland, in his remarks upon Indian famines, p. III, where—after admitting that substantial advantages have accrued to India from British rule—he says that :—

“ This is true ; but in all cases India has paid the bills, and in many cases the advantages have been small compared with the heavy cost. Much is said about education. How much does the Indian Government spend on education ? A little less than a penny per person of the population. *Compare this with the enormous sum spent for military purposes ; and then remember that the whole expenditure, whether for education or the army, comes from the pocket of the Indian taxpayer.*”

As a further confirmation of this inference which I have drawn, that in comparison with the schemes that relate to the maintenance of its hold upon the coloured peoples of the Empire, the British Government considers the education of those peoples to be quite secondary, I may observe that in October, 1905, in the course of an address which a distinguished African gentleman delivered in London upon Southern Nigeria, he remarked about the Colony of Lagos that, compared with the many thousands of pounds that were spent annually upon the salaries and dwellings of the European officials of the colony, the sum which was spent by the Government upon the education of the people was ludicrously small.

To the same effect is the fact that, whereas in England and Wales the age limit for children to attend school is from three to fourteen, in Jamaica, for example, it is from six to fourteen ; and whereas in these two places the seventh is the standard of proficiency at which pupils are expected to have arrived at the time of leaving school, in coloured communities the standard is generally three or four. And lastly, to the same effect also is the following extract, which I take from the statement that was submitted to Mr. Chamberlain on the occasion of his visit to South Africa in 1903 by representatives of the South African Native Congress :—

“ The parlous condition of education in South Africa may be judged by the anomalous attitude of former Ministers under Responsible Government towards Native Education. Through the retrograde influence of the Africander and British anti-Native party, the education of the coloured people has

been hampered, and the instructions of the Government of the day to the Education Commissioners of 1891, and the findings of the Commissions of 1896 and 1900, as recorded in the reports of the Education Department, will amply bear out this serious assertion.

“At the present time, under the improved management of the Superintendent-General of Education, the disparity between the grants allowed per pupil to white and black, as shown by the Education Report, will be seen from the following table :—

	£	s.	d.
First Class Public Schools (White) . . . . .	3	17	4½
” ” ” ” (Black) . . . . .	0	12	2¾
Third ” ” ” (White) . . . . .	2	1	3½
” ” ” ” (Black) . . . . .	0	13	3¾”

The social consideration of the British West Indies properly belongs to the sixth chapter, nevertheless we shall touch upon it here in regard to the practice of discrimination in those colonies on account of colour.

Notwithstanding the ostentation with which the colourless race in general, and the Anglo-Saxon in particular, demonstrates the repugnance that it professes to feel about the idea of commingling with the coloured races, yet, wherever its members are found to have settled among coloured communities (and not alone where climatic conditions are inimical to the presence of white women), their practice is invariably seen to belie their profession. Some punctilious fellow has supplied the following dermic gradations, as being the results of the commingling between black and white.

They are from white to black, octoroon, quadroon, mulatto, and sambo. In the United States, as is well known, these varieties of complexion are divided into two classes, viz. white and coloured, or white and non-white ; but in Jamaica, and throughout the British West Indies, these varieties possess the most striking significance ; for not only are they the chief gauge or the basis upon which all social considerations and relations are determined, but they are also the doorway—easy of access or straitened—to political, commercial, and industrial occupations, and of preferment in those pursuits.

Indeed, in Jamaica—and I am still speaking of Jamaica as the representative of the whole of the British West Indies—

a man's skin, more than his brain, his character, or his physical powers, and not only according to the colour, or absence of colour that it has, but also according to the degree in which pigment in it is present or absent, is in a very special sense his fortune or misfortune. The white dermis, of course, as the skin *par excellence*—according to the popular belief—stands at the summit; it is that in which the flesh of the Saviour was enshrouded, the colour of the angels, these logicians affirm, hence the white man is held to be lord of all he surveys, and of all that others survey.

Like all the other British colonies, the majority of Englishmen who go to reside officially and otherwise in Jamaica, being members of the classes whose social position in England is not assured, and being, in consequence, the more anxious to appear as persons who at home are of distinguished rank, many of them, in the eager and painful endeavour, end, by substituting bluster for authority, swagger for superiority, and insolence for brain. As will be readily conceived, these persons are inexorable in their determination always to maintain the colour gauge at the zenith of its exactions and restrictions.

For it is they whom society welcomes to its chief seats, and with obsequious adulation fawns upon and fondles. It is upon them, too, that the Government, in the form of its highest and most lucrative offices, bestows its fatlings and the custody of its preserves; all these favours being on the basis of dermic distinction. Next in importance to the Caucasian, as approaching nearest to it in whiteness, is the integumentary coat of the octoroon; at its tail is that of the quadroon, and behind the quadroon comes the mulatto, whilst the sambo follows the mulatto.

These, then, in the order given, constitute the elect or élite of the British West Indies, and they form a system of caste which, in the niceness of its prudery, the shallowness of its claims, and the imperiousness of its demands, is unsurpassed even by systems that are supported by the prestige of a venerable antiquity.

The pretensions of this system of caste are the eyes through which all local matters are seen; and it is to its chariot-wheels—moving with snail-like progress—that the welfare of those colonies is chained. When Governor Blake—whom as the representative of the sovereign of these realms was supposed

to have had at heart the interest of all sections of the community—had so far departed from that position of impartiality as to hint, according to the quotation that has been recently given from his evidence before the Royal Sugar Commission, 1897—that the Jamaica peasantry existed only for purposes of taxation, and when Lady Hemming, the wife of Governor Blake's successor, commanded in a public exhibition in 1903 that a woman, because she was black, should be removed from the seat that she was occupying, in proximity to her ladyship's, but for which she had paid, they were but recognizing the primacy and the omnipotence of this West Indian Juggernaut. The superiority of the white complexion being universally believed in, being believed in by the rich as well as by the poor, the educated as well as the illiterate, those who possess it, endeavour—like the necromancer with his tricks—to make the most of their opportunities. On the other hand, many of those who have not the white skin strive to appear as if they had, and, following a simple law of human nature, a law by which a man who desires to be other than he is becomes an inveterate opponent of everything that reminds him that he is not what he would be, they, viz. the mulatto—I use the term as including the other gradations between the parent centres—who if they could, would be white, and one of whose longings is to be thought to be white, being reminded by the Negro blood that courses their veins that they are not white, and that they cannot be white although they are deferential to the whites, and in that deference are even servile, despise the blacks.

Further, the European also, being, to some extent, reminded of his own former position in his native land by the position of the Negro, or taking advantage of the superior place that is accorded him by popular sentiment, on the supposed merit of his integument, or simply conforming to a custom that he finds to be useful to his advancement, for one or other, or for all these reasons, he too despises and loathes the blacks. Thus, socially, commercially, industrially and politically, the British West Indian Negro has as his antagonists the two most powerful sections of those communities.

And he being in their absolute power, they do not scruple to bring into play, those forces which would bar his progress

This is accomplished through the Imperial Government, as well as through the local legislatures, both these divisions of the machinery of the Empire being well within the sphere of their influence. And it was to their influence, no doubt, the influence of these two sections, that the Royal Sugar Commission referred when counselling the Imperial Government in its report of 1898, it said: ". . . it is the special duty of Your Majesty's Government to see that the welfare of the general public is not sacrificed to the interests of a small but influential minority, which has special means of enforcing its wishes and bringing its claims to notice."

The unequal and crushing weight of taxation, burying the peasant in abject penury, the manipulation of his education, and his systematic and deliberate exclusion from the land, are among the practices which are followed by the conspiracy that is arrayed against the black skin; the object being to keep the Ethiopian in a state of mental and material impotence.

In a series of articles upon the subject of the relations between the white and non-white sections of the communities of the British West Indies, which were written by Mr., now Sir, Sydney Olivier, who is Governor of Jamaica, and which appeared in the "New Age," the writer in the fourth article, of the 25th of January, 1906, referring particularly to Jamaica, says:—

"Many coloured men" (i.e. mulattoes) "are magistrates of Petty Sessions, more than one are Custodes—that is to say, chief magistrates of their parishes; more than one hold, or have held, important judicial positions under the Government. According to their professional position they associate with the white residents on precisely the same terms as persons of pure European extraction. In practice, it is a fact that the pure negro does not show the capacity and ambition of the man of mixed race, and there are few, if any, persons of pure African extraction in positions of high consideration, authority, or responsibility."

Let me say at the outset that whether it be the rôle of a scribe who records his impressions of the Negro as he has met him, or of an administrator whose duties have been discharged in Negro communities, Mr. Olivier, instead of being a mere caterer to popular prejudice, and unlike the bulk of

his countrymen in this respect, endeavours to be fair. However, in the inference that the slower rate of progress which the West Indian Negro has made, in comparison with the mulatto, is due to his lack of "capacity and ambition," Mr. Olivier is in error. It is not improbable that if Mr. Olivier had given a reason for the existing disproportion between the progress of the mulatto and the progress of the Negro in British West Indies, it would have been the presence of the white blood in the one and its absence in the other. Although a useful element in the nebula of Caucasian superiority—a usefulness, by the way, with which its universal acceptance by the whites may not be remotely connected—this assertion that the greater progress of the mulatto is the result of his white blood, is absolutely devoid of any foundation of fact.

Incidentally, in the first volume of this work, p. 73, I have given the reason why it is that the mulatto in the British West Indies is preferred to the Negro. And so, here, I will be content by observing that it is not because of the incapacity of the Negro, nor because of the inheritance of white blood by the mulatto, that the latter is preferred to the former, but that it is because the mulatto, in the first place, by means of the education and the wealth that he obtained from his father even prior to the emancipation, had had an earlier and a much more favourable start on the way of progress than the Negro. And it is because that the mulatto in the next place has employed his greater opportunities, in combination with the whites (the people of his father), to systematically obstruct the progress of the blacks.

The facts which are given in this chapter are the explanation of Mr. Olivier's statement "that there are few, if any, persons of pure African extraction in positions of high consideration, authority, and responsibility." And they also demonstrate Mr. Olivier's error.

As confirming my assertions that the British West Indies are in a state of stagnation, and that the blame rests entirely with the British Government, which sanctioned the abuses that have produced the stagnation, I close this chapter with the following highly interesting and important remarks from Toronto, dated the 11th of April, 1907:—

"Addressing a special meeting of the Toronto Board of

Trade, Mr. Allan, the delegate who was appointed by the Board to investigate trade conditions in the West Indies, said that business facilities were behind the times because of Downing Street rule. The islands were practically deserted by Great Britain, and mail and cable communication was almost neglected."

#### WEST AFRICA

So far in our consideration of the subject, viz. the manner that the coloured races of the British Empire are treated, politically, economically, and socially, after that they have been forced to become its subjects, we have used as illustrations India and the British West Indies; and now we proceed to a third illustration, namely, West Africa. In regard to West Africa, I will speak of the colony of Sierra Leone in particular, and of West Africa in general. In a speech that was delivered in the House of Commons Mr. Chamberlain, as Secretary of State for the Colonies, referred to the difference between the British and French colonies in the West Indies in these terms: "When I contrast," he observes, "what we have done with what the French have done in the neighbouring colonies, I confess the comparison is not to our advantage." It will be noticed that the testimonies of Viscount Mountmorres and Dr. Blyden, which I quoted in an earlier chapter concerning British and French West Africa, agree with this contrast by Mr. Chamberlain concerning British and French West Indies.

Mr. Chamberlain's comparison and conclusion will not be unfamiliar to those who have visited West Africa. Nor are the persons natives who are responsible for it. And yet the Englishmen who thus unfavourably differentiate between the British West African colonies and the West African colonies of other European nations have far less reason to complain than has the native. For all improvements, such as the railways, which have recently been constructed from the coasts of Sierra Leone, the Gold Coast, and Lagos, to the Hinterlands, have been undertaken, not for the profit of the native merchant, not for the convenience of the native population, but in the interest and for the benefit of European officials and European merchants.

Of course, the native merchant and the other indigenous inhabitants are helped by these enterprises; but the help



that should come to them was by no means a factor in the decisions that launched those undertakings upon the sea of being. Hence, so far as the native is concerned, such enterprises are purely incidental and accidental. Still, although the Englishman sojourning in West Africa has had less reason for complaint, since the improvements that have been set on foot there are primarily for his advantage, the conclusion of his comparison is true. For as far as the development of the country is concerned, British rule in West Africa, in comparison with French rule, has been, until very recently, in a state of almost absolute quiescence.

And why? Is it because the resources of the country are too few, and the possibilities of the people are too narrow? Not at all; but because of the absence there of colonies of Europeans that form large percentages of the populations. This reason is expressed by Sir Edward Grey, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, thus. Speaking at Horncliffe-on-Tweed in October, 1905, Sir Edward Grey said, "that at the last election he had prophesied that the Government which got them into a mess over the war would make a mess of the settlement in South Africa. They had done so by introducing Chinese labour, forgetting that it was upon the proportion of white men in a country that its value to the Empire depended." British rule, then, does not believe in developing a country for the good of its inhabitants, if the majority of the inhabitants should be people other than those of Caucasian blood.

Otherwise, it seeks the country's progress only to the extent in which that progress subserves its own continuance and profit. In India this is the significance of the presence of Government railways, Government schools, and Government colleges. In Africa this is the significance of the absence of Government schools, Government colleges, and hitherto of railways. Instead of such accessories in West Africa, British rule there runs upon the lines of punitive expeditions, annexations, taxation, repression, and stagnation.

In pursuance of two at least of these affirmations we proceed to the subject of Sierra Leone. As an asylum to some of those whom slavery had outraged, as well as a beacon to the surrounding barbarism, benevolent and noble-minded Englishmen and Englishwomen acquired by purchase in 1788, through the British Government, the piece of ground

on which Freetown, the capital of the colony, now stands. The size of the original area, which scarcely exceeded twenty square miles, has increased to four thousand square miles during ninety-six years (1788-1884), by means of cessions of territory and other treaties of mere friendship that have been concluded between native rulers and the different Governors of the colony on behalf of the British Crown. And during the same period the population has increased from that of 480 souls to over 60,000.

As it was declared by the British Government, the objects of such cessions of territory by the native rulers were in order that tribal wars and slave-raiding might be put down, that the country may be opened up to British subjects for purposes of trade and missionary enterprise, that the traders and missionaries may be protected, and that other ends of a like character may be secured. But in both classes of treaties, commencing from the foundation of the colony, down to the latest treaty that was made in 1895, the position of the native princes, as owners and sovereigns of the ceded territories, and as independent contracting powers, had been unequivocally recognized by both the contracting parties. A few of the treaties of friendship contained a clause by which the British Government should assume sovereign rights over this territory, in default of the native ruler fulfilling his treaty obligations.

This free community being thus established, that it might introduce among its savage neighbours, by means of the peaceful interchange of trade, a higher standard of living, had at different times to take some of these neighbours—at their own requests—owing to their inter-tribal disputes—under its immediate care. It is partly in this manner that the territorial growth of the Peninsula has been so rapid, that by the year 1862 its treaty-rights had united to it tracts of country as extensive as the contiguous districts which are known as British Kwia, and also the important island of Sherbro.

On the other hand, without such a surrender of sovereign rights by the native princes, the colonists, in co-operation with the British Government, used these friendly treaties, first as stepping-stones towards the exercise of control over the independent states, and then towards the absorption of these

states by the colony. A Parliamentary Committee that was appointed in 1865 to inquire into the state of the British establishments on the Western Coast of Africa—which consisted then of the Gambia, the Gold Coast, and Lagos, in addition to Sierra Leone—reported, as we noticed before, “that the further extension of territory, or assumption of Government, or new treaties offering any protection to native tribes, would be inexpedient, and that the object of our policy should be to encourage in the native those qualities which may render it possible for us more and more to transfer to them the administration of all the Governments, with a view to an ultimate withdrawal from all except, probably, Sierra Leone.” For a time the report of this committee had the effect of checking that progress of expansion which for half a century had been very active.

But, in 1879, the old policy having been revived, the tract of country that stretches northward to as far as the Skarcies River was annexed; and in 1884 the seaboard stretching down to the boundary of Liberia was also formally annexed.

From this bird's-eye view it will be seen that, with the exception of the temporary check which the report of the committee that was appointed in 1865 had imposed, territorial expansion has been an unvarying pursuit of the Sierra Leone Colony. And territorial expansion having been seen to be the most marked feature in the external development of the Sierra Leone Colony, we may, therefore, now ask, What has been the most marked feature in the internal development of the colony? Of course, in Freetown, the capital of Sierra Leone, there are Government buildings that are staffed by officials who direct the public affairs of the colony.

There are also stores, shops, and a market, that supply the inhabitants with the necessaries of life; roads and bridges which, as the sinews, bind all the parts of the colony into a common whole; churches, for ministering to the moral and spiritual needs of the community; and schools, for its intellectual equipment. In a word, there is present in this colony all the paraphernalia that go to make up what is called a civilized state. Surely, then, with such an array, there cannot be any other requirement? No other requirement! Why, our examination has been concerned only with the machinery. If it be without steam (without water, without

fuel, and without fire) of what value is a steam-engine for purposes of travel? And of the colony, what is the steam (or the fuel, the water, and the fire) of the locomotive, of which the parts are its religious, educational, political, judicial, and commercial sections? Is it not its industries?

But practically this colony is without industries. Concerning minerals, I believe I am right in stating that in that respect no authorized official inquiry has ever been made in regard to the resources of the colony; but upon the testimony of the late Sir Samuel Lewis—a native gentleman who had devoted to the subject much time and labour—iron exists in Sierra Leone, as well as in the interior; and in the interior it is used by the natives for the manufacture of implements. However, as there has not been any systematic or exhaustive investigation into the matter, it cannot be said with certainty what benefit this class of products would confer upon the colony.

But whereas with regard to metals our ignorance of their quantity and variety compels us to exclude them from the assets of the colony, with regard to agriculture the case is otherwise. For, besides being able to produce supplies for home consumption, the soil of Sierra Leone is capable of growing such articles of export as oranges, pineapples, bananas, arrowroot, ginger, kola-nuts, pea-nuts, palm-kernel, palm-oil, rubber, gum-copal, and cotton. Yet these resources, which for more than a hundred years of British rule, have remained merely as possibilities of wealth to the colony, still remain to it to-day merely as possibilities of wealth.

And why? Because the inhabitants are ignorant of scientific agriculture. But it will be remembered that we have also noticed this ignorance of scientific agriculture among the rayat of India and the peasants of the British West Indies. Ploughing with oxen, for example, is unpractised, because unknown. The manuring of the land, the rearing of rotation crops, the protection of forests, as an aid to cultivation, are methods which, on account of ignorance, are disregarded. Thus the land is denuded of forest trees, is unmanured, and in tillage and in husbandry manual labour alone is employed.

On the other hand, products such as the rubber plant, which are spontaneously grown by nature, are destroyed in the process of collecting the yield. For these reasons Sierra

Leone fulfils the duty of the *middleman*; that is to say, it does not produce, but merely distributes. And it derives its subsistence entirely from the profits of its trade with the Hinterland, of which we have spoken already. By this absolute dependence, the colony is extremely sensitive to the fluctuations of trade in the Hinterland, and that sensitiveness was the necessity for creating there—for the purpose of steadying the course of the trade—that despotism of which, under the head of the Sierra Leone Protectorate, we have also spoken.

As a further illustration of the extent to which the colony is dependent upon the interior for its support, I repeat here the figures which I have had occasion to quote before. These figures represent that 82·4 per cent of the entire imports into the colony in 1897 passed to the interior, the colony having retained only 17·6 per cent. The payment by which the interior tribes purchased this 82·4 per cent of goods included, of course, such incidental expenses as custom dues and light and harbour duties. Hence, concerning the revenue of £87,093 which represent the duties that were yielded in 1897, whereas the colony contributed £15,328, the Protectorate contributed £71,765.

Here, then, is this colony, with natural resources which are sufficient for its support; yet these resources being wholly undeveloped, through the absence of some institution within its borders or elsewhere in British West Africa, where its youths could be instructed in husbandry; through the absence, furthermore, of an agricultural society or agricultural shows, by which knowledge might be acquired and rivalry created and fostered; it appears after a hundred and ten years of British rule, as the absolute dependent of a region to which it contributes nothing, and which has been described by Mr. Chamberlain as "a wild, savage, and almost untrodden country." Of such a colony would it be unfair to characterize its condition as that of stagnation? And so, whereas externally, or in territorial expansion, this colony has advanced with rapidity, internally, or in its material development, it has remained stationary. But these two sets of conditions generally apply to all British West Africa.

We shall now speak more particularly of West Africa in general, and we shall speak of it in connection with an order

which was issued by the Colonial Office on the 1st of January, 1902, bearing the caption, "Information for the use of candidates for appointments in the West African Medical Staff," and containing this paragraph :—

"Applicants for appointment as Medical Officers in the West African Medical Staff (the highest grades will usually be filled by promotion from the lower) must be of European parentage, and be between twenty-five and thirty-five years of age, and must possess a complete double qualification."

It is well known that for a number of years Africans and persons of African descent, who are British subjects, have been in the habit of coming from the different colonies and dependencies to Great Britain, in order to qualify themselves in the theory and practice of medicine and surgery. The students who so come distribute themselves among all the leading medical schools, colleges, and universities, and successfully submit themselves to the examinations of these bodies—including such examinations as are generally regarded as the most difficult.

These students, then, in respect to the fees which are paid for their tuition, in respect to the subjects which are taught them, and in respect to the examinations which they pass, stand on precisely the same footing as their fellow-students of the colourless race. Returning to their homes, after completing their studies, some of these native practitioners have found employment hitherto in the service of the Government. But, as we have noticed from the order that I have just quoted, West Africa, where, I believe, members of the Ethiopian race were first appointed as medical officers by the British Government, is now closed to all men of colour.

Nor is it inconceivable that if the silence in which the order has been received, by those whom it chiefly affects, be maintained indefinitely, the exclusion of this class of persons from the Medical Service, in other places of the Empire where they are now employed would be long delayed.

The appointment of Africans, or men of African descent, or coloured men—for at least one Indian has also been appointed to this service—by the Imperial Government, for the West African Medical Service, began as early as 1859.

In that year two African doctors, as Assistant Surgeons, were allowed to join the army; they were promoted in 1873 to the rank of surgeon; in 1875 to that of surgeon-major, and in 1881 they retired on pensions.

Since this period coloured men, no longer as army surgeons, but as assistant colonial surgeons, have been constantly appointed to the West African Medical Service. Thus, besides the colonies of Sierra Leone and Lagos, the Gold Coast Government alone, at different times since 1859, and to as late as 1893, has employed seven coloured medical men. But being thus excluded from this branch of the service by the Imperial edict—a branch of the service that, indeed, is small, yet it was that which they have been held to be eligible to fill—a branch of the service, moreover, that some of them have filled at different times during forty-three years—with satisfaction to the Governments and credit to themselves. But being thus excluded, I repeat, from this branch of the service, His Majesty's coloured subjects have been summarily repressed in their legitimate aspiration and lawful ambition.

## VI

# The Manner in which Coloured British Subjects are Treated within the Empire

### (c) THEIR SOCIAL CONDITION

IT will be remembered that after discussing the manner that coloured British subjects are brought into the Empire, we proceeded to consider the manner they are treated within the Empire. It will be further recalled that we purposed to follow out this consideration under three heads, namely: (a) Certain popular fallacies; (b) political and economical conditions of coloured British subjects; and (c) social conditions of coloured British subjects. Having concluded our remarks under the first and second of these heads, of which, in the latter case, certain aspects of the political and economic conditions of the coloured races of British India, the British West Indies, and British West Africa have been used as illustrations, we have now come to the third head, namely, the social condition of coloured British subjects.

This third head will be introduced by a few extracts, of which, the first shall be taken from an article which appeared in a London paper on the 10th of January, 1903, of which Mr. Raymond Blathwayt is the author. The article was suggested to the author, I understand, by an earlier article on the same subject—the southern Afro-American—that had appeared in the paper, and that had been written by Mr. Percival Phillips.

“To the ordinary English reader,” Mr. Blathwayt begins, “Mr. Percival Phillips’ deeply interesting article on ‘Black and White in the Southern States,’ will come as a shock and a revelation.” The purpose of my present paper is to show that with strenuous modifications the case throughout the whole British Empire is precisely similar. Whenever the



white man is confronted by the black man *en masse*, the prejudice against the latter is bitter in the extreme. "The theory of equality, 'the man and the brother' doctrine, however beautiful it may appear, is absolutely unworkable in the practice of everyday life." From this point Mr. Blathwayt proceeds to furnish the reason why the white man feels "a prejudice that is bitter in the extreme," towards the black man "when he confronts him *en masse*," but as this will be dealt with more conveniently under another head, I pass on now chiefly to reproduce here the examples which he gives in confirmation of the statement "that with strenuous modifications, the case throughout the British Empire is precisely similar" to that which is found in the southern states.

"The suppression of the black man," Mr. Blathwayt informs us, "is a stern duty." And proceeding first, to show why the suppression of the black man "is a stern duty," he says:—

"It has to be remembered that the differences between white and black go so deep and are so intimately connected with the subtlest physiological problems, that any attempts to do away with them would be fraught with danger to the whole human family. And they cannot be done away with; they lie too deep" (for tears?). "They are a part of the race. Within the last seven years," Mr. Blathwayt continues, "I myself have seen the thumbscrew applied, with the full knowledge and consent of British authorities, to a thieving native; and in West Africa the methods adopted by white officials are frequently cruel in the extreme. We in England say that the black man is in all respects the equal of the white.

"If you go to Bombay, one of the daintiest jewels in our Imperial crown, you will find that not even the greatest Indian Prince is allowed to put so much as his face within the doors of the Byculla Club or the Yacht Club. Some time ago a distinguished coloured cricketer was staying with the Governor of one of our great Indian provinces. The Governor wrote to the secretary of a certain club, and asked that this cricketer should be put up as an honorary member. The reply ran as follows:—'My dear Lord —, I have received your Excellency's letter. If your friend chooses to come in his turban, and take off his shoes and wait at table like his brethren, he can enter the club. Not unless.'

"When Lord Reay was Governor of Bombay, he gave a

large dinner party, to which he invited a certain very high-class native gentleman. This gentleman he introduced to an English lady, saying, 'Will you take Mrs. So-and-so in to dinner?' The lady at once left the room, accompanied by her husband; and the Anglo-Indian has not even yet forgiven Lord Reay for his innocent solecism. Sometimes, I own, this prejudice can be carried too far. Some years ago, a young subaltern in India left his first-class railway carriage for a moment, and on his return he found a coloured gentleman sitting there. 'D——n your cheek!' he cried, in a frenzy of rage and indignation. 'Out you go, you black brute,' and so saying, he flung him bag and baggage upon the platform.

"Unfortunately, this 'black brute' happened to be one of Her Majesty's judges of the Supreme Court. I could give many other instances of a like nature, but these will suffice to show my readers that, with certain modifications, we of the British Empire entertain precisely the same feeling towards the coloured man that the Southerners do towards their own negroes."

It is not my intention to offer here, any detailed comment upon these extracts, that are taken from Mr. Blathwayt's article, and so, with respect to the statement "that the differences between white and black are so intimately connected with the subtlest physiological problems," etc., I will simply remark in passing that knowing that it is not only communities but "the whole human family" which would be in danger if any attempt were made to do away with "the differences between white and black," Mr. Blathwayt, as a public teacher, a public benefactor, and an authority on physiology, owes to mankind, to furnish examples of "the subtlest physiological problems" with which the "differences between white and black are intimately connected," in order that the great weight of his counsel may be felt, and thereby followed.

It is altogether unintelligible that a matter of world-wide importance, involving danger or deliverance to "the whole human family" should have been buried in the mystic phrase, "subtlest physiological problems," so that, like one of the Delphic oracles, instead of enlightening, it only perplexes. I am unable, unfortunately, to command language sufficiently forceful, with which to denounce a dereliction of duty, that is

so awful. In conveying an illuminating idea, an idea that is calculated to shield "the whole human family" from dire calamity, in conveying such an idea in the enigmatic phrase, "the subtlest physiological problems," Mr. Blathwayt is guilty of nothing less than an atrocious crime against "the whole human family," and for this most criminal blunder, had it not been that he is a conspicuous journalist, I should have adjudged him an inconspicuous physiologist.

Another extract that I shall submit relates to the British West Indies, and has been recently alluded to. The incident to which it alludes happened in April, 1903, and the central figure of that incident was Lady Hemming, the wife of the gentleman who at the time was Governor of Jamaica. The extract runs thus:—

"At the horse show which was held on Hope Grounds"—Kingston, Jamaica—"on Wednesday, the 14th instant, an incident occurred which has produced much irritation, and given Lady Hemming unenviable notoriety. According to unimpeachable testimony, a black woman, respectably dressed and well behaved, having paid for a seat in the 'stand,' quietly took it. The seat was not very far from that occupied by Lady Hemming and her party. The proximity of this black woman was evidently too much for her ladyship's pride . . . so she commanded the Governor's aide-de-camp, one Lieutenant Maddick, to have the woman removed. Maddick immediately called one of the constables in attendance, and in a loud voice commanded him to remove the woman, the colour of whose skin was so obnoxious to her ladyship; and the word of command was passed to the unoffending woman.

"With a show of good-breeding above her station, she calmly consented to take another seat, if one could be found for her. She was not violently removed because a strange gentleman and lady present, indignant at the behaviour of the Governor's wife towards one who had in no way offended her, offered her their own seat, and as a sign of their disgust at the snobbery, immediately left the show."

It may not be uninteresting to observe that the taxes from which Governor Hemming's salary was being paid were contributed, directly and indirectly, by the class to which this woman belonged.

The third extract of the series relates to South Africa ; in it the narrator thus records his experience :—

“ It is rarely, if it ever happens, that a native, whatever his rank, is received on any social occasion inside the house of a white person ; indeed, he would seldom be permitted, except as a domestic servant, to enter a private house at all. When Khama, the famous chief of the Ba-Mangwato, a Christian and a man of admittedly high character, who has ruled his people with singular ability and wisdom, was in England . . . and was there entertained at lunch by the Duke of Westminster and other persons of social eminence, the news excited general annoyance and disgust among the whites in South Africa. A story was told me,” our informant continues, “ of a garden party given by the wife of a leading white ecclesiastic, the appearance at which of a native clergyman led many of the white guests to withdraw in dudgeon.

“ Once, when I was asked by my host whether I had any objection to his bringing into the family meal the pastor who had been preaching to the native congregation, when I expressed some surprise that he should think it necessary to ask, he explained that the race feeling was so strong among the colonists, that it would have been deemed improper, and, indeed, insulting, to make a white guest sit down at the same table with a black man, unless special permission had at first been asked.

“ Thus one may say that there is no social intercourse whatever between the races ; their relations are purely those of business. Now and then the black man gets ahead of the white, but the latter’s pride of race remains. I was told of a white man who condescended to be hired to work by a Kaffir, but stipulated that the Kaffir should address him as ‘ Boss.’ Of intermarriage, there is of course no question. It is not forbidden by law in the British colonies, as it is in most if not all of the Southern States of America, but it is excessively rare ; nor does it appear that there are now other irregular unions outside marriage, as there constantly were in the old days while slavery existed. . . .”

Concerning Northern Nigeria, West Africa, the “ Lagos Weekly Record ” reports the following occurrence :—

“ The captain of the Government stern-wheeler ‘ Benue ’ was once ordered to do something by a European clerk, in the military transport department on board this ship ; and before

the captain could reply, the clerk, Wilson, slapped him for not taking off his hat before him, a white man. Paul, the black captain, returned the third slap in the face, when the European clerk, Wilson, ordered Captain Paul to be thrown overboard by a soldier of the West African Frontier Police, and Paul swam ashore, but he was arrested and brought before the European Assistant District Commissioner Davidson, who forwarded a final report to the High Commissioner, stating that Paul was provoked by Wilson, who struck the first blow, and therefore recommended his release.

“The High Commissioner is reported to have written on the report of the Assistant Resident at Jebba that no provocation from Wilson could warrant Paul striking a white man, and consequently Paul should have three months’ hard labour, be dismissed, and his salary forfeited, and that in future the white man’s prestige must be kept up in Nigeria at any cost.”

I venture to think that it is not by such unmeasured insolence and overweening conceit that the white man will succeed in maintaining his “prestige.” We are further informed that after Captain Paul had served his term of imprisonment, the High Commissioner directed that he should be re-engaged under the following condition: That, furnishing two sureties, he should execute a bond for ten pounds, undertaking never to strike a white man again, in any circumstance whatever. The bond executed, Paul resumed his duties as Captain of the steam launch “Zaria.”

Here, too, is the substance of a letter that is headed, “The status of the native in Nigeria.” It was written for the purpose of informing immigrants, who intend to go to Northern Nigeria from the other British West African possessions, of the treatment they should expect to receive there. Perhaps I had better give the writer’s own words. Referring to the customary violation of contract by the authorities, and to the reduction of wages that had been stipulated for, the writer, after mentioning how scarce was the supply of food stuffs, because that the food which was most easily procured was reserved for the European residents, proceeds to say:—

“This restriction is not only put on food, but medicines as well, and I can only say that the native who falls ill in Nigeria fares badly. The treatment, too, is anything but what would be expected, the native is discriminated against

and subjected to treatment which is the reverse of what would have been expected in the Queen's service. As illustrating the sort of treatment meted out, I may mention the case of a dispenser who said he was unable to accompany a military expedition. This man was called up, and for his refusal to accompany the expedition he was laid across a beam and flogged most unmercifully."

This case, as it would seem, quite bears out Mr. Blathwayt's statement that "in West Africa the methods adopted by white officials are frequently cruel in the extreme." But we return to the native's letter:—

"I was surprised to find," he continues, "that this sort of treatment was not confined to Northern Nigeria only, for I met the same thing in Southern Nigeria. Several native officers' salaries had been reduced, while they were removed from one post to another, under the most aggravating circumstances. While at Old Calabar I found a road existed upon which no native was permitted to walk, and which was for the exclusive use of Europeans."

Concerning Northern Nigeria, we have had corroborative evidence from the "Lagos Weekly Record," and from an employé of the Northern Nigeria Government, of the treatment which is received by natives who are in the service of that Government. Now let me supplement this corroborative evidence by that of a third witness, a witness who lived in Northern Nigeria for about two years, not as a Government servant, however, but as a missionary:—

"Every native official," this witness proceeds to say (such as clerks), "must of necessity, on meeting any European in the streets take off his hat; failing to do so, the hat is knocked off and the official is flogged, besides his chances of getting increase of pay are forfeited. This is a standing order, though unwritten. Many of these clerks have been flogged and denied promotion. Native officials, if they are as well treated, are no better treated than a pig. No native official can travel first-class on the river boats; under special privilege he may go second. No travelling allowance is allowed the native when he is out on official duty. A native on refusing to work because of the smallness of the salary offered him has been flogged by an engineer at Zungeru, as late as 1904.

"Kings and chiefs are often imprisoned and ill-treated on

refusing to supply the requirements of Europeans—such requirements as firewood for river launches, food, and men to carry their luggage. In the majority of cases expeditions are led against the natives for the reasons just given.”

Between this loathsome exhibition of vanity by which the native officials of Northern Nigeria are required to uncover their heads in the streets whenever they meet Europeans, and by which if they fail to do so they would incur the risk of corporal punishment and the ruin of their official career, between this exhibition and the following facts with regard to India the parallel is so close that I have submitted both :—

“I have known the Political Representative of the Indian Government in a native state go even so far as to order his *chuprassies* to tie up two ignorant villagers and give them each ‘a dozen’ for having passed him without duly acknowledging his presence. That occurred in 1871, and was, I gladly admit, an extreme case. Not so very long ago, I heard a civil surgeon gaily tell at a mess-dinner how the other day he had felt constrained to teach a native forcibly his respectful duty to the ‘Ruling Race.’ The ‘nigger,’ as he puts it, had his whiskers and beard tied up—as all natives like to have them when travelling—when he met him on a country road. The doctor pulled him up and demanded to know why he had not undone his face-cloth when he saw a *sahib* coming. Then suddenly remembering that he had a pair of forceps in his pocket, he dismounted, and taking the poor man’s head under his powerful arm, extracted two of his teeth, saying, ‘Now tie up your mouth, my man. You have some excuse now.’ That is how some of us try to teach the poor natives to be loyal.”

This extract appeared in an article of the “Contemporary Review” for October, 1895, and was by Rev. William Bonner.

Perhaps to many persons these examples which denote the treatment that is meted out to coloured British subjects in the dependencies and colonies of the Empire by white British subjects will not be altogether unfamiliar. Their general reading, their intercourse with persons who have sojourned in those parts, or their study of the general Imperial trend, these, singly or jointly, may have prepared them for the facts which these examples embody ; so that as far as they are concerned, novelty will not be the character-

istic of this field of inquiry. Therefore, on the ground of such a possibility, we will return to the homeland from these Imperial outposts, to find out there, from the experience of the comparatively few members of His Majesty's coloured subjects who have either visited or are settled there, as well as from the expressions of the Press—that great mirror of public sentiment—the position, socially, of coloured British subjects.

I will preface the investigation with the following remarks, that occur in one of the reviews on the first volume of this work. Commenting upon the necessity, or the wisdom, that led the author to write a book to prove that the coloured races are not inferior to the colourless race, the reviewer adds :—

“Of course, if Dr. Scholes thinks it worth while to break a lance with vulgar error, we should be the last to say him nay. But surely it is only the ‘Man in the Street,’ in his most unreasoning mood—the man in the street of Louisiana when lynching is afoot—who would assert that the white man is always, everywhere superior to the black.”

And I begin with the experience of a friend—a British West Indian, who, after completing his medical curriculum in the United States, and obtaining there his degree of doctor of medicine, came to this country in order to obtain an English qualification also. With this end in view he joined one of the leading London hospitals. His contact with the students during the months that he worked the hospital, he assured me, was to him anything but happy ; adding that he had received far more courtesy from the white students with whom he had worked in the United States than he had received from the students of this London hospital. For, not only was the general behaviour of these latter students towards him icy in the extreme, but occasionally he heard such queries as this uttered with reference to himself, “What has he come here for ? ”

On one occasion, when by early attendance he had secured a place of vantage from which to view an important operation that was to be performed, one student, having come up to him from the other end of the crowd of students, actually attempted to push him aside, that he might obtain the coveted



place. My friend declared that the opinion which he had cherished previous to his coming to this country in regard to the treatment which persons of colour receive in England, had undergone a complete change, but not a favourable one.

It was only during the summer of 1905 that a young gentleman (black), a student of a great northern university, related to me his experience of how the coloured students of his university were treated by the white students. That treatment was the very opposite of courteous. The coloured students, he said, were hooted and called names. The students' magazine of the university had even suggested that the coloured students should be expelled the university. And this feeling of intense antipathy towards the coloured students had even appeared among the teaching staff of the institution.

Perhaps the reader will recall the incident that occurred during the brief sojourn of the Alake of Abeokuta, in Great Britain in 1904, when, after that he had visited a certain Scottish university, and was returning from his visit, his carriage was pursued by a band of the students, and one of the band, jumping up behind the carriage, deranged the cap of the distinguished visitor. Imagine such an indignity to have been offered to a prince of European blood, even though in its singularity his head-dress were even grotesque. But these young gentlemen are the future moulders of British opinion.

The next experience is a personal one. Soon after the publication of a previous work, the author received a letter from the President of the Anglo-Russian Literary Society, dated December, 1899, in which, after stating that he had seen reviews of the work, he continued :—

“The object of this A.R.L.S., besides the study of the Russian language and literature, is to promote more friendly relations between England and Russia, while avoiding politics. Good relations dispense with politics. If our work can in any way interest you, and perhaps induce you to assist us by reading a paper before the A.R.L.S., I should be pleased to have some of our journals of proceedings forwarded for your perusal. With apologies for addressing you,” etc., signed, — President.

The next communication which the author received from

the President of the Anglo-Russian Literary Society ended with this offer: "If you care to join, I shall be pleased to have you elected."

It may be mentioned that before he received the first of the two communications that are quoted here the author had never so much as heard that there was such a society as the Anglo-Russian Literary Society. It may be stated likewise that the author neither consented to read a paper before the Anglo-Russian Literary Society nor to be elected to its membership, but he, being in Scotland at the time that he received these communications, he promised that when he returned to London he would call at the headquarters of the society.

This he did. On the occasion of his call he received a courteous welcome from the Secretary. This gentleman informed the author that the President was absent, but that a meeting of the society would be held a few days hence. The day being mentioned, the author was asked to attend the meeting, and was assured that if he could attend, the President would be glad to see him. He promised to attend the meeting, and he did attend it. The meeting was held in a room of the Imperial Institute, a room that could probably accommodate a hundred to a hundred and fifty persons. At the meeting a paper was read, of which the subject, of course, was Russia. A discussion followed the reading of the paper, then tea.

But all this time—from the end of the discussion to the serving of tea—although he stood a few yards only from the seat which the stranger occupied, he at whose initiative the stranger was informed of the existence of the Anglo-Russian Society, the stranger whom he had invited to read a paper before that society, the stranger whom he had offered to elect to its membership, the stranger whom the Secretary had invited to that meeting, and to whom he had given the assurance of welcome, the President, the manly and gentlemanly President of the Anglo-Russian Literary Society for Promoting Good Relations between Great Britain and Russia, to this stranger did not even deign to speak. Of course the stranger soon perceived the snobbish intent of the President of the Anglo-Russian Literary Society for Promoting Good Relations between Great Britain and Russia, and thereupon he left the room.

I take it that the reviews of the work, which had led the President of the Anglo-Russian Literary Society to proffer to the author the courtesies referred to, had produced upon his mind a favourable impression ; here, then, is a man of professed enlightenment and breadth of culture, who was prepared to acknowledge merit when he thought that it was under a pale skin, but when he found that it was under a black skin he despised it. And yet this is that much-vaunted "superiority," at whose shrine coloured men are bidden to worship. In order that the Anglo-Russian Literary Society may realize the hope of its mission, viz. of stimulating among the peoples of the British and Russian Empires the sentiments of international goodwill, it is to be devoutly wished that the President may be animated by a desire that is more liberal than that which he has shown concerning the promotion of inter-racial goodwill within the British Empire itself.

Recently, three white men, of gentlemanly appearance, members of one of the middle or upper classes, of ages between twenty-five and thirty-five, who were walking abreast and were going in the opposite direction to that of a coloured man who was returning home at about eleven p.m. along one of the fashionable thoroughfares in London, one of the company, pointing his lips in the direction in which the coloured man was coming, called the attention of his comrades to the presence of the coloured man, and then said, "Look at that thing." Perceiving that he was overheard by the coloured man, whom he had thus gratuitously and grossly insulted, the despicable cur and ninny poltroon hastened away as fast as he could. But this laceration of the feelings of coloured people, which has now become a practice in England, is due partly to the fact that Englishmen, having adopted the notion that they are superior to coloured men, have found rudeness and incivility to be the best supports of the imposture.

We have come now to the Press. The attitude of this great alembic of public opinion, respecting the social position of the coloured British subject in Great Britain will be presented in a series of five extracts. Of these extracts, the first is taken from a review that appeared in a London evening paper, of June, 1905, on Professor Burghardt Du Bois's book, "The Souls of Black Folk," and it reads thus :—

"It is hard in any circumstances for the white man to

regard the black without a touch of contempt. In America it is as yet impossible, so deeply-engraved are the marks of slavery days. If the present generation cannot reconcile itself to the negro as brother, another generation may."

Having referred to the story, "Of the Coming of John," a story which is related in "The Souls of Black Folk," the review thus concludes :—

"An impressive little story, presenting a pitiable picture of racial isolation! He who would learn sympathy with the negro in his struggles—his too-often frustrated struggles—towards freedom and enlightenment will do well to read and consider it. For it presents, as no other facts can, and not even Mr. Du Bois's arguments are able, the tragedy of the curse of Canaan."

It is in this same sense that the Rev. Dr. Pierson, in the first of his series of supplementary lectures on "The Bible and Spiritual Life," which he delivered recently in London, said of "the marvellous way in which the Bible gives . . . a forecast of entire racial history," that "the Biblical outline of the history of the race gives the threefold division—the three great streams of primeval civilization, and their special character is shown. The Hamitic people are to be not only servants, but of the lowest kind—slaves—and are to serve both Japhet and Shem." It would evidently appear from this statement that even upon a subject that is specially his own, the theologian is not more accurate than the journalist.

The second extract occurs in the course of a review of one of the author's works, and it, as well as the succeeding extract, is quoted here, in order to show the frequency with which Englishmen—not only, and perhaps not as much, of the masses as of the classes—now use the epithet "nigger" when they refer to the Negro. I have said *now*, for the usage of this epithet in Great Britain in the manner indicated is an innovation, and an importation, of only recent years.

The second extract, then :—

"He next takes up the question of the white races and the blacks, and pleads that according to the teaching of Christianity, Caucasian and niggers are men and brothers, and ought to be politically equal."

The third extract is taken from the report of a trial that occurred in the Scottish capital during the autumn of October, 1905. The nature of the trial was that of a breach of promise of marriage. The plaintiff was a Scotch lady, and the defendant a gentleman of colour—a Negro. We read :—

“Counsel in cross-examination: He is a negro with thick lips, the woolly hair, and the general appearance of the negro? The plaintiff: Yes. Counsel: He is just a ‘nigger’? From this characterization by the learned Counsel, it is to be inferred, I suppose, that in all the cases of ‘breach of promise’ that appear before the Scottish courts the defendants are ‘niggers.’”

Concerning the first of these extracts in relation to the subject with which it deals, one is made conscious of the fact that an air of patronage and exoneration—these constituents being in a greater proportion than ordinarily—surrounds it. The excess of these elements renders the air extremely heavy and exceptionally oppressive, that surrounds the extract. And in this air by which the extract is enveloped the cause of the present excess of these elements of patronage and exoneration arises, I believe, from a feeling of elation on the part of its author in that he is identified with the side that has arrogated to itself the pretensions of superiority.

In the patronizing condescension of the announcement that “it is hard in any circumstances for the white man to regard the black without a touch of contempt,” that “if the present generation cannot reconcile itself to the negro as brother, another generation may,” and that the story of John “presents . . . the tragedy of the curse of Canaan,” the author of the extract—which in its tone and temper represents the average Englishman of to-day—the term Englishman being used to include the Scotch, Irish, and Welsh—seems to say to the African race: Whenever we act kindly and considerately towards you, you must understand that such an act on our part is purely gratuitous; for the curse of Canaan has relieved us of all obligations to treat you kindly and considerately. On the other hand, you possess qualities and a condition which are exceedingly objectionable to our race. For example, there is the colour of your skin, the peculiarity of your features, your past condition of centuries of servile service to us, and

among us your present condition of ignorance, poverty, and impotence. So that, in our intercourse with you, we are released by the curse of Canaan from all the ordinary obligations twixt man and man ; whilst you, on your part, restricting mutual intercourse by the repulsiveness of your characteristics and condition, cause contact between us to be influenced, on our part, towards you, by feelings of condescension and patronage.

Of the prevailing poverty in the realm of morals there is no surer index than the persistence with which the base coins of falsehood are continued in circulation ; and of this discredited class of currency none is more palpably, nay, none more absurdly, below the standard of truth than the cowry-shell (as applied to the Negro race) which is called " the curse of Canaan." And the following two reasons are the marks of condemnation of this base coin. First, that the African race, according to the Scriptures—which, however, are also said to teach that that race was cursed in Canaan—descended, if at all, not from Canaan alone, who was one of the four sons of Ham, but from those four sons of Ham.

Now, concerning the Negro peoples of the African continent—the home of the race and the place where its majority dwells—with the exception of the ancient Ethiopians, the ancient Egyptians, the Abyssinians, and the Mohammedans—they all may be said to have always occupied the same moral and intellectual plane. Therefore, if Canaan alone were cursed, in accordance with the assurance of Holy Writ, and if through him his descendants alone were cursed, yet these descendants in moral and mental culture were at least the equals of the descendants of the other three progenitors of the race, then there is no evidence that the curse has exercised upon its victims any specific influence of a malignant kind.

Further, if Canaan and his descendants alone were cursed, as we are assured by the Scriptures, then by what sanction of logic is the inference drawn by the author of our extract that the descendants, too, of the other sons of Ham have been likewise cursed ; and that, therefore, the part of the Negro race which descended from those three sons of Ham has been cursed ? But in these remarks I have assumed that Africa was peopled by all the sons of Noah. There is another view, however, that is held on the subject by the learned ; it is that Canaan,

the son of Ham, peopled Canaan, or Palestine, and not Africa. But whether it be believed that Canaan took part in the peopling of Africa, or that he peopled Palestine, one thing which, according to the Scriptures, appears certain is that his progeny alone were cursed, and that, therefore, the great majority of the peoples of the African continent, who have not descended from Canaan, could not have been cursed. Hence "the tragedy of the curse of Canaan," of which the extract speaks, and by which its author exonerates his race in their habitual malevolence and bad manners towards black men, is but a gross and clumsy myth.

The second reason for which the so-called curse of the Negro race is discredited is that of African communities, all those phases of tribal and national life which are regarded by the Caucasian as proofs that the Negro has been cursed, have been likewise the concomitants of the development of Caucasian communities. Thus, corresponding with the phases of savage African communities, we have in Caucasian communities—in the earlier periods of their existence—not that they have all even now passed away—we have "polygamy," "human sacrifice," "domestic slavery," "the purchasing of wives," "the imposing upon women the tillage of the soil," "indolence," "treachery," "warlike proclivities," "witchcraft," "cannibalism" (vol. i., p. 189). Therefore, if these phases, as proofs, indicate that the Negro is cursed, then, in like manner, they indicate also that the Caucasian is cursed; but if they do not indicate that the latter is cursed, they do not indicate that the former is cursed.

Such, then, is the ground—as substantial as snow—upon which Englishmen claim the right to cherish and to cultivate, respecting black men, feelings of "contempt." These tatters with which Englishmen have clothed their objection to treat the Negro as a man and an equal, viz. the curse of Canaan and the present and past condition of the African, having been stripped off by the rebutting evidence which is adduced—that the African race, as a race, has not been cursed, that all the phases that characterize African barbarism have characterized Caucasian barbarism, and that all the phases which at the present time characterize European progress are by the African being reproduced.<sup>1</sup> I affirm that between

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i., p. 280.

man and man of every degree and condition of life the mutual observance of kindness, courtesy, and consideration is a duty and not an option. That, therefore, it is no less binding upon the Englishman that he should be kind, respectful, courteous, and considerate to the Ethiopian, than it is binding upon the Ethiopian that he should be kind, respectful, courteous, and considerate to the Englishman.

To promote each other's happiness is man's chief duty to man, and it is by courtesy, kindness, and consideration that the mutual obligation is discharged. That each person has in his keeping the sacred treasure of his neighbour's happiness, and that courtesy, kindness, and considerateness are the means by which that trust is fulfilled is apparent, from the universal existence which these qualities have, and also from the fact that they are indispensable to the welfare of mankind. Thus among the members of the most degraded community of savages that could be found anywhere, courtesy, kindness, and consideration would be seen to be exchanged; and that default in such an interchange is penal. That which is universal and is at the same time indispensable constitutes a law.

That tenanted dwellings—which range from a palace to a hut—are equipped, however scantily, with some sort of furniture is universal, but not indispensable; but that these dwellings should all possess a foundation is both universal and indispensable. And so in this latter case we have a law established. Similarly, courtesy, kindness, and consideration being qualities which are universal amongst mankind, and at the same time indispensable, constitute a law of human society. Therefore, in regarding black men with "contempt"—an act which is a breach of the law of courtesy, kindness, and consideration—Englishmen are guilty of violating one of the fundamental laws of human society.

But although habitually breaking this elementary law, and at the same time glorying in the breach thereof, Englishmen—as one of the articles of the treaty that the British Government concluded with China in 1858, declares that "the Christian religion, as professed by Protestants and Roman Catholics, inculcates the practice of virtue, and teaches man to do as he would be done by"—profess that the qualities of courtesy, kindness, and consideration guide their practice.



Further, the whole Christian religion, viz. doing to others as one would be done by, of which courtesy, kindness, and consideration are a part, is not only professed by Englishmen to be the perfect standard of conduct, but is also, at considerable cost of treasure, and peril of life, being propagated by them among the coloured races. Lastly, as the following illustration shows, Englishmen do not only profess to practise the religion of doing to others as one would be done by, and, with commendable zeal strive to inculcate its tenets among the coloured races, but they also resent, with regard to themselves, any breach of its rules by these coloured races.

Thus it is we read in the article of the Anglo-Chinese treaty—to which allusion has just now been made—that—

“It is agreed that henceforth the character ‘I’ (I) (barbarian) shall not be applied to the Government or subjects of Her Britannic Majesty in any Chinese official document issued by the Chinese authorities, either in the capital or in the provinces.”

So, then, whereas Englishmen are noticeably sensitive about having the epithet “barbarian” applied to themselves; whereas they profess to be governed by the perfect law of doing to others as we would be done by; and whereas they insist that this law should also govern the conduct of the coloured races toward themselves; besides such treatment as that of the English and Scotch students towards coloured students, and the boast that the white man can scarcely regard the black without a touch of contempt, they, i.e. Englishmen, habitually hurl at the Ethiopian the epithet “nigger,” of which the genus is the same as that of “barbarian.” It is to such a charge of inconsistency as these facts constitute that an English writer exposes his people, when he declares that “it is hard in any circumstances for the white man to regard the black without a touch of contempt.”

In the course of my remarks I have observed that, in addition to the curse of Canaan and his present condition—a condition that is not unique, as we have seen, but corresponds in every important particular to the past condition of the Germanic branch of the Aryan race—the physical peculiarities of the Negro are also held by Englishmen to be

a reason why he should be regarded by them with "contempt." On the subject of "The Quality of Beauty among the Races" (vol. i., p. 53), I have indicated that the types of features which are noticeable in the human race may be broadly divided into three, and that they are represented by the Hamitic, by the Semitic, and by the Japhetic races. I have said that the chief factors by which these types of features have been produced are the bones and muscles of the face and the complexion.

I have remarked further that beauty may be classified into what I have termed as "natural and artificial beauty"; that the difference between these two types is that, whereas natural beauty, for the most part, appeals to the peoples of all three races, artificial beauty, which is arbitrary, and is chiefly the result of association and familiarity, appeals, for the most part, to the race with which any type of it is identified. But I have also hinted that whatever may be the standard of artificial beauty that a race or the peoples of a race might adopt, the same being likewise true of natural beauty, that standard would be represented not by the majority of their members, but by a small minority. In other words, that in the bestowal of physical beauty, nature, as in the bestowal of her other ornaments—such as those of the intellect—is not bounteous, but penurious.

Again, with regard to artificial beauty, I have stated, that among the members of a community in which one form of it is the standard, the effect of that standard, owing to their familiarity with it, would probably be that of attraction, whereas among the members of a community which has a different form of artificial beauty as its standard, the effect of the first standard, owing to the absence of familiarity, would probably be that of repulsion. Hence, that the European type of artificial beauty—for example—appears to the African who is unfamiliar with it just as repulsive as the African type of artificial beauty appears to the European who is unfamiliar with it. But how should these disagreeable feelings be treated if they should really exist? Should they be preserved, cultivated, expatiated upon, and gloried in, both in private and in public?

I have just now remarked that the standard of artificial beauty which may be the ideal of a race or of the peoples of

a race is realized not in the many, but in the few. The members of this privileged class are described by terms such as "pretty," "beautiful," "handsome." The bulk of those who are outside of this elect pale are unclassed, whereas those of them whose deficiencies in facial charms are very pronounced are described as "ugly," or more mildly as "plain." But would the pronounced facial deficiencies of this last class be made a theme of general conversation in private, or be trumpeted abroad in public? Would such conduct be regarded as a sign of good breeding? Could it be imagined that in the most untutored class of society, any company of men, women, or even children would ordinarily tell one of their fellows that he is ugly? Would not that, or any other defect or peculiarity of the individual, be mentioned, if mentioned at all, in a whisper only, in order that the person alluded to might not hear the remark? We could not imagine any one, however low in the social scale, who would blurt out in an ordinary private gathering, and without provocation, what he believed to be the peculiarity or the defects of another. How much less could it be imagined that under the same circumstances such a declaration would be made in public.

For the purpose of illustrating the fact that to the African who is unfamiliar with the European type of artificial beauty that type of beauty appears just as strange, and even as hideous, as the African type appears to the European who is unfamiliar with it, I have instanced in the first volume of this work the case of the Negress, who from sheer abhorrence of the colour of her white visitor—a minister of the Gospel—sought to have him expelled from her house. Also the case of the African youths who heralded the white man's approach as that of a "white monkey." But in the first of these examples it was fear that moved the woman to betray to the white man that his physical peculiarities had produced in her feelings, that were other than agreeable; whilst the shouting of the epithet "white monkey" in the presence of the white man by African youths is exceptional.

For the African who for the first time beholds a white man—particularly African women and children—may run away from him, but as if from a sense of innate good breeding, they do not as a rule, in his hearing, make offensive comments

about his physical peculiarities. But in this respect what is the conduct of the Englishman towards the black man? The Englishman, discarding every consideration of the ordinary rules of politeness, good breeding, and good manners, in public as well as in private, holds up to ridicule, to scorn, and to contempt the physical peculiarities of black men. Here is an ordinary example that appeared recently in a London evening paper :—

“To put it bluntly, it would appear to be evident to those who are no anthropologists or craniologists that the negro features are obviously of a more bestial cast, and that some of their marked anatomical peculiarities have more of the monkey than the man.”

I am fully aware that the tone of this scurrilous excerpt is that which is now generally employed by the best as well as the worst of English literature, in referring to the features of the Negro. I am also aware that this violation of one of the most elementary laws of human society finds favour in the highest walks of English social life; therefore, that it is now a part of the recognized standard of English ethics. But in defiance of that standard I declare that even if the colour and the physiognomy of the Ethiopian were more “repulsive” to the Caucasian than the colour and physiognomy of the Caucasian were to the Ethiopian—and I aver they are not—ordinary good taste, ordinary good feeling, and ordinary good breeding had enjoined forbearance, instead of the lash of the blatant and brutal taunts with which Englishmen delight to pursue him. How much more, then, is such forbearance incumbent when, beyond the accident of association or familiarity, no real reason exists for exhibiting these vile and unseemly aspersions?

“It is hard in any circumstances for the white man to regard the black without a touch of contempt.” The rejoinder which this statement provokes is this: Whether there is not that also in the white man which “in any circumstances” is fitted to excite in the black man contempt for him? His astounding egoism, for example, by which he is ever trumpeting his own praises, by which, after that he has received his civilization from the coloured races he not only ignores the reciprocity, but even affects to doubt

the capacity of these races to assimilate the same civilization. Or his consummate hypocrisy, by which, under the guises of philanthropy and religion, he seizes the countries of the coloured races, and perpetuates his hold of them by keeping the inhabitants in poverty and ignorance, and by inoculating them with the virus of Caucasian superiority; and I advance the seizure of Kiao-Chau by the Germans, p. 15, the annexation of Porto Rico and of the Philippine Islands by the Americans, and British rule over, and British missionary enterprise among, the coloured races, in answer to this query.

Lastly, whether the idolatry by which the white man deifies material things, and the infidelity by which he violates sacred things—of which in the former case his superstitious reverence for force, station, and wealth, and in the latter case his savage and habitual outrages upon the feelings of the coloured races, and his reckless, unscrupulous, and untruthful attacks upon their character—are examples? Whether these traits, standing out in bold relief in the character of the white man, are not as much fitted to excite in the black man contempt of him, as those which excite in him contempt for the black man? But the black men who have escaped the mesmeric influence of contact with the white man, who in consequence have maintained inviolable their manhood, and who measure the white man as he is, and not as he says that he is, prefer to turn away from these his grave defects, and to seek for those good qualities that are also native to his character, and to admire them when they are found.

Let the white man, therefore, in emulation of this, act similarly towards the black man, and in the process his own character will be thereby ennobled.

## VII

### Reasons Alleged as Accounting for their Social Condition

**I**N regard to the expression of the Press apropos to the social position of the coloured British subject in Great Britain, we have come now to the fourth and fifth extracts that complete the series of five. The fourth appeared on the 26th of October, 1901, as part of an article of the "Spectator," and is entitled "The Negro Problem in America." Commenting on the incident of the dining of President Roosevelt with Mr. Booker T. Washington, after vindicating the President's right to invite to his house or to his table whomsoever he choose, the article proceeds:—

"Nevertheless, we wish that the President had not been moved to give the invitation, because we do not believe that the recognition of non-existent equality between the races is the way to kill out the white prejudice against the black one.

"There is no equality. As they all inter-breed, it may be taken as certain, that in that far past which it has been the will of Providence to hide so completely from us, all the families of man sprang from one common stock; but it is equally certain that they have developed very unequally, and that the negro stands at the present moment behind both the white and the brown.

"Individuals have advanced to high level, but the race, besides its apparent deficiency in accumulating power, retain in Africa, in Hayti, and in the Southern States deep traces of savagery, especially as regards the relations of the sexes, which it will need generations to work out."

The fifth and last extract to which we now proceed appeared in the well-known London daily, the "Daily Telegraph," on the 29th of August, 1902, and is to this effect:—

“At a time when the numerical increase, combined with the moral and mental stagnation of the dark races, is steadily raising a very grave and critical issue for both branches of the English-speaking world, it is instructive to remember that yesterday was the anniversary of a social experiment among the most remarkable in history. . . . The decree of emancipation, and the tenderness of treatment extended at the cost of the nation to a vested interest even in human flesh were works of so entirely pure and just intention that they will always be remembered as an episode no less honourable than unique in the record of British policy.

“But when we look back over the lessons of sixty-nine years, it is impossible not to contrast the expectations of the abolitionists with the knowledge of to-day, and *to reflect upon one of the most suggestive instances of failure in politics of ardent idealism proclaiming abstract principle in denial or disregard of facts.*

“From the success in this country of the anti-slavery cause to its victorious issue in the American Civil War, there was a large, fervent, and influential school which believed that the degradations inseparable from the condition of slavery were responsible for *the sloth, vices, and incapacity of the slave.* The more enthusiastic abolitionists maintained that the black was susceptible of an indefinite degree of civilized development, and that freedom would evoke the moral and mental powers which had been dormant in bondage.

“*In a word, the theory was widely held that the negro was capable of working out his own salvation. We have made the test.* The results of manumission have been tested under the Stars and Stripes for a generation, and under our own flag for two generations. Anglo-Saxon experience has been reinforced by that of every other nation. We have seen what it meant by negro independence in Hayti as well as by negro enfranchisement in the Southern States. And in the final period which has witnessed the opening up of the Dark Continent itself, the profound study of its tribes in their own environment has completed the painful process of dissipating the sentimental view. *The potential equality of the typical African with the white people, as we now know, never has existed and never can exist. No black race is capable of assimilating the higher spirit or of mastering the political and economic mechanism of modern civilization. . . .*

“What has been verified in the actual practice was foreseen even before the time of Wilberforce and Clarkson, by one of the most judicious and penetrating minds of any age.

There is a page in Gibbon's great masterpiece which, after a century and a quarter, remains as sound and sensible as when it was written. The historian is writing of the troubles of Libya when the barriers of the Roman Empire were breaking down on every side, under the increasing weight of barbarian pressure. 'The inaction of the negroes,' he remarks, 'does not seem to be the effect either of their pusillanimity.

"But their rude ignorance has never invented any effectual weapons of defence or of destruction; they appear incapable of forming any extensive plans of government or conquest, and the obvious inferiority of their mental faculties has been discovered and abused by the natives of this temperate zone. . . . *That this fundamental want of inventiveness, or in other words, of the independent faculty of civilized progress, is inherent in the black-skinned populations, the results of manumission and of freedom, wherever they have enjoyed it, have shown. . . . They have some fluent and effective preachers and agitators . . . but they have developed no executive ability, and have not produced a single leader who could compare with the stronger type of white ability in any sphere of intellect.*"

Never is dogmatism so dogmatic as when it essays to support a cause that it knows to be false. On this ground, therefore, the certitudes of the "Daily Telegraph," that "the potential equality of the typical African with the white people . . . never existed, and never can exist," that "no black race is capable of assimilating the higher spirit, or of mastering the political and economic mechanism of modern civilization," etc., may be excused.

It will be noticed that in both these extracts equality between the white and the black man is contemptuously denied. The premises from which the conclusion of the "Spectator" is drawn are (1) the Negro's lack of accumulating power; (2) his savagery, as it is exhibited in Africa, Hayti, and the Southern States. The premises of the "Daily Telegraph" are practically the same. Of course, the "Daily Telegraph" and the "Spectator" as is shown by the extracts, aver that the freedmen have failed; and, as the proofs of the freedmen's failure, they advance the mental incapacity of the Negro race, and the evidence that supports that incapacity.

Thus, our remarks shall be concerned, first, with the subject of the incapacity of the Negro race and the evidence that



supports it, and next with the failure of the freed men. According to the extract from the "Daily Telegraph," the following is what that paper has said on the subject of the mental incapacity of the Negro race :—

"The potential equality of the typical African with the white people, as we now know, never has existed and never can exist. No black race is capable of assimilating the higher spirit, or of mastering the political and economic mechanism of modern civilization. That this fundamental want of inventiveness, or in other words, of the independent faculty of civilized progress—is inherent in the black-skinned populations, the result of manumission and freedom wherever they have enjoyed it have shown."

With a confidence no less engaging the "Spectator" avers that there is in the negro race an "apparent deficiency in accumulating power."

But we have seen (vol. i., p. 334) that the "higher spirit which the Caucasian has assimilated," and "the political and economic mechanism which he has mastered" and developed to their modern magnitude, have not been the products of his own originality, but have been gifts to him by a Negro people. So that the world has seen one Negro people at least which were "capable of assimilating the higher spirit, and of mastering the political mechanism," whereof those of modern civilization are the outgrowths.

But this instance negatives the assertion of the "Daily Telegraph" concerning the Negro's incapacity, or the assertion that "no black race is capable of assimilating the higher spirit," etc. It also negatives the inference of the freedmen's failure, which the "Daily Telegraph" has drawn from this assertion of the Negro's incapacity. Further, this instance invalidates the averment of the "Spectator," by which "deficiency in the accumulating power" of the Negro race is alleged to be the cause of the failure of the freedmen.

Having negatived the assertion of the incapacity of the Negro race, by showing that European civilization itself, had its origin with a Negro people, we proceed to examine the proofs that support the alleged incapacity of the Negro. As the conclusion of an argument, the incapacity of the Negro race having been negatived, the proofs upon which that con-

clusion rests must have also been negatived. Yet these proofs, as weapons for vilifying the Ethiopian, are so constantly in demand, and with effects that are so disastrous to him, that it seems to me necessary that they should be noticed here in detail.

The proofs by which the mental incapacity of the African race is sustained, according to the extracts, are (1) the unequal development of the races ; (2) failure of the Negro in Africa and in Hayti ; (3) failure of one generation of Negroes in the United States ; (4) failure of two generation of Negroes in the British Empire ; (5) that the Negro has produced " not a single leader who could be compared with the stronger type of white ability in the sphere of intellect " ; (6) Gibbon's testimony. On the first point the " Spectator " declares :—

" There is no equality. As they all inter-breed, it must be taken for certain that . . . all the families of man sprang from one common stock ; but it is equally certain that they have developed very unequally, and that the Negro stands at the present moment behind both the white and brown."

With regard to the subject of the unequal development of the peoples which constitute the three races, I have shown in vol. i., p. 342, from which I reproduce here the subjoined excerpt, that the lateness of uncivilized African communities in evolving civilizations is not exceptional :—

" Thus, taking as an example the Indo-European family, it will be seen that while in conformity to what may be called the law of spontaneous evolution, the Hindoo branch of this family, in common with the Egyptians, Phœnicians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Mexicans, Peruvians, Chinese, etc., was probably in possession of a fully developed civilization long before what is called historic times ; the other members of this family did not only develop their imitative civilizations at much later times, but at *irregular periods* during those times. In this way the intellectual life of the Hindoo, as revealed in the vedic hymns, was operating on the higher planes of knowledge more than 2000 years B.C.—according to some authorities, 4000 years ; whereas, the visit of Thales, Pythagoras, Anaxagoras, Plato, and other Greek philosophers to Egypt did not begin until 640 B.C.

" Similarly, the maturity of Roman literature, being taken as the time when the Roman nation reached the highest rung

of its intellectual ladder, is to be put down at 240 B.C. And, lastly, the manhood of modern European intellect, as it appears in signs such as the withdrawal of politics from ecclesiastical control, and the individualizing and consolidating of the states, great maritime discoveries, great extension of commerce, etc., was reached in the fifteenth century, 1450 A.D., so that, as representing on the one side the nations which developed their civilizations contemporaneously or regularly, we have the first member of the Indo-European family developing its civilization 1360 years before the second—the Greeks; 1760 years before the third—the Romans; and 3,450 years before the modern nations of Europe, which I will call the fourth member, and which, on the other side, represents the peoples whose civilizations are *irregularly developed*."

Now, if these instances of *irregular development of Indo-European communities* are not proofs of the intellectual incapacity of the Aryan race, then the irregular development of African communities cannot be proof of the intellectual incapacity of the African race, as the "Spectator" affirms that it is.

With respect to the second point—failure of the Negro in Africa and in Hayti—taking Africa first, I divide its peoples into three groups—heathen, Mohammedan, and Christian. Concerning the first of these groups, it has been seen (vol. i., p. 249) that in general progress they occupy a position that is much higher than that which was occupied by heathen Europe. Concerning the Mohammedan group, it has been seen (vol. i., p. 250) that its members have completely assimilated the culture of the Arab. And concerning the third group, if we take such Christian communities as Sierra Leone, Lagos, the Gold Coast, and the Gambia, as representatives, we should find that all the chief institutions of civilization—religious, political, municipal, social, commercial, judicial, educational, etc.—are present in them.

That in the case of one of those colonies these institutions have successfully existed—inasmuch as their maintenance has depended entirely upon the indigenous part of the inhabitants—for more than a century, that in the case of two others of those colonies these institutions have existed for nearly a century, and that in the case of the fourth of those colonies these institutions have existed for nearly half a

century. But if the heathen African possesses a standard of living which is higher than that which the heathen European possessed, if having been brought into contact with the still higher culture of the Arabs he assimilated that culture, and if having been brought into contact with the highest culture of all, namely, Christian culture, he has assimilated that also—and the institutions of Christian culture that are just now named could not have existed in those colonies during the years which are mentioned if that culture had not been assimilated—then I contend that such manifestations by the native African do not support the allegation of the failure of the Negro in Africa.

On the subject of Hayti I am compelled to notice the singular spectacle of finding this accused country alone in the dock ; for until quite recently it had been the invariable habit of English writers—distinguished as well as obscure—as a salve to the national conscience in their treatment of their fellow-subjects of the African race—to summon to the dock, for the purpose of rehearsing to them the charges of their misdemeanour, viz. misgovernment, not Hayti alone, but Hayti and Liberia. But it having been suddenly discovered that Liberia is a commercial asset of international importance, that fortunate country was thereupon honourably acquitted of the charge whereof it had been accused and habitually condemned.

Therefore the inference would seem to be this, that should Hayti likewise succeed in developing commercial possibilities of international importance, she too, concerning the offence of which she is habitually accused and condemned, including even that of "cannibalism," will receive an honourable discharge. But in the meantime what are the salient facts of the case? The island of Hayti was discovered in 1492 by Columbus ; and until 1630 it was owned entirely by Spain. The French, in 1630, settled in the eastern part of the island, while the Spanish remained in the western division. In 1697 Spain ceded to France the eastern division that the French had occupied. In 1791 French Hayti revolted against the mother country ; the revolt, after varying fortunes, came under the leadership of Toussaint L'Ouverture. The whole island was subdued by him, and an independent government was established.

The whole island having now become French possession, Toussaint L'Ouverture was treacherously taken to France as a prisoner. In 1803, Dessalines, one of the late generals of L'Ouverture, heading an insurrection against the rule of France, drove the French from the island, and established an independent republic. Dessalines was assassinated in 1806, after which the Spaniards regained possession of the eastern part of the island. In 1821 this section declared itself independent of Spain, and, under the title of Spanish Hayti, it formed its own government.

But in 1844 it was subjugated by Boyer, the President of French Hayti. Thereafter the people of Spanish Hayti seceded from French Hayti, and founded the republic of San Domingo. In 1861 a reunion between Spain and San Domingo was negotiated by Soutana; but in 1865 Spain evacuated the island. From this period, at irregular intervals, Hayti has been devastated by political cyclones of a revolutionary kind. And as if to accentuate the world's prejudice against this Negro republic with regard to its political ebullitions, Sir Spencer St. John, from his fervid brain, evolved a figment, which Froude the unsafe popularized, imputing to the Haytian people the practice of cannibalism.

Thus a well-known cyclopædia has this to say upon the subject: "The state of society in Hayti is represented as deplorable, cannibalism being said to be common." Should the reader care to know what has been said in refutation of this reprehensible impeachment, I would recommend him to consult the author's work, "The British Empire and Alliances," p. 268. And further, in the United States and in Great Britain the internal disorders of Hayti have been seized upon and used by interested persons as an argument against the political enfranchisement of the Negro. It is in this sense that the "Spectator" and the "Daily Telegraph" say ". . . the race" (the Negro) ". . . retains in Africa, *in Hayti*, and in the Southern States deep traces of savagery, especially as regards the relations of the sexes." "We have seen what is meant by Negro independence in Hayti." I do not wish in the least to minimize either the nature or the effect of the social convulsions of which Hayti has been frequently the scene. Upon the commonweal their demoralizing results must be very marked. A grave responsibility, therefore,

must rest upon the enlightened section of the Haytian state ; for its patriotism ought to have been adequate to keep in check such unstable tendencies. However, instead of the prejudice with which the case of Hayti is so constantly approached and under which it is so invariably conducted, if due allowance were made for the character of the material that constituted the foundation of the Haytian state—ignorant men, whom, for the most part, centuries of servitude to the lowest level had debased—if such allowance were taken in conjunction with the age of the Haytian Republic—the age of one century only—in conjunction with the condition that similarly characterized European states at the centenary of their age, and in conjunction with the progress which Hayti, notwithstanding her disabilities, has made, the verdict, I venture to think, would be less harsh, less unsympathetic, and less discouraging than it usually is.

Misgovernment is a wide term ; its meaning is unexhausted by the term “revolution.” For any system of government that diminishes the happiness of the governed, or that obstructs the growth of their progress, is misgovernment. Hence, even those who bandy at Hayti the term misgovernment would themselves be found to be entangled in its meshes.

And as regards the procedure by which the misgovernment of Hayti is advanced as a proof of the incapacity of the Ethiopian race, it would, no doubt, be justifiable if the fact could be shown that those states whose peoples are members of the other races have all or most of them been free from similar disorders. But is it the case ? What state is there in Europe which, during the first century of its existence, aye and more centuries than one—did not develop disorders of the nature of those of Hayti ? And although many centuries have passed since the period of their juvenescence, are they all, even yet, free from the incubus of misgovernment ? In this respect what shall be said of the Balkan States and of Turkey—the Mount Etna and the Mount Vesuvius of European politics ? The former with its internecine strifes and implacable hates, ever threatening the *peace* of Europe ; the latter the dismembered trunk of a once mighty empire, venting its spleen upon the impotence of its Christian subjects, with the gore of whose myriad corpses its tattered ensign drips ?

Or what shall be said of "Holy Russia," before whose turbulent rage, in one of its most recent massacres of Jews, the flushed cheeks of heathen barbarity blanched with horror? Thus, on the 6th of November, 1905, we read :—

"Telegrams from Odessa show that almost unspeakable outrages have been committed there under the eyes and even with the active assistance of the military authorities, whose duty it was to repress disorder. The Jewish quarter of the city has been sacked, the authorities declaring that the 'Christian population must be allowed to give vent to their patriotic feelings,' children have been torn limb from limb, men and women beheaded, and old people soaked with petroleum and burnt to death in cellars.

"No reliable estimates can be formed of the number of victims, but they must be counted in thousands. It was not till late on Saturday afternoon that, acting under imperative orders from St. Petersburg, the Governor-General took any effective steps to stop the bloodshed."

"Odessa, 5 November.—Plundering in the outlying suburbs continued early this morning. Unheard of atrocities have been committed by the mob in the poorer Jewish quarters of the town. The aged and sick, who were found hidden in the cellars, were soaked in petroleum and burnt alive in their homes. Police and soldiers marched at the head of the bands, and openly encouraged them in the work of devastation."

Again :—

"Odessa, 4 November.—The events in the suburbs of Moldavanka, Slobodka, and Bugaievovka last night were of a most terrible nature. Immense bands of ruffians, accompanied by policemen, invaded all the Jewish houses, and mercilessly slaughtered the occupants. Men and women were barbarously felled and decapitated with axes. Children were torn limb from limb, and their brains dashed out against the walls. The streets were littered with the corpses which were hurled out of the windows. The houses of the murdered Jews were then systematically destroyed, not the smallest piece of furniture being left intact."

"Kieff, 4 November.—All the hospitals are filled to their utmost capacity with dead and wounded Christians and Jews ; for three days the Jewish quarters of the town were given over to plunder, rapine, and murder."

Or again, what shall be said of the independent State of

the Congo—the foundling of Christian philanthropy, the monument of civilized unselfishness? Of this stupendous province that has been created for the weal of the native inhabitants, and that has been maintained for their happiness, the following are its achievements. By the aid of a picture let us seek to realize these achievements. The picture shall be a mansion, that is divided into certain great halls, and these halls leading into various rooms. The key by which access into these apartments of halls and rooms is gained is supplied by a dispatch of the Governor-General of the Congo Free State to the principal officers of his administration, dated the 29th of March, 1901.

Of that dispatch the following sentences, as part of the translation, appeared with Consul Casement's report to the Marquis of Lansdowne, which was received on the 12th of December, 1903:—

“The quality of the rubber exported from the Congo is sensibly inferior to what it was some time ago. This difference arises from several causes, but principally from the addition to the latex which is fit to be gathered, of other kind of latex of very inferior value, or even of any dust-like matter. This cause of loss can and must be removed. The Commissioners of districts and chiefs of zones, who all have experience, know the fraudulent means which the natives often try to employ. They must take measures completely to prevent these frauds. . . . Whenever these frauds are discovered they must be put down. . . . To this cause of the decline in the value of rubber must be added that arising from defective packing of the produce. . . . Much of the effort which has been taken to obtain produce in keeping with the richness of the country may be said to be lost through this neglect, for the value of the rubber may be diminished by half through this want of care. I may add that the value of rubber, even when free from all admixture, has gone down in every market for some time past; territorial chiefs must, therefore, not only remove the two causes of loss which they may eliminate, but they must also try to neutralize the third by making unceasing effort to increase production to the extent laid down in the instructions. The orders which have been given will have constant attention.”

By means, then, of this key—which is the demand that is made by the Governor-General that the output of rubber



should be increased—we gain entrance into certain halls. These halls are certain societies or commercial companies, to which the Government of the Congo State has conceded exclusive rights over vast tracts of territories, of which rubber is the chief product. In addition to conferring upon these companies exclusive commercial rights, the Congo Government has also delegated to them certain executive powers; of these powers that of police is one. Whether the Congo Government had also in theory entrusted to these establishments the exercise of judicial functions, it is a fact that in practice they discharge those functions.

For, as Mr. Casement informs us in his report, within the limits of these concessions there were no qualified resident magistrates, and this despite the fact that some of these concessions are as large as European states. Nor is there any court of appeal within reach of the people. Thus the visits of the Commissaire-Général of the Equator District, who is chief of the Executive and President of the Territorial Court of the entire district, have been made to the stations of what is known as the A.B.I.R. concession, not as an official, but as a guest; and as a guest he also travelled in the steamers of the company.

Proceeding to the subject of the relations that exist between these commercial companies and the natives who are within their territorial zones, we discern how absolutely the natives are controlled by the companies. Take, for example, the A.B.I.R. Company. It will be found that on its books the name of each male inhabitant of nearly every village that is under its rule—according to his age and fitness to work—is registered. The work that these natives are expected to do is of a twofold character; of this one may be described as domestic and the other as commercial.

The natives whose villages are in proximity to the trading stations render the first of these two classes of service; and they render it by supplying the factories with food-stuffs, such as the flesh of antelope and of wild pig—which the older men are expected to hunt—Kwanga bread or bananas, goats, ducks, and fowls. For the purpose of illustrating the rigour of this form of service, I may cite the following cases, which Consul Casement has given in his report. Late one night, a man attended by seven others whom he represented as his

friends, waited upon Mr. Casement with the request that he would take them with him to the French territory at Lukolela. The cause of the request was that they were no longer able to meet the demands for domestic supplies which the agent of their factory had laid upon them. Part of the imposition which they and their town were given to bear was a monthly contribution of two goats for the white man's table. The result was that all the goats had now disappeared from their town, so that they could continue to meet the demand only by purchasing goats from inland. But for each of these goats they would have to pay 3000 rods (150 fr.), whereas the recompense that is given by the Government for a goat is 100 rods (5 fr.).

And they were now at the end of their resources. He had laid the circumstances of the case before their taskmaster, but no abatement of their burden was vouchsafed, hence, as a last resort, they have had recourse to flight.

Regretting that it was beyond his power to aid them, Mr. Casement advised the petitioners to represent their case to the higher authorities at Boma. The leader replied that such a representation was clearly impossible, for on the last occasion that he made application to the officials at "S" concerning the matter, the answer he received was that if his next tax should not be forthcoming he would be sent to the "chain gang." He added that a neighbouring chief who had failed in his supplies to the factory had recently died in the "prison gang," and he feared that, if he were caught, the same fate would befall him.

This man's statement to Mr. Casement was corroborated by a person at "T." With regard to the chief who had died in chains, this witness also said that "he had every reason to fear it, for recently two chiefs died in the chain." Of these two chiefs, the crime of him whose town was "U" was that the removal of his houses a few hundred yards, in order to join them to — had not been done as quickly as the Commissaire thought that it should have been done. The crime of the other chief was that his fortnightly tax had not been regularly paid. The two chiefs were chained together, and made to carry loads of brick and water, and were frequently beaten by the soldiers that were in charge of them.

Another instance that I shall cite in order to illustrate the

rigour of the domestic branch of service that the Congo State exacts from the natives, refers to the forcible transference of the town of " P " from the north bank of the " X " river, where it was first seen by Mr. Casement, to the south bank near to the factory of " Q. " The person " W " who made the communication to Mr. Casement said that the transference was undertaken by the direct command of the Commissaire-Général.

This official had visited " P " by steamer, and on the occasion of his visit he directed that the people should work daily at the La Lulanga factory of " Q. " Replying to the command, " W " informed the Commissaire-Général that the journey to " Q " was too great for the women of " P " to undertake daily. To this very reasonable objection the Commissaire-Général's answer was the taking away of fifty women and two men with him to " Q. "

In order to secure the return of the women, " W " continued, he and his people had to pay a ransom of 10,000 brass rods (500 fr.). This sum was paid to the Commissaire-Général himself. Nor was the ransom all, for when it was paid, the Commissaire-Général gave the order that as the town of " P " was too far from the factory it should be abandoned, and that a fresh town should be built near " Q, " by which the services of the people would be more accessible to the needs of the white men there. To this mandate they had been compelled to acquiesce, for many of them by force had been taken across. It was now about two years since the deportation was effected, and " W " was asking Mr. Casement to use his influence with the local authorities that permission to return to the site of the former home may be granted to himself and his people ; as in their present station they were " most unhappy. "

The following are the contributions that were demanded of these wretched people : " Daily—10 baskets gum-copal, 1000 long canes " (termed " Ngodji, " that grow in the swamps, and that are used for thatching and roofing), " and 500 bamboos for building ; weekly—200 rations of kwanga and 120 rations of fish. " In addition to these items, fifty women were required each morning to go and work at the factory. When they complained that the pay for their services was inadequate, they were beaten. The chief " W " was asked by Mr. Casement why he had not gone to the " D.F. " to complain, if he and his people

were being beaten by the sentries. He answered the question by opening his mouth, and pointing to a tooth that was dropping out ; then he said : " This is what I got from the ' D.F.' four days ago when I went to tell him what I now say to you." He added that he and his people were frequently beaten by the white man.

The third illustration that I shall give, in order to indicate the harshness of the domestic service which the Congo State wrings from the natives, is furnished by the town of " W." This town is situated in a swampy forest near the mouth of the River " X." Mr. Casement had heard that for their failure to deliver their weekly supplies at the Coquihatville station certain towns had been fined, and that the fine had fallen with especial weight upon the town of " W " ; accordingly, he determined to visit that town.

The town of " W " was found by Mr. Casement to consist of one long street of huts, lying in the midst of a forest ; and he estimated the population, from one end of the town to the other, to number six hundred souls all told. A crowd of men and women was congregated at the upper end of the town, and some of its members made a statement to Mr. Casement, of which the following is the substance. From this upper end of the town, they said, one hundred rations of kwanga had to be supplied each week, and thirty fowls at a longer interval. The fowls were for use at Coquihatville, while the kwanga was principally served out to the wood-cutters at the nearest wood-cutting post of the Government, on the main river.

The prices that are usually paid for these articles are one rod for each kwanga and twenty rods for each fowl. Besides these dues, the people of this section of the town had further to deliver to the local wood-post ten fathoms of firewood—for which they were often unremunerated ; and the women twice each week had to work at the coffee plantation of the Government that surrounds the wood-post. Mr. Casement saw some bundles of the firewood that were being prepared for transit ; he has described them as being large and very heavy, and as weighing seventy to eighty pounds each.

The people also said that some months earlier, at the beginning of the year, owing to their failure to send to Coquihatville the fowls that were demanded of them, an armed ex-

pedition of some thirty men occupied their town. At first they fled to the forest, but they were persuaded to return. Many of them having returned, their principal men were seized and tied to trees; thereupon the officer informed them that they had failed in their duty, and must be punished. He commanded that twenty-five men should be given up for the service of the Government. The twenty-five men were received by the officer, and as labourers they were taken by him for the service of the Government; but their friends who made this statement to Mr. Casement had neither heard anything of them since they were forcibly deported, nor even knew where they were.

Eighteen of these twenty-five men belonged to the upper end of the town, and their names were supplied to Mr. Casement; the other seven hailed from the lower end of the town, and the informants assured Mr. Casement that, should he wish it, the names of these seven men would also be furnished to him there by their relatives. Besides the requisition for these twenty-five men, the officer imposed the further punishment, of a fine of 55,000 brass rods (2750 fr., or £110). Compelled to raise this enormous mulct from the depth of their penury, the people were forced to the heartrending expedient of selling their wives and their children. Mr. Casement said that he saw no live stock of any kind at "W," except "a very few fowls—possibly under a dozen," and that indeed it did not seem unlikely, as was asserted by the people, that they had great difficulty in always getting ready their supplies. Stepping out from the crowd, a father and mother declared to Mr. Casement that in order to contribute their share to the fine they had to sell their son—a little boy called "F"—for 1000 rods. A widow avowed that for the same reason she had to sell her daughter "G"—a little girl whom Mr. Casement thought to be about ten years old. This child, for 1000 rods, was sold to a man in "Y," whose name was given Mr. Casement.

Of the commercial branch of the twofold service that is exacted from the Congolese by the Government of the Congo State, the chief product is rubber. And as we have seen from the Governor-General's letter which is quoted above, it is to the production of rubber that the energies of the Congo Government and the monopolist companies are mainly directed. Now let me supply a few examples indicative of the methods that are

employed by these two civilizing and ennobling agencies, in their efforts to develop the rubber industry.

In order to procure rubber the native has to leave his house, his wife and children, and, under guard, to perform a journey of fully two days to the confines of the forest ; penetrating the forest, he now begins his search for the coveted article. The time he may be engaged in this expedition is five or six days, and extension of this time-limit is a punishable offence. The forest wherein the native is now to spend five or six days is generally swampy ; and, moreover, the search for well-flowing rubber-vines entails much fatigue and often fruitless endeavours ; whereas with the decrease of the area of supply there arises an increase in the demand of the market.

Each man is expected to furnish three kilogrammes net, of rubber, every fortnight. Each fortnight, therefore, the rubber market meets. At this trysting-place the natives of the surrounding country congregate, each man carrying his fortnight's collection of rubber. They are then marched under armed guards to deliver up to the agents of the company the rubber that they had collected. In this manner the men of the district of " F " were brought to Bongandanga—a factory of the A.B.I.R. Company—a distance of some twenty miles. They marched in single file, and numbered 242. As each man was required to bring in three kilos, the aggregate quantity of pure rubber which they had probably delivered on this occasion would be about three-quarters of a ton.

On being taken to the factory, the rubber of each man is weighed ; and if it be found to be correct, it is carried into a large store, where it is cut up. After it is cut up the rubber is placed upon shelves in other stores, for the purpose of drying. As the process of drying causes considerable shrinkage, it is required that the net weight of rubber which each man bring in should be considerably more than three kilos. All over the grounds of the factory sentries were distributed, and they guarded and controlled the natives, who were also armed with knives and spears.

Many of the sentries were armed with rifles, and some of them who were prepared for instant action had several cartridges slipped in between their fingers. Standing in detachments, the native vendors of rubber were thus guarded ; many of them were behind a barricade that stood before a house that

was said to be the prison of the factory. The rubber which each man under guard had brought up was weighed by one of the two agents of the A.B.I.R. Company, who were sitting on the verandah.

Of those who had successfully passed the weighing ordeal there were eighty or a hundred men ; these persons, who were now squatted on raised cane platforms, were busily engaged in cutting up the rubber to the required size. On these platforms, too, there were sentries of the A.B.I.R. Company, who, armed with rifles, were either standing or squatting. Mr. Casement relates that during his visit to one of the drying stores seven natives who came in with baskets of rubber, which they began at once to sort and to spread upon the raised platforms, were guarded by four armed sentries. Should the rubber which the native takes to the factory, be found to be seriously below the required weight, he would be detained, and then locked up in the local prison, which is also called the "maison des otages."

Mr. Casement was told from many quarters that flogging with the chicotte—the hide of the hippopotamus—was another form of punishment that was inflicted for shortage in the weight of rubber ; and that on two occasions in 1903, natives were so severely flogged at one of the rubber factories that when the time arrived that they should return home they had to be carried by their friends. Cases of death among those that have been incarcerated in the local prison have also been reported. Of the several cases of which Mr. Casement had heard, one was that of the late chief of "H," a town which he visited, in company with the agent of the A.B.I.R. Company. This chief, as the result of his imprisonment some months before, had died. He had been arrested because another man of his town had failed to bring in antelopes' flesh when he was required to do so ; and, after having been imprisoned for one month and a half, he was released ; but then he was so weak that he was unable to walk the two miles to his home at "H," and so, collapsing on the way, he died early on the following morning.

As to the remuneration which the natives receive for this forced labour, the following is Mr. Casement's estimate. Having taken, as his example, three men who had collected rubber for a factory of the A.B.I.R. Company, he computes

the amount of pure rubber that they collected during one fortnight as that of seven kilos. This he assures us to be a safe estimate. Reckoning this rubber at 7 fr. per kilo, the value of the 7 kilos would be £2. Now, for their labour the three natives that produced this two pounds' worth of rubber were paid in goods.

The goods were articles such as knives, matches, strings of beads, and sometimes a little salt; and their cost was less than a shilling, or, according to the local valuation, it was 45 rods, or 1s. 10d. As the fortnightly collection of the rubber is repeated twenty-six times in the year, it will be seen that the sum which these three men yielded to the local factory at the end of the year would be £52. But for this amount they received as payment, goods, of which the local market value is £2 7s. 8d. And their alternatives to accepting this most paltry pittance are imprisonment or flogging with the chicotte.

In the course of these remarks we have had occasion to notice—especially with regard to the Governor-General's letter—the urgent demand that is made by the representatives of the rubber industry on the Congo, not only for the continuance, but also for the increase of the output of rubber. We have noticed further that in order to secure this increase, as well as continuance in the output of rubber, the natives are marched to the forest limits under armed escort; and that meeting at the rendezvous after that the rubber has been collected, they are again marched to the factory, under armed escort, to deliver up the rubber.

Now, we are to notice once more, towards these same ends of continuance and increase, a third mode of procedure that is in vogue; a mode of procedure that is employed in the interval between the time when the native proceeds to the forest to collect the rubber and the time when he takes the rubber to the factory; a mode of procedure which is fruitful of the grossest abuses. That mode of procedure is the quartering of armed guards, or "forest guards," as they are called, in the native towns. The reason that is given for this outrageous practice is that the collection of the rubber may be insured. And the following cases illustrate the iniquity of the procedure.

Mr. Casement tells us that steaming up a small tributary of the Lulonga, and his approach being unpreceded by rumour,



he arrived at the village of "A." In this village in an open shed he found two sentries of the La Lulunga Company guarding fifteen native women. Five of these women had infants at the breast, and three more were about to become mothers.

The head sentry, who was carrying a double-barrelled shotgun, for which he was provided with a belt of cartridges, volunteered an explanation of the reason why the women were detained in the shed. Four of the women, he said, were hostages who were being held to insure the peaceful settlement of a dispute that had already caused the life of a man.

The other eleven women, he said further, had been caught, and were being detained as prisoners in order to compel their husbands to bring in the prescribed amount of rubber on the next market day. Asked by Mr. Casement if the collecting of rubber was women's work, he replied that it was not, that it was man's work. Asked further why, then, he had caught the women and not the men, he answered, "Don't you see, if I caught and kept the men, who would work the rubber? But if I catch their wives, the husbands are anxious to have them home again, and so the rubber is brought in quickly and quite up to the mark." Asked further by Mr. Casement what would be the fate of the women if their husbands should fail to bring in the proper quantity of rubber on the next market day, the sentry replied instantly that they would be kept there until their husbands should redeem them. He also said that the chief of the town was made to provide food for the captives, and that daily he superintended the supply of the food which they received. The women were not natives of "A," they belonged to more than one of the villages of the neighbourhood, but chiefly to that of Ngombi; further that at this town he has often had to catch women, in order that the collection of rubber in sufficient quantity may be accomplished. This statement of the sentry was corroborated by several villagers with whom Mr. Casement spoke on the subject.

The two sentries who were quartered at "A" were the masters of the town; for instance, supplies such as firewood, which Mr. Casement required for his steamer, were ordered by them from the townspeople. And one of them, with his gun over his shoulder, marched a procession of men that were carrying the firewood, down to the waterside, the chief of the

village being at the head of the procession. A few chickens which were bought on the occasion were delivered through the intermediary of these men. On the evening of the day of his visit Mr. Casement asked the chief of the village to come and talk with him ; he did so, but with evident fear of the sentries ; and when the chief sentry found him talking with Mr. Casement afterwards, he not only broke into the conversation, but himself undertook to answer the questions that were addressed to the chief. Thus the chief was asked if the townspeople caught fish in the river " C," which was reputed to be well supplied with fish, but this sentry, intervening, replied that it was not the business of the people to catch fish ; " they have no time for that, they have got to get the rubber I tell them to."

At nightfall the fifteen women prisoners in the shed were tied either neck to neck or ankle to ankle, and it was in this posture that Mr. Casement saw them twice during the evening ; at one of these times they were trying to huddle around a fire. Before leaving the village the next morning the chief sentry, in the hearing of Mr. Casement, ordered his companion to keep close watch over the prisoners.

In September, 1903, Mr. Casement visited a native village that was called " D," and that was situated some miles away from the factory of the A.B.I.R. Company at Bongandanga. The purpose of his visit was to see a native, who with his wife and children had visited him ; this man was reputed as one who bore an excellent character, and as one who was a pattern to his countrymen.

On the way to this village, at some four or five miles only from the A.B.I.R. factory, Mr. Casement passed through a part of " D," at which he found two sentries of the A.B.I.R. company. One of these men was armed with a six-chamber revolver, that was loaded with six 4.50 Ely cartridges, and the other was armed with a cap-gun. The second man informed Mr. Casement that there were six sentries of the A.B.I.R. Company in the village, but that the other four had gone with prisoners to Bongandanga. The prisoners, he further related, were natives of the country who had not brought in the amount of rubber that was required of them.

A little further on in the town Mr. Casement met two other sentries of the A.B.I.R. Company, and on returning home by

another way he found two others. These last, in the capacity of judges, were settling some native dispute. Interference in the domestic concerns of the natives is one of the commonest uses to which these men in their own interest put their authority, levying blackmail and compelling payment for their judicial decisions. During the same month of September a man named "T" visited Mr. Casement; he had received a severe gunshot wound, and in consequence it was only with difficulty that he could walk. The statement which this man made to Mr. Casement was that a sentry of the A.B.I.R. Company, a man named "U," had shot him, and that this sentry at the same time killed his friend "V."

The sentries had come to arrest the chief of "H," on account of the shortage of meat for the white man's table, and the people gathered around their chief to protect him. Mr. Casement ascertained that an inquiry into this, and kindred outrages that were committed in the previous year, had been made by a law officer, with the result that the sentry "U" was removed from the district. But the man "T" proceeded to add that this same sentry by whom he had been wounded had now returned, that he was at large in the country, and that he was a free man. Asked by Mr. Casement if he himself had not been compensated for his injuries which had disabled him, "T" replied as follows:—

"Four months ago I was arrested for not having got meat, and kept one and a half months in prison on that account. 'U,' who killed 'V' and shot me here in the thigh, is a free man, as all men know; but I, who am wounded, have to hunt."

"This statement," Mr. Casement remarks, "I found on fuller inquiry in other quarters was confirmed, and it became apparent that while the murderer was at large one of those he had seriously injured, and almost incapacitated, was still required to hunt game, and paid for his failure by imprisonment."

Concerning this series of crimes that had been committed by sentries Mr. Casement observes that upon further investigation he found that only one official inquiry had been held locally by a qualified law officer; and this, notwithstanding the fact that accusations had frequently been preferred. The reason which is given for this entire absence of equity in these localities is

that throughout the whole of the concession of the A.B.I.R. Company there is not a single resident magistrate. Therefore legal redress must devolve upon either the agents of the A.B.I.R. Company, against whom, with their dependents, such redress is generally sought, or it must be sought at Coquihatville, a distance of 270 miles from Bongandanga, and more than 400 miles from other parts of the concession, or else it must be left alone. Leaving Bongandanga on the 3rd of September, and returning by the rivers Lopori and Lulongo, Mr. Casement arrived at "J." On the following day, at nine p.m., he was visited by some natives of the neighbourhood; they were attended by a lad of about sixteen years of age, whose right hand was missing. The lad's name was "X," and he came from the village of "K," some few miles away.

Concerning the loss of his hand the story that was told to Mr. Casement by the relatives of the lad was, that it had been cut off in "K" by a sentry of the La Lulanga Company, who was, or who had been quartered there. And the circumstances of the outrage are these, that "X" falling down insensible after he had been shot, the sentry cut off his hand, saying that he would take it to the Director of the Company at Mampoko. Asked by Mr. Casement whether the sentry took the hand to the Director of the Company, as he said he would do, the natives answered that they did not believe that he took it to the Director, but that they thought he took it a part of the way to Mampoko, and then threw it away. They said further that at the time the sentry mutilated "X," he also shot dead one of the men of the town. But besides being mutilated, "X" had also been shot in the shoulder-blade, so that now he was quite deformed. The natives next told Mr. Casement that at the beginning of the year—as far as they were able to fix the date—a boy who was younger than "X" was mutilated by a sentry in a similar manner, that this sentry was still in their town, and that he belonged to the same trading company (the La Lulanga Company).

They said that they also wished to bring this victim to Mr. Casement, but that the sentry threatened them that if they should do so he would kill the boy, the result being that the boy was now in hiding. They had made no complaint about these atrocities, as they were by no means certain that such a course would lead to any useful end. But they now begged

that Mr. Casement would himself go back with them to their town, in order to ascertain if they were speaking the truth. Mr. Casement consented to go. However, when he was about to start on the next morning he was delayed by the visit of a number of persons from the surrounding country. These people had with them three individuals—two men and a boy—who had been shockingly wounded by firearms. The boy, who was between six and seven years of age, had had his right hand cut off at the wrist. Of the two men, one who gave his name as "Y," and said the name of his village, which was some miles away, was "L," declared that he had been shot under the following circumstances.

The soldiers had entered his town, he stated, to enforce the payment of the rubber-tax that was owing by the community. They tied him up, and announced that unless he paid 1000 brass rods they would shoot him. Having no rods to pay, he was shot through the arm, and was left bound to the tree. The soldiers who perpetrated this deed were four, and their names were given to Mr. Casement. "Y" also informed Mr. Casement that the soldiers having been requested by the chief of his village not to hurt "Y," thereupon killed the chief. Two of the murderers, the informant proceeded to say, had been taken to Coquihatville, but the other two, whom he named, were still at Mampoko. The people of "L" had sent to tell the white man at Mampoko what his soldiers had done, but he did not know what punishment—if any—had been meted out to them, for at "L" no inquiry had been made about the matter, and against the culprits no persons from that town had been summoned to appear. These statements, which were made by the man "Y," were corroborated by all those who were present. The visitors from the town of "L," as well as others from other towns, having now been dismissed, Mr. Casement proceeded on his deferred journey to the town of "K." Indeed, the following are his own remarks about the circumstances of his delay, and of his journey to "K":—

"Other people were waiting, desirous of speaking with me, but so much time was taken up in noting the statements already made, that I had to leave, if I hoped to reach 'K' at a reasonable hour. I proceeded in a canoe across the Lulongo and up the tributary to a landing-place, which seemed to be about . . . miles from 'I.' Here, leaving the

canoes, we walked for a couple of miles through a flooded forest to reach the village."

Arriving at "K," Mr. Casement found a sentry of the La Lulanga Company, with a considerable number of natives. Soon after, a youth of about fifteen years of age, emerging from the crowd, appeared with his left arm wrapped in a dirty rag. This covering having been removed, Mr. Casement saw that his left hand had been hacked off at the wrist, and that in the fleshy part of the forearm there was a hole, indicating a bullet wound. In answer to Mr. Casement's questions, the boy, who gave his name as "I I," said that a sentry of the La Lulanga Company, who was now in the town, had cut off his hand. Having been so informed, Mr. Casement, who was followed by a considerable band of natives, started out in search of the miscreant soldier.

At first he could not be found, but after some time he appeared, and was carrying a cap-gun. The boy, with whom Mr. Casement now confronted the soldier, accused him of the crime, to his face. The men of the town corroborated the boy's statement; while the sentry, who gave his name as "K K," beyond alleging that "I I" must have been mutilated by some other sentry of the company, and that his predecessor had cut off the hands of several persons, of whom "I I" was probably one, could say nothing. The natives asserted that there were two other sentries in the town, but that "K K" was the worst of the three: that he was a villain. As the evidence that proved this man's guilt was most conclusive—man after man, standing up in his presence declared that they had seen him commit the crime—Mr. Casement informed him and the people that were present that he would appeal to the local authorities for his immediate arrest and trial. In the wake of this more serious charge other charges of a minor character, of which the customary blackmail was the commonest, were made against this man. Thus one man avowed that the accused had tied up his wife, and then demanded a ransom of 1000 rods for her release; another accused him of stealing two ducks and a dog. To all these minor charges, however, like that of the major charge, the accused demurred. Mr. Casement took the boy "I I" back with him, and brought him later to Coquihatville; there the Commandant, through a special Government interpreter, took down the boy's state-

ment. In his statement the boy accused "K K" of the crime of his mutilation, and affirmed that rubber was the cause. Mr. Casement was subsequently informed that the authorities at Coquihatville, acting upon his request, had arrested "K K," whom he presumably thought would be tried in due course.

According to the summary of the report of the Commission that was appointed by the Congo Government to inquire into the charges of maladministration, which had been made against its agents (a summary report, however, of which the official character appears to be doubtful), the mutilation of natives by agents of the Independent States of the Congo, either directly or indirectly, has been denied by the Commission. The Commission is said to attribute the practice of mutilation to a custom that is prevalent among the Congolese. But when this case of "I I" is considered upon its own merits, and also in connection with other facts that relate to other charges of mutilation that have been made against agents of the Independent State of the Congo, the finding of the Commission—if it be really the finding of the Commission—on this head appears to be invalid.

Thus, in the first place there is the lacerated forearm of the lad, with its perforated bullet wound, also the loss of his hand. In the next place there is the unequivocal charge of mutilation that is made by the lad against an agent of the Independent State of the Congo. The charge is confirmed by several of the townsmen; in the presence of the accused they assert that they had witnessed the outrage. Against the charge there is the denial by the accused that he had mutilated "I I," but rather than being positive and emphatic, it is vague and confused. And besides this equivocal denial of the crime by the accused, there is his accusation, in which he charges his predecessors with the guilt of the crime (an accusation that carries with it the admission that the crime of mutilation was practised by the agents of the Independent State of the Congo); for had it been unknown among them, the accused could not have attributed "I I's" mutilation to his predecessors.

Lastly, there is the fact that other towns had made similar charges of mutilation against the agents of the Independent State of the Congo; towns of which the distances from one another, and the distinctness of their tribes from one another,

preclude the possibility that their peoples had previously concocted together those charges. In the face, then, of these facts, viz. the nature of the mutilation, the nature of the accusation—emphatic and widely confirmed—the nature of the denial by the accused, viz. that of equivocation, one is forced to believe that the atrocity of mutilation is practised by the agents of the Independent State of the Congo. And the following statement that was recently made (November, 1905) to one of the staff of a London paper by Dr. Harry Guinness, Director of a well-known Christian Mission on the Upper Congo, leads to this same conclusion.

Referring to the alleged denial by the Commission that mutilation is practised by the agents of the Independent State of the Congo, Dr. Guinness is reported to have said :—

“ We gave evidence before the Commission that mutilation never was a native custom. We were in the country long before the Abir Company came, and we never heard of it, but as soon as the rubber forcing came into vogue, Pastor Hayes saw fifty hands in the bottom of one canoe.”

Asked by the interviewer why the hands were cut off, Dr. Guinness replied :—

“ To show the white man the cartridges have not been wasted. Mrs. Banks saw one day a woman carrying a basket and being flogged as she went along. She asked the reason, and the man said she had lost a hand. There were eighteen in the basket, and there should have been nineteen, and the man was flogging her to make her find the missing hand. Asked where they were to be taken, the man replied he had to show them to the agent in return for nineteen cartridges. To say they had no evidence is a ghastly lie. Their refusal to publish the evidence given them is significant.”

The number of these armed brigands, whose work of murder, mutilation, plunder, and oppression, thrives under the euphemism of “ forest-guards,” is estimated by Mr. Casement as 10,000. In our sketch, a mere scintilla of Mr. Casement’s full and painstaking report, we have seen something of the misery that a town has suffered when two or three of these men have been quartered there. Therefore, in what proportions of intensity, must the misery be which the natives have suffered throughout the total concessional areas, and which they are



still suffering, when it is wrought by 10,000 men? The effect, the disastrous and dire effect, of this devouring and unrestrained misery upon the Congo peoples finds a poignant proof in the following extract of a letter to the Governor-General of the Congo State by the Rev. J. Whitehead, of the Baptist Missionary Society, dated the 28th of July, 1903, which is incorporated with Mr. Casement's report. In it the writer says:—

“The population in the villages of Lukolela in January, 1891, must have been not less than 6000 people, but when I counted the whole population in Lukolela at the end of December, 1896, I found it to be only 719, and I estimated from the decrease, as far as we could count up the number of known deaths during the year, that at the same rate of decrease in ten years the people would be reduced to about 400, but judge of my heartache when counting them all again on Friday and Saturday to find only a population of 352 people, and the death-rate rapidly increasing. I note also a decrease very appalling apparent in the island districts during the same number of years; three districts are well-nigh swept out . . . and others are nearly diminished.”

Thus, like fat in contact with a flame, a people in contact with the tyranny of a professedly Christian European Government, and before the very eyes of Christendom, is rapidly melting away. But at the head of this banquet of corpses and blood, in the Independent State of the Congo, sits Leopold II, in regal magnificence.

Goaded by the splendid and praiseworthy endeavours of the “Congo Reform Association,” the British Government, on behalf of the hapless Congolese, has moved a little, the other Great Powers remain absolutely indifferent. Hence, now that the Congo Government, as an outcome of the slight move of the British, has appointed a Commission, and that Commission has made its report, we may expect the process of the extermination of the Congolese to resume its normal, devilish course. For in these abominable atrocities against its indigenous peoples, is not the Government of the Congo state but the advance-guard of all the other Caucasian states?

How, then, can the kettle-policy of the Americans in the Philippines, of the Germans in South-west and East Africa,

of the French on the French Congo, and of the British in the Sierra Leone Hinterland, in Nigeria, in India, in Africa, South as well as West, and in the West Indies, call the pot-policy of the Congo State, black? But our picture is now complete. The aspects of forced labour, by which the Congo natives are burdened with a fortnightly tax, its medium being a precarious and diminishing product; by which they are marched to the forests to collect that product, *viz.* rubber, then are marched from the forests to give up the rubber; by which the wives of defaulting husbands are caught and held in confinement by brutal soldiers, every feeling of feminine delicacy and womanly modesty outraged—for I know that women who are called savages have these feelings; by which native women are beaten; by which soldiers are quartered in native towns, and at their pleasure, fine, tie up, flog, rob, mutilate and kill the inhabitants including the chiefs; by which white officials unauthorized impose and levy oppressive and penal fines, and by which the whole machinery of government becomes one stupendous imposture. These aspects of forced labour are the gloomy chambers of abuse and wantonness, into which the great halls of the monopolist Companies give access. And the key of entrance into the grim, Bastille-like structure is the letter of the Governor-General, of which these incidents are the expression. Professing to be the guardian of the rights of every member of the state, whilst at the same time entering into commercial relations with the stronger section, the monopolist Companies, whose creation it had encouraged, *and whose aim is gain*, the Congo Government has ended by sacrificing the rights of the weaker section, the native, to the rapacity of the stronger section; and this with the result that for the deeds of violence of which the stronger section towards the weaker section is guilty—deeds of violence whose savagery is unsurpassed by the most barbarous of its native clients—it stands as sponsor.

Now we return to the main branch of the subject of discussion. In regard to it, we have on the one hand a single misgoverned state (Hayti) that is ruled by black men, and on the other hand a series of misgoverned states (the states of the Balkan Peninsula, Turkey, Russia, and the Independent State of the Congo) that are ruled by white men; but the

misgovernment of Hayti, we are told, is a conclusive proof of the natural incapacity of the Ethiopian race.

And since the capacity of the Caucasian peoples for government is vehemently upheld by the "Daily Telegraph" and the "Spectator," it must be concluded, I suppose, that the misgovernment of the Balkan states, etc., is conclusive proof of the capacity of the Caucasian for self-government. Or perhaps these two papers would point to the majority of the European states and also to the United States, Mexico, Canada, etc., in support of their contention. But such a course would make it necessary to define good government and misgovernment as the outcome respectively of capacity and incapacity for self-government. Therefore I should define good government as happiness of the majority of the governed, and misgovernment as unhappiness of the majority of the governed. Applying these definitions to the illustration which we have so far been considering, i.e. the British Empire applying it to the peoples of India, of the West Indies, of West and South Africa, in fact, to the majority of the British Empire, that majority would be seen to fall under the head of unhappiness. Consequently, the governments of the British Empire and that of Hayti, do not differ in essence, but only in expression. The Haytian form of misgovernment assumes periodically a violent expression, while the British Imperial type of misgovernment assumes uninterruptedly a milder expression. In its expression, Haytian misgovernment is nearer to that of Turkey, the Balkan States, and the Independent State of the Congo, than to the misgovernment of the British Empire. But since our conclusion must be drawn from the essence rather than from the expression of misgovernment, then, in government the British Empire also must be classed with Hayti. Thus, in deducing the incapacity of the Negro race from the misgovernment of Hayti, and the capacity of the Caucasian peoples from the misgovernment of the British Empire, the reasoning of the "Daily Telegraph" and the "Spectator," proceeding upon the assumption that things that are equal to the same thing are unequal to one another, is entirely fallacious.

We have now to notice the third proof by which the "Daily Telegraph" and the "Spectator" support their assertion regarding the natural incapacity of the Ethiopian

race ; it is that of the failure of one generation of Negroes in the United States. But this proof is invalidated by the facts that are treated in vol. i., p. 251, of this work, facts which show the Afro-American to be an active and successful participator in all phases of Euro-American culture.

However, according to the "Spectator," there is apparent in the American Negro, a trait of character of which the baseness—if it be indeed present—must more than neutralize—to his great discredit and undying shame—all these pleasing tokens of his material and intellectual progress. That trait is alluded to in the indictment that "the race . . . retain in Africa, in Hayti, and in the Southern States deep traces of savagery, especially as regards the sexes." Judging from the structure of the sentences, this indictment would seem to represent that these criminal relations of the Negro in regard to "the sexes" have been prevalent in Africa, in Hayti, and in the Southern States. But as it is only from the United States that such reports against the Negro have actually come, it is not improbable that the writer meant to refer to the Southern States alone. Therefore it is upon this presumption that we will go.

Had this indictment been made by a Swiss, a Swede, an Austrian, or even a German, and had it appeared in a journal of the author's country, it would have been surprising, but at the same time excusable. It would have been excusable for the reason that the three former peoples, not being colonizing states, are probably ignorant of the character of the Negro. And in the case of the German it would have been excusable (although less so than in the three former cases), for the reason that, having only lately entered upon the work of colonization, they may not yet have had sufficient knowledge of the character of the Negro.

But as the indictment is made presumably by an Englishman and in an English journal, there is also surprise, but not excuse. For this Englishman is identified with a people which as colonizers have been for centuries in the closest touch with the Negro, and at the present time, according to the Imperial Census of last year (1906), it has forty-three millions of Negroes as its fellow-subjects. Now what is the nature of this indictment? In plain language, it is that the Negro is a race of rapists.

The reports that come from the United States, and chiefly from the Southern section, are the grounds for this most remarkable generalization.

As applied to the Afro-American, I intend to deal exhaustively with this indictment in the third volume, and so here I shall touch upon that part of the subject only as far as it relates to this phase of the indictment. I have said that this very grave charge that has been preferred presumably by an Englishman, and in an English periodical, against the African race, is founded upon the charges of the Euro-American. Throughout the entire range of criminal terminology there is none that is more serious, and there are few that are as serious, as the term by which the alleged characteristic crime of the Negro is represented. I mean the term rape. Like the leprosy that excluded the Hebrew from the congregation of Israel, the moral disease to which the charge of the "Spectator" refers is fitted to exclude the Negro race from the society of the peoples of the two other races. Therefore, the barest justice demands that the charge should at least be substantiated. Such a substantiation could be properly reached only by a study of the sexual relations of Negro peoples in different parts of the globe, particularly in the home of these peoples. And, owing to the knowledge that has been furnished by travel and recent explorations among these African peoples, owing also to the increased facilities that there are for supplementing that knowledge, there could be no great difficulty in carrying out such a study. Besides, any difficulty that that study could present would be small indeed in comparison with the fact that the study involves the character of a third of the human race. But I repeat that the data from which the "Spectator" has drawn this most damning accusation against the Negro race are purely and entirely American. So that in the consideration Negro communities in other parts of the world, and especially of Africa, have not been cited. Nay, more, in the examination—if it can be called an examination—even the Negro communities of the British Empire have been ignored.

Well, let us take these Negro communities of the British Empire, and let us ask what has been their sexual record. According to the Imperial Census that was issued in 1906 members of the Negro race within the British Empire are distributed

as follows: West African Colonies, twenty-nine millions; South African Colonies, five millions and a half; other colonies, seven millions; West Indian Colonies, one and a half million. Of Canada the coloured population is 167,000; of Australia it is 120,000, and of Polynesia and New Guinea it is 500,000. Total for Africans and their descendants forty-three millions. Well, then, from these communities have there been reports announcing that white women have been outraged by Negroes? No. From none of these communities have there been such reports. And the same is true of other Negro communities in Africa and elsewhere, that are under dominions other than British. The Afro-American population of the United States is variously estimated as being from nine to eleven millions. Thus, whereas from among these eleven millions, cases of rape are being frequently reported, from among the forty-three millions of the British Empire no such cases have been reported. Further, of the nearly two and a half centuries that the Afro-American has been in North America, it is only within the last twenty years or so that this foul charge has been made against him. That is to say, that when he was less progressive in morals and in intellect he was more moral than now that he has admittedly increased in morals.

But against this improbability of the Afro-American being incontinent now that he is admittedly more moral, but continent when he was less moral, is the probability that the charge is the progeny of malice, which again is the offspring of the deep-rooted and implacable hate of the Euro-American against him. Thus, dividing the Negro communities into three sections, the smallest section of eleven millions, within the American commonwealth, the larger section of forty-three millions within the British Empire, and the largest section of many millions more than fifty-four millions outside of the British Empire and the American commonwealth, we have the crime of rape reported only from among the smallest.

This fact does certainly not entitle the conclusion that rape is a characteristic of the Negro race. It seems rather to suggest that the presence of this manifestation of the crime of rape might be accounted for upon local rather than upon racial grounds. And when we come to examine this smallest section of these three divisions of Negro communities, we discover that

of the two and a half centuries since the Negro has been on the American continent it is only within the last twenty or thirty years that the crime of rape has been charged against him.

Attempting to account for the anomaly, we have as a probable explanation the presence of a deep and abiding hatred of the Afro-American by the Euro-American, and also the fact that it is the Euro-American alone that is responsible for the charge. Excluding, then, the largest section of Negro communities that are outside the British Empire and the American commonwealth, and excluding the smaller communities of forty-three millions that are within the British Empire, the "Spectator" has founded its indictment, its terrible and abominable indictment of the Negro as a race of rapists, upon eleven millions of Negroes in the United States; it has done this upon the testimony of their vilifiers there, it has done it upon charges of the last twenty or thirty years, and it has done it upon charges, too, that the previous century and a half has contradicted.

Such, then, is the study, such the data, and such the grounds upon which this great English journal, unprovoked, has maliciously poured upon the character of the offenceless and defenceless Negro the contents of its bucket of vitriolic aspersions. Is it a fair procedure, is it an honest procedure, is it an honourable procedure? Is it the procedure of a great organ, which, conscious of its responsibility as a public informer and a public instructor, holds impartially aloft the lamp of truth? But in this reckless, this heartless, this shameless and untruthful traducement of the Negro race, the attitude of the "Spectator" is the attitude to-day of the great body of English literature. Outside of the United States I have been unable to find any records of the crime of rape against the Negro, but concerning the United Kingdom, Professor Kelly Miller, of Harvard University, U.S., in his open letter to Mr. John Temple Graves, informs us that "England and Wales, in 1887, furnished 878 prisoners on this charge. From 1871 to 1880 there were in the same countries 758 persons convicted for this assault upon girls that are under thirteen." Now then, in the face of these figures, is there greater reason for labelling the Negro as a race of rapists than for labelling the Caucasian race as a race of rapists?

The fourth proof of the "Daily Telegraph" and the "Spec-

tator" is: Failure of two generations of Negroes in the British Empire. But this proof is negatived by my observations on Africa, under the second head, p. 195, by which it is shown that all the principal institutions of civilized culture have been introduced into the British West African colonies, and that during the varying periods since they were introduced into these colonies—which, in the case of the oldest one of them (Sierra Leone) extends beyond a century—they have been chiefly maintained by the native inhabitants.

Therefore, such a result does not warrant the assertion that the British African native has failed. And as these facts also apply to Negro communities of other parts of the British Empire, it follows that the same conclusion that has been deduced with regard to the former must also be deduced with regard to the latter. The fifth assertion is that the Negro has produced "not a single leader, who could be compared with the stronger type of white ability in the sphere of intellect." My answer to this assertion is, the four great Negro leaders whom I have portrayed in vol. i., at p. 264—Booker T. Washington, Frederick Douglass, Dr. W. E. Blyden, and Toussaint L'Ouverture—of whom I aver that in the sphere of intellect they compare favourably with "white ability."

But here is a sample of "the stronger type of white ability in" the "sphere of intellect." It is taken from a *leading* London journal, and is as follows:—

"It is easy to theorize over the negro, and one of the theories of which Sir Harry Johnston's recent monograph on Liberia reminds us has always been that if the African negro were placed in suitable environment and given a fair start in life's handicap, he would develop as other races have done. He may develop, and the existence of negro scholars, preachers, poets, and philosophers is a proof of his capability, but he does not develop at the same rate as other races with similar opportunities. A writer in the 'American Journal of Anatomy' endeavours to account for this arrested development historically and physiologically. The negro race is one of the oldest in the world, he points out; it has been in contact with the most ancient civilizations; with nations that have risen and declined; but its own subservient position has never altered, and the only reasonable explanation is to be found in the size and conformation of the negro brain.



“The average negro brain is smaller than the average Caucasian brain, the ratio being about 1210 grammes (negro) to 1400 grammes (Caucasian), and it is believed that in proportion as the negro races intermarry with the white races the weight of the brain increases. The writer suggests by elaborate tables that a striking relationship can be made out between the weight of the brain in the descendants of black and white parents, and the preponderance of black or white blood. Thus an octoroon’s brain would weigh more than that of a quadroon, and a quadroon’s more than that of a mulatto. As, however, he observes that there are very few pure-blooded African negroes left in the United States, it is not easy to see where the investigation points. It is in the areas of the brain where thought and reasoning power are believed to reside that the negro is assumed to be most deficient. As a ‘visual,’ and therefore even as a geometer, he might become a success, and as an orator or an individual with an artistic temperament there are many possibilities before him.”

On the one side we are told that the Negro “may develop,” because, already, he has produced scholars, preachers, poets, and philosophers. That “as a ‘visual,’ and therefore even as a geometer he might become a success,” and that as an orator or an individual with artistic temperament there are many possibilities before him. Thus, on this side, there is first of all on the part of the Negro, the manifestation of high intellectual powers, and the inference of a more extended manifestation of intellect by him in the future. Yet on the other side, we are told that although as one of the oldest of the races, the negro has been in contact with “the most ancient civilizations,” he has always been in the same subservient position, and that this is due to “the size and conformation of” his “brain”; that “the average negro brain is smaller than the average Caucasian brain, the ratio being about 1210 grammes (negro) to 1400 grammes (Caucasian), and it is believed that in proportion as the negro races intermarry with the white races, the weight of the brain increases. It is in the areas of the brain, where thought and reasoning power are believed to reside, that the negro is assumed to be most deficient.”

Obviously between these two statements there is a great

and glaring contradiction. For if it be true that "the average negro brain is smaller than the average Caucasian brain" in the ratio of 1210 grammes to 1400 grammes, and that the areas of the brain where thought and reasoning power are believed to reside "are "most deficient" in the Negro, then, that the Negro could have produced "scholars, preachers, poets, and philosophers," that "as a 'visual' and even as a geometer, he might become a success, and as an orator or an individual with an artistic temperament there are many possibilities before him," is an utter impossibility. On the other hand, if the Negro has produced "scholars, preachers, poets, and philosophers," and has before him these possibilities of a "geometer," and "orator," etc., then that his brain should be less than the brain of the Caucasian, by 190 grammes on an average, is likewise an impossibility.

And yet these two impossibilities are complacently set before us as an ascertained and harmonious phenomenon and consequence. But as characterizing the reasoning of "the stronger type of white ability in the sphere of intellect," the palpable contradiction and solecism, that are revealed by this extract represent the rule rather than the exception. And in this mode of reasoning by which the average of that "stronger type of white ability in the sphere of intellect" is usually characterized is there anything which, captivating the reverence and enthralling the awe of the Negro, should compel him in his renunciation of his own powers, and in his admiration of the powers of the whites, to cry out from the depth of his amazed and bewildered soul: Superior is the intellect of the Caucasian?

In the pursuit of his endeavour to impress the coloured man with a sense of his superiority, the white man's success in the end will be only to render himself absolutely ridiculous in the eyes of the coloured man. For the rest, it may be remarked that it is not true that "the *negro race* has been in contact with the most ancient civilization . . . but its own subservient position has *never altered*," but what is true is that the Negro race has produced a people that has been the most gifted of the peoples of the world; a people from which the Caucasian peoples have borrowed their civilization. And further, what is probably true is that, exhausted in having given birth to a people of such astounding genius, the African

race may have been granted by the director of the destinies of peoples a longer season of respite ere resuming its task.

But what a singular proof is this of the weakness of the Caucasian, that after he had received from the Negro Egyptians his entire mental kit, including even the alphabet, he should be found to-day writing this, that :

“The negro race is one of the oldest in the world . . . it has been in contact with the most ancient civilizations, with nations that have risen and declined ; but its own subservient position has never altered . . .”

The meaning being, of course, that none of these ancient civilizations were of Negro origin, but that they were all of Caucasian origin. The last assertion of the “Daily Telegraph” and of the “Spectator,” to which we have now come, refers to Gibbon’s opinion concerning the mental incapacity of the African. But this opinion of Gibbon concerning the African finds a parallel in the opinion of the Greek and Roman historians (vol. i., p. 178), concerning the mental incapacity of the Germanic peoples that were then inhabiting Europe. For Gibbon’s opinion about the African is not one whit more severe than are the opinions of the ancients about his forbears. So that in the light of facts of the present day, we are entitled to attach to the opinion of Gibbon, which was formed nearly a century and a quarter ago, regarding the incapacity of the Negro, the same importance that we are entitled to attach to the opinions of the ancients, in the light of the facts of the present day, regarding the incapacity of the Germanic peoples.

The pronouncement of the “Daily Telegraph” and the “Spectator,” which we are considering, may be regarded as embodying the reasons for, and the justification of, the present form of treatment which is being meted out in England to coloured men. Further, these reasons and justification rest upon the statements, first, that the freedmen in both the British Empire and the American Republic have failed to take advantage of the opportunities that have been afforded them for the bettering of their condition ; second, that the racial incapacity of the freedmen has been the cause of their failure to redeem their opportunities ; and third, that the racial incapacity of the freedmen is established by the following

six proofs: (1) The unequal development of the race; (2) failure of the Negro in Africa and in Hayti; (3) failure of one generation of Negroes in the United States; (4) failure of two generations of Negroes in the British Empire; (5) that the Negro has produced no great leaders that are comparable to those that the colourless race has produced; (6) that Gibbon believed in the mental incapacity of the Hamitic race.

With regard to the first of these six proofs, we have seen that the late or unequal development of the bulk of the Negro race is not at all a singular phenomenon, inasmuch as this same lateness or inequality has also characterized the development of the peoples who now endeavour to make it a peculiarity of the Negro race. So that if the late development of Negro peoples be a proof of the mental incapacity of the race, then it must similarly be a proof of the incapacity of the colourless race, whose mental development has been likewise unequal. With regard to the second proof, I have shown, concerning Africa, that inasmuch as certain civilized communities there have been able to maintain in their midst, and in efficiency, all the great institutions of Christian culture that have been introduced, it cannot be correct to impute to them mental incapacity.

And with regard to Hayti, it has been shown that Haytian misgovernment cannot be a proof of the Negro's incapacity, for not only in the past, but also in the present, misgovernment—of which the Balkan States, Turkey, Russia, and the Congo State, etc., are examples—likewise exists in Japhetic States. The third proof has been met by the fact that the Afro-American successfully participates in every phase of Euro-American civilization. The fourth proof has been met by the same argument that is used under the second head, in relation to Africa. The fifth proof has been invalidated by the four great Negro leaders that have been cited in the first volume. And the sixth proof has been invalidated by the fact that what Gibbon has said about the Negro is the same as what the ancients have said about his sires; hence, the importance of Gibbon's opinion concerning the incapacity of the Negro is to be gauged by the importance of the opinion of the ancients, regarding the incapacity of the Germanic peoples.

Therefore I claim that these proofs, that the "Daily Telegraph" and the "Spectator" have put forward in sup-

port of the mental incapacity of the Negro have been refuted. Thus, if the freedmen of the British Empire, and of the American Republic, have failed to realize the hopes that their patrons who laboured for their emancipation had cherished, respecting their future progress, then their failure cannot have been due to their mental incapacity. And so we are brought to this question. Have the freedmen failed to make good the expectations of the abolitionists, and if they have failed, what has been the cause of their failure ?

## VIII

### The Real Reason that Accounts for their Conditions

**A**S bearing upon the subject of this section of the chapter, viz. "The social position of the coloured British subject at the heart of the Empire—Great Britain," these two extracts of the "Daily Telegraph" and the "Spectator" are of striking significance. First, because they are the utterance of two of the most powerful organs of British journalism, and second, because the utterance boldly declares that between the black and white races there exists a fundamental inequality. In the introductory chapter of the first volume of this work I have remarked that "if it be true that the authoritative voice of science has declared that certain radical defects exist in the coloured races which are absent in the colourless race, defects whereof their backwardness is the expression, defects which are innate and irremediable, then, of all mankind, they—the coloured races—are most miserable. Still, if the Almighty has entrusted to them talents which are so few, they can hope for, and ought not to expect any more responsible service than that of unskilled labourers which they now perform in the erection and preservation of empires and states." Therefore, seeing that it is such defects as these that the extracts of the "Spectator" and "Daily Telegraph" affirm to be inherent in the Ethiopian race, and that this affirmation would involve to the Negro race the abdication of its manhood, the proofs whereon the affirmation of the extracts rests should have the closest scrutiny.

It will be seen that, both in their sense and in their scope, the two extracts are identical. Hence in their further examination, upon which we are about to enter, they will be treated as one; but one or two points of difference between them will be

dealt with separately. The subjects regarding which the extracts suggest further examination are: first, the ideal which the friends of the Negro had expected that he would fulfil when he should be emancipated; secondly, the non-fulfilment of that ideal by the freedmen; thirdly, the cause of their failure, by which the ideal was unfulfilled. The first of these three points is not really at issue, for it is a fact that the abolitionists did believe that when the emancipated should be free they would show themselves to be, mentally and morally, the equals of their former masters. But whether or not the emancipated have failed to realize the ideal which the abolitionists had cherished concerning them, and the cause or the proofs of their failure—if they have failed—are the points that our inquiry embraces.

Of course, the terms failure and success are those of degree, hence it is most unlikely that all the abolitionists had a uniform standard, to which they expected that the progress of the freedmen would conform. And, probably, despite the representation of the "Daily Telegraph" and of the "Spectator" to the contrary, had the abolitionists been with us to-day, some of them would have regarded the progress which the freedmen have made since the time of the emancipation as being in harmony with their anticipations. But, be this as it may, for my own part, I feel constrained to say that whereas on the one hand I do not believe that the freedmen, either as subjects or as citizens, have failed through incapacity, and that for the reasons that are given in my review of the arguments of the "Daily Telegraph" and the "Spectator"; on the other hand, I am of the belief that the coloured races—those of them that have been enslaved, and those of them that have been always free—those of the British Empire, and those of the American Republic—have not attained to that point of progress which, under ordinary circumstances, they should have reached.

Now then, what is the cause of this seeming dereliction? I think that there are three alternative causes by which the backwardness might be accounted for. One is incapacity, another indolence, and the third lack of opportunity. But our refutation of the arguments of the "Daily Telegraph" and the "Spectator" forbids us to entertain the idea that incapacity has been the cause of this backwardness. And the success with which the Afro-American in the United States has

identified himself with every aspect of Euro-American culture, as we have seen, and with which coloured British subjects have maintained civilized institutions among themselves in the British Empire, equally precludes us from entertaining the belief that indolence has been the cause of such backwardness. Therefore I assert that lack of opportunity must be the cause of the comparative failure of the British and American peoples of colour to have made greater progress than they have made. And I pass on to verify this assertion.

The case of the Afro-American will not be considered here, but will be reserved for our discussion of the subject of the Euro-American *v.* the Afro-American in the third volume. Confining my remarks to the British Empire, I begin at the heart of the Empire, and in connection with this theme of lack of opportunity that there is for the coloured British subject at the heart of the Empire, I proceed to relate the following facts.

In September, 1905, a coloured man visited a restaurant in the West End of London to get some refreshments. But he was so annoyed by certain remarks that were made with respect to himself by some American guests of the restaurant that he immediately quitted the establishment. The incident led to a correspondence of some weeks' duration in a London evening paper; and on the 25th of September, in a leading article of the same paper, the following observations were made:—

“Our ‘black and white’ correspondence has in many ways proved one of the most remarkable that has ever been conducted by the ‘——.’ Not only has the number of letters received been abnormal, but the ‘sides have been taken’ with a zest and eagerness—one might almost say bitterness—that rarely marks even such controversial matter as a newspaper discussion. The primary question at issue is: Ought a negro to be treated as a white man in a public restaurant? Then comes the secondary question: How far is it fair to ourselves and advisable to treat negroes as our social equals?”

On this subject of “colour” in England, it is particularly desirable that specific examples, such as the above, should be submitted; for even now, when one converses with the average Englishman upon the subject of the treatment of men of colour, also when reference is made in English literature to the indignities and disabilities to which coloured men are subjected,



in South Africa and the United States, for example, on account of their colour, the idea is not infrequently conveyed that in England coloured men are free from such indignities and disabilities. But is this really the case? Why! the feeling seems to be even entertained by Englishmen that coloured men should not settle in England. For coloured persons who settle in England are not infrequently asked, "When are you going home?" As in other white communities, the crime of murder is not unknown in England. Yet, while a white murderer is announced on the headlines of the newsboards simply as a murderer, a black murderer is announced as a "black fiend." Indeed, by close observation one has been convinced that in regard to coloured men the dominance of that passion by which the explosions in the American Republic are marked with such savage fury obtains in England to-day, and that it awaits for its manifestations there only the circumstances that prevail in the United States.

The subjoined utterance, therefore, which occurred in a sermon that was preached at St. Paul's Cathedral, London, by Canon Hensley Henson, in November, 1905, is timely as well as accurate: ". . . all serious men were watching with close attention, and with no small anxiety, the events now proceeding in Russia." Having come to the third lesson that he had drawn from the events that were transpiring in Russia, Canon Henson stated that that lesson "was the extreme guilt of stimulating and letting loose the prejudices of class, race, and religion which must be assumed to be latent in every nation. Racial and religious prejudices were certainly present among us, and they formed a latent force of cruelty and injustice which could at any time, if we be weak enough or wicked enough to give it free play, stain this land with the most amazing oppressions. Class rivalries were, for the members of a civilized industrial community like ours, a still more pressing danger. The truth was that we could not rightly indulge the thought that we in this country were so much better educated and so much more civilized than the Jew-baiters of Russia that we could never sink to such barbarities as had disgraced them."

I pass on to the next case. Seeing an advertisement in a leading medical journal for a Resident House Surgeon for the Royal Hospital, a coloured medical man, a member of both the Royal College of Surgeons and Physicians, England, approached

Mr. —, Surgeon of — Hospital, and Surgeon of the Seamen's Hospital, Greenwich, and asked him if he thought it would be worth his while to apply for the post. Mr. — said in reply to the coloured doctor that, owing to his colour, and to the fact that private patients were admitted to the hospital, it would be futile to apply, as the Committee would not appoint him, that they would prefer a white man. But as an alternative to his application for this post at the Royal — Hospital, Mr. — suggested that the coloured doctor should try for the vacant post at the Seamen's Hospital, Greenwich. "Go," he said, "and see — (M.S.Lond., F.R.C.S.Eng., Surgeon to the Seamen's Hospital, and Assistant Surgeon to the — Hospital), who is an old —'s man. He is on the staff of the Seamen's Hospital. Ask him what chance you would have for getting a post there."

Having interviewed this gentleman, the coloured doctor learned from him that his colour would be an efficient bar to his holding a resident appointment at the Seamen's Hospital. It may be added that the coloured doctor was particularly desirous to get an appointment at this hospital, on account of the singular advantage it offers for the study of tropical diseases. Afterwards the same coloured doctor applied for the post of Resident Medical Officer at the — General Dispensary. He was asked to appear before the Committee; he did so, but failed to obtain the appointment. But subsequently he learned from a reliable source that, although he had been invited to appear before the Committee, yet, on account of his colour, his candidature had not been seriously entertained.

Thus in England, in this twentieth century of the Christian era, a man is humiliated, and denied the opportunity of earning a livelihood, not because he is immoral or is incompetent, but solely because his skin is not white. And yet coloured men are expected to believe that in England, as well as other parts of Europe, the principles of Christ have triumphed. No doubt Englishmen will justify the humiliation and boycott to which this coloured physician has been subjected, on the ground that it is natural that white people should prefer to be treated by white doctors. Well, if the coloured peoples in different parts of the world, among whom probably thousands of English doctors practise, had suddenly become imbued with the idea that they would have only men of their own races as their

medical attendants, would Englishmen dismiss the tidings with this same complacent air of philosophic calm ?

The logical issue of the plea that "it is natural that white people should prefer to be treated by white physicians," by which Englishmen would justify the insult and injury which have been dealt out to this coloured physician, is certainly this, that it is unnatural that coloured doctors should practise among white people, and therefore that it is improper that coloured doctors should practise in England. Surely, then, it must also be an unnatural thing, and therefore an improper thing, that white doctors should practise among coloured peoples. But this logical issue of the white man's position, viz. that it is unnatural, and therefore that it is improper that coloured doctors should practise in England, is precisely that which the Chinese hold regarding the settling of Europeans in China.

Hence I read in the news from Peking, of the 28th of December, 1905, that "for several months past a constantly growing irritation has been observable in the attitude of the Chinese people towards foreigners." That "this feeling of irritation has become more widespread, although less intense, than the Boxer excitement." That "'China for the Chinese' sums up the objects of the movement, among the chief promoters of which there are many students of foreign learning, and newspapers conducted by Chinese educated abroad. And that "these organs are beginning to gain great influence." Well, then, if Englishmen were consistent in their views that it is unnatural that coloured doctors should practise among white people, and therefore that it is unnatural that white doctors should practise among coloured peoples, they would on the same principle abandon China to the Chinese. But do they do so ? or will they do so ?

I have already admitted that between members of the different races who are unfamiliar with the physical peculiarities of each other there is generally a mutual feeling of strangeness, or even of repugnance, the one towards the other. But to what class does such a feeling belong, to the noble class of feeling or to the ignoble class ? Does it belong to the virtuous class of feeling or to the vicious class ? Most assuredly it belongs to the latter class. And the outrages which, on account of his colour, were committed against

this coloured doctor, as well as those other cases of personal insults and indignities which, as we have noticed already, Englishmen glory in heaping upon coloured men, are all of them the fruit of this ignoble and vicious feeling. But is it consistent that whereas Englishmen, in their relations with the coloured races, allow themselves to be governed by this ignoble and vicious feeling, they should at the same time send missionaries to these same coloured races to instruct them in the practice of the very opposite feeling ?

And for knowingly, boastingly, and systematically violating two of the elementary obligations that man owes to man—the obligations of courtesy and of opportunity—Englishmen cannot even excuse themselves on the plea of being the victims of an overmastering habit. For, as I shall have occasion to notice later, the present temper is an indulgence of only very recent years ; and the subsisting Anglo-Japanese friendship exhibits its artificial character. As it is a fact that before the Japanese—who are now (1905) being caressed and flattered by Englishmen and other Caucasian peoples—had attained to naval and military renown, they were as much despised by Englishmen as any other members of the coloured races. So that a prejudice which is so accommodating in its elasticity has in it more of art than of nature ; when, therefore, acts like that of which the coloured doctor has been the butt, and like those others that we have touched upon, are committed in the name of such a prejudice, they are the less excusable.

Now, before proceeding to the extremities of the empire in order to continue the task of verifying the assertion that lack of opportunity is the reason that the coloured peoples of the British Empire are not more progressive, I pause here to return to the remarks of the reviewer that we noticed at the beginning of this section of the chapter, for the facts that we have since considered permit such a return. After questioning the wisdom of the author in writing a book to prove that the colourless race is not superior to the coloured races, the review, as we saw, said this :—

“Of course, if Dr. Scholes thinks it worth while to break a lance with vulgar error, we should be the last to say him nay. But surely it is only the ‘man in the street’ in his most unreasoning mood—the man in the street of Louisiana

when lynching is afoot—who would assert that the white man is always, everywhere, superior to the black ”

That the reviewer is right in characterizing as “vulgar error” the abuse, the vilification, and the humiliations, etc., with which colourless men, on the ground of their alleged superiority, incessantly assail coloured men I cannot for an instant doubt. But that he should deny that the claim to superiority under all circumstances is made by the colourless man, that he should aver that this claim is made only by the “man in the street,” and that it is made by him only “in his most un-reasoning mood—when lynching is afoot,” dumfounds me.

I have been under the impression that this personage, the “man in the street,” whose movements, as it would appear, so profoundly stir the enthusiasm of current literature, flourished not in the higher ranks of social life, but in the lower ranks. Hence I should not have been inclined to identify him with the white students of the London hospital, to whose unmanly and unmannerly conduct towards a coloured fellow-student reference has been made before; nor should I have been inclined to identify him with the white students of the Scottish university, whose calculated and systematic bearishness and boorishness to their fellow-students of colour make the academic life of the latter all but intolerable; nor with the students of the other Scotch university, who, having pursued the carriage of the African prince who had visited their university, insulted the distinguished stranger by seizing and disarranging his head-dress; nor with the President of the Anglo-Russian Literary Society; nor with the persons in the restaurant of the West End of London, who objected to the presence of an Ethiopian only on account of his colour; nor should I have been inclined to identify the “man in the street” with the persons who for the same reason refused to give employment to a fully qualified medical man; nor with the writers of the articles of the “Daily Telegraph” and the “Spectator,” whose views we are considering.

I say that I should not have been inclined to identify the “man in the street” with these persons. But probably I am wrong in my definition of this celebrity. For the persons of whom I have just spoken do undoubtedly indulge in the “vulgar error” “that the white man is always, and every-

where, superior to the black," and what is more is that they glory in the indulgence. And these persons are not of the lower ranks of social life, but are of the higher ranks.

However, although I am uncertain about the social standing of this engaging personality "the man in the street," and although, on that account, I am uncertain about the propriety which led the reviewer to lay upon him alone the responsibility of the "vulgar error" "that the white man is always, and everywhere, superior to the black," I am most certain about the localities where the "vulgar error" lives, moves, and has its being. I am likewise certain about the character of the "vulgar error." And these certainties lead me to say, regarding the reviewer's assertion that the "vulgar error" is confined to Louisiana, that he is in a culpable and inexcusable illusion; for London and Scotland and Louisiana are not interchangeable terms, that represent the same locality. These certainties in the second place lead me to say, regarding the character of the "vulgar error," that the reviewer is in a delusion, a delusion that is no less inexcusable than that which relates to the localities of the "vulgar error." For this "vulgar error" which alleges that "the white man is always, everywhere, superior to the black" is not an idea by which the mind is involuntarily seized, but it is an idea—as the remarks of the reviewer of "The Souls of Black Folk" and the extracts of the "Daily Telegraph" and the "Spectator" show—which is deliberately welcomed and industriously fostered by the minds of its patrons.

The reader, no doubt knows, that there are two optical conditions that are named respectively, myopia and hypermetropia. Myopia, which is that refractive state of the eye whereby parallel rays are brought to a focus in front of the retina, is popularly known as shortsightedness; and hypermetropia, which is that refractive state of the eye whereby parallel rays during the rest of accommodation are focused behind the retina, is popularly known as longsightedness. Now, of these two physical conditions, our reviewer furnishes an example of the hypermetropic type. For whereas, living in England, he has completely failed to see in the literature of the country, in the policy of the Government, and in the whole national trend, illustrations and exemplifications of what he has rightly called a "vulgar error," that is, the assertion that

" the white man is always, everywhere, superior to the black," a failure, too, that imports a tone of levity into his remarks, and colours them with an innocence that even a visitant from Mars might envy, he has been able to perceive these illustrations and exemplifications in the State of Louisiana across the Atlantic. As for the reviewer's doubt about the wisdom of the author in discussing this subject of the superiority of the colourless race and the inferiority of the coloured races, the author claims that he who drags error from its hold of concealment to the market-place of exposure renders to his fellows a service, worthier than that which is rendered by him who, in denying its presence, supports its continuance.

We shall now resume the proof of our assertion that lack of opportunity is the reason why the coloured races of the British Empire have not been more progressive. I take India as our next example of proof ; because more than any other of the coloured communities of the British Empire, India supplies the most accurate test, for providing an answer to this important question, whether adequate opportunity for development is afforded the coloured British subject. This singular fitness of the great Indian dependency to determine the question of the adequacy or inadequacy of opportunity to the coloured British subject rests upon the fact that at the time of her first contact with Britain she was an aggregation of highly civilized states. It is almost superfluous to add that this was not the condition of the great bulk of the other section of the coloured communities of the empire, at the time of their first contact with the ruling state, but that the civilized institutions which they now maintain have for the most part been introduced among them by the hegemonial state, since the time of that contact.

And the fact that the civilization of these states is not indigenous but exotic gives rise to both affirmative and negative replies, when the attempt is made to answer the questions whether the opportunity of the coloured British subject for progress has been adequate or inadequate. For whereas, on the one side, the presence of civilized institutions in these coloured communities that were formerly without them might furnish a strong argument in favour of the adequacy of opportunity which their inhabitants have enjoyed, and whereas the absence of extension or increase of these institutions, which would have afforded increased opportunity, might be

attributed to the unreadiness of the inhabitants for such an extension or increase, on the other side an equally cogent argument might be made to prove that these coloured communities suffer from no lack of receptiveness, that the civilized institutions among them ought to have been increased, and that those that are already in existence ought to have been made more available to the inhabitants as well as increased, that therefore the prevailing want in the number and scope of these institutions does, in the case of the British coloured subjects, constitute a lack of opportunity.

Thus, according to his predilection, each combatant upon this one question of the adequacy or inadequacy of the opportunity of this division of British coloured subjects might reasonably hold the opposite affirmative or negative view. But on this same subject of the adequacy or inadequacy of opportunity, which in the case of India is afforded to the coloured British subject there cannot be room for dual and opposite views. For she, at the beginning of her contact with the hegemonial state, possessed a civilization that was older and that was also higher in some respects than that of the hegemonial state.

As the result there are two incontrovertible facts that stand related to this Indian people. These facts are, their power of originality, which is proved by their civilized institutions, and their civilized institutions, which prove their power of originality. Now, to estimate the adequacy or inadequacy of opportunity of the Indian under British rule, we need only to examine the condition of their institutions now in comparison with what they were before. In order that these institutions may be regarded as affording adequate opportunity to the Indian people, they must at least be equal in number and efficiency to what they were originally. And, if they should be found now to be less in number or efficiency than they were originally, I shall conclude, as regards the Indian section of coloured races of the empire, that my contention is proved, that lack of opportunity has been the reason why the coloured British subject is not more progressive.

For our examination I select the mechanical industries of India, and the employment there of native Indians, in the public service. Her mechanical and agricultural industries at the time of the British conquest of the peninsula were the two



legs on which India trod the way of progress. In relation to Indian famine we have had occasion to notice the agricultural member. And of the mechanical limb the strength may be understood from the following statement with respect to her principal trades. In the highest social rank stand the goldsmiths, blacksmiths, and carpenters. Next in order there come weavers of many kinds, ranging from those by whom the coarsest cotton cloths are produced to those by whom the exquisite diaphanous muslins, brocades, and cloths of gold and silver, were made. The products of this last class were unexcelled by the most skilful workmen in Europe, and they excited the admiration and the wonder of the world. Ship-builders, tailors, potters, painters, masons, stonecutters, carpet makers, mat and basket weavers, saddle and harness makers, dyers, brass and copper smiths, barbers, cutlers, armourers, paper makers, inlayers, marble and ivory workers, embroiderers, lime burners, brick makers, rope makers, silk cotton winders, cleaners, distillers, confectioners.

The products of India's trades, of which trades, some of the chief are mentioned here, also of her agricultural pursuits, were sufficient not only to meet the immediate needs of a complex and highly organized society, but also to furnish a surplus that constituted her exports. For the distribution abroad, as well as for the distribution at home, of her exports, India had her bankers, her merchants, and her ships. The bankers knew about, and were guided by, the fluctuations of the money market; they kept account-books, day-books, and ledgers of single and double entry. They charged simple and compound interest, negotiated insurances for land and sea travel, granted bills of exchange, and provided protests.

In short, they practised in their business transactions the same methods that are now recognized in the West as those by which commercial pursuits should be conducted. Indian merchants of the great cities, such as Calcutta and Bombay, exported produce to England, France, and America, and in return they brought back the products of those and of other lands. Indian manufactures were thus very flourishing, and under the Mogul dynasty they received every needed encouragement.

The fame of the Bengal muslins, with their fine texture, of its rich silks, its beautiful brocades, and excellent cotton prints,

had spread far and wide in Europe and in Asia. It was in this respect concerning Asia, that Verelst, who as Governor of Bengal had preceded Hastings, wrote, that "the Bengal silks, cloths, etc., were dispersed to a vast amount to the west and north, inland as far as Guzerat, Lahore, and even Ispahan." And the fact that is to be noticed concerning Europe, is, that it was the industrial "wealth of Ormuz and Ind" which, dazzling the eyes of Western nations, impelled them to the search for a passage to the El Dorado of the East. At the most flourishing period of its career, it was the practice of the Hon. East India Company to devote a portion of the revenue of the country to the purchasing of native wares (which were called investments) for exportation to England.

Like her external trade, the internal trade of India was also considerable at this time. One result of the interaction between her vigorous manufactures and her teeming millions was the creation of great and magnificent cities. Of one of these, Murshidabad, the old capital of Bengal, Clive wrote: "This city is as extensive, populous, and rich as the city of London, with this difference, that there are individuals in the first possessing infinitely greater property than in the last city." For the distribution of her beautifully wrought, her extensive, and greatly prized surplus manufactures, beyond her shores, as well as along her coasts, India, as I have observed already, was provided with her own merchant fleet. As late as the year 1857, according to Mr. William Digby, Indian-built ships which were entered during that year and which had cleared amounted to 34,286 in number, with a tonnage of 1,219,958.

A hundred years ago the shipbuilding industry of India was in a condition so thriving, that under the convoy of British frigates, and in company with British-built ships, Indian-built vessels sailed to the Thames. In a communication to his superiors in London, in 1800, the Governor-General stated:—

"That the port of Calcutta contains about 10,000 tons of shipping, built in India, of a description calculated for the conveyance of cargoes to England."

In that same year Lord Wellesley wrote:—

"From the quantity of private tonnage now at command

in the port of Calcutta, from the state of perfection which the art of shipbuilding has already attained in Bengal (promising a still more rapid progress, and supported by abundant and increasing supplies of timber), it is certain that this port will always be able to furnish tonnage to whatever extent may be required for conveying to the port of London the trade of the private British merchants of Bengal."

In Bombay alone, two ships of the line, or one ship and two frigates for the British navy could be produced every eighteen months. And the docks of Bombay were capable of containing ships "of any force."

With respect to the quality of these Indian-made crafts, the teakwood of which they were built caused them to be much more durable than were the "oaken walls of Old England."

It was calculated that every ship in the British navy was renewed every twelve years, but that vessels which were built of teakwood lasted upwards of fifty years. Thus many ships that were built in Bombay were drafted into the British navy after they had been in the merchant service for fourteen or fifteen years, and such ships were regarded then as being as good as new. Of this class was the "Sir Edward Hughes," a craft which was believed to have performed eight voyages as an Indiaman before she was bought for the navy. No Indiaman that was built in Europe was thought to be capable of performing with safety more than six voyages. Added to the other advantages, there was also this, that ships that were built in the docks of Bombay cost less by one-fourth than those that were built in English docks. Now, respecting the range and the solidity of Indian manufactures—those manufactures that were for personal use, and those such as shipping, by which the first class was distributed, the facts which we have just considered will enable us, I think, to perceive the great outlet that they afforded to the energy of the Indian people.

So much for the place that was occupied by Indian manufactures previous to and at the time that British rule over the peninsula was established. The question that we have next to consider is, whether that place during the century and a half of direct imperial rule has been maintained, whether it has increased or whether it has diminished. Dealing

with the question of Indian manufactures, Mr. Digby says :—

“These have been ruthlessly destroyed, and, during the earlier part of the century, destroyed without any pretence at concealment of the circumstance that English industries were to be benefited by the destruction.”

And Sir Henry Cotton, who has spent thirty-five years in the Indian Civil Service, and whose father and grandfather had also spent in that service sixty years, tells us in like manner in his “New India” that :—

“The arts of spinning and weaving, which for ages afforded employment to a numerous and industrious population, have now become extinct.”

He says again :—

“The most profitable Indian industries have been destroyed and the most valuable Indian arts have greatly deteriorated. Dyeing, carpet-making, fine embroidery, jewel metal-work, the damascening of arms, carving, paper-making, even architecture and sculpture have decayed.”

Sir William Ramsay, who went out to India to report upon Mr. Jamsetjid N. Tata's endowment scheme, is also quoted by Sir Henry Cotton as having observed, that of the two facts which impressed him about India, the first was that most of the population supports itself by agriculture, and that the relative proportion of manufacture to agriculture was insignificant ; the second was, that the raw products of India have either not been exploited, that they are in the hands of English companies, or that they are exported in an unmanufactured state.

Diminution or extinction is also the record of Indian shipping. For whereas we noticed that in the year 1857, Indian-built ships were 34,286 in number and that their tonnage was 1,219,958, in 1899-1900, or forty-three years after, this number of ships had shrunk to 1676, and represented a tonnage of 109,813. And a further question that arises here is this. What cause was it, that led to this deplorable collapse of one of the two chief stays of the national life of India? But this question is answered already by Mr. Digby's extract, where he says :—

“These national industries have been ruthlessly destroyed . . . that English industries were to be benefited by the destruction.”

The spirit which brought about this calamitous end, will be perceived in the subjoined excerpt, that has been culled from Taylor's "History of India."

"The arrival in the port of London of Indian produce in Indian-built ships created a sensation among the monopolists, which could not have been exceeded if a hostile fleet had appeared in the Thames. The shipbuilders of the port of London took the lead in raising the cry of alarm; they declared that their business was on the point of ruin, and that the families of all the shipwrights in England were certain to be reduced to starvation."

And the following examples are among the means that were employed to secure the annihilation of Indian industries.

"England compelled India to take her exports, either without duty or with a duty that was merely nominal, whereas she excluded Indian exports from her own market by means of prohibitive tariffs. In this manner, in 1813, the following import duties obtained :—

Flowered or stitched muslins of white calicoes and of Indian manufacture . . .	£32	9	2	for every	£100	of value.
Calicoes and dimities . . .	81	2	11	"	"	"
Raw cotton (per 100 lbs.) . . .	0	16	11	"	"	"
Cotton, manufactured . . .	81	2	11	"	"	"
Articles of cotton manufac- ture, wholly or in part made up, not otherwise charged with duty . . .	32	9	2	"	"	"
Hair of goat's wool, manu- factures of . . .	84	6	3	"	"	"
Lacquered ware, per cent . . .	81	2	11			
Mats and matting . . .	84	6	3			
Oil of aniseed . . .	84	6	3			
Oil of cocoanut, per ton . . .	84	8	3			
Tea, in 1814, Custom and Excise . . . . .	96	0	0"			

This process and its effect are thus explained by Mr. St. George Tucker, a Director of the East India Company :—

"The silk manufactures, and its piece goods made of silk and cotton intermixed, have long since been excluded altogether from our market; and of late, partly in consequence

of the operation of a duty of 67 per cent, but chiefly from the effect of superior machinery, the cotton fabrics which hitherto constituted the staple of India have not only been displaced in this country, but we actually export our cotton manufactures to supply a part of the consumption of our Asiatic possessions."

And with respect to the propriety of this course, Mr. Rickard's comment, which he made before a Select Committee of the East India Company, was that

" . . . The rate of duty imposed on Indian imports into Britain, when compared with the exemption from duty of British staples into India (cotton goods being subject to a duty of only 2½ per cent), constitute an important feature in the present question. Indians within the Company's jurisdiction, like English, Scotch, or Irish, are equally subjects of the British Government. To make invidious distinctions, favouring one class but oppressing another, all being subjects of the same empire, cannot be reconciled with the principles of justice; and whilst British imports into India are thus so highly favoured, I know that Indo-British subjects feel it a great grievance that their commodities when imported into England should be so enormously taxed."

The question might not unnaturally be asked, Why did not India circumvent the threatened destruction of her manufactures by turning the inventions of Watt, Arkwright, and Hargreaves to her account, and so meet her rival on equal terms? For two reasons such a course was clearly impracticable. One is, that England had the power, and did use that power, to prevent Indian manufactures from flooding her market, but that India lacked the power to prevent English manufactures from flooding her market. The other reason is, the constant drain to which the specie of the vassal state was subjected by the liege state. Lastly, I must observe that the cotton mills of Bombay, which for the most part belong to native gentlemen, a few coal mines of which the profits remain in the country, the cheap manufactures with which England supplies the Indian people, also English local industries, such as tea and indigo growing, and the investments in railways, etc., of which, however, the interest does not remain in the country, that all of these, as is evidenced by the

dire poverty of the people, do not in the least counterbalance the loss of the native manufactures.

On the subject of employing native-Indians in the public service of India, we have already had the statement of Mr. Sunderland that it is a fact, that only one-fiftieth part of the places in the Indian Government Service, and these the lowest and poorest-paid places, are generally filled by native Indians. And that this is the case, "although there are thousands of well-educated and competent Indians who would be glad to get the places, and who would fill them well if they were allowed." The judicial department is the only division of the Indian administration in which native Indians may fill the higher as well as the lower posts.

And that these native judges, in the discharge of their important duties, have worthily maintained the high traditions of their great profession, is a fact that is not only not denied, but that is affirmed, as this sentence testifies, which occurs in a speech that was made in Parliament by the late Lord Chancellor, the Earl of Selborne. Speaking of the native Indian judges, the late Lord Chancellor said:—

"I should be sorry to say anything in disparagement of English judges, who as a class are most anxious carefully to discharge their duty; but I repeat that I have no hesitation in saying that in every instance, in respect of integrity, of learning, of knowledge, of the soundness and satisfactory character of the judgments arrived at, the native judgments were quite as good as those of English judges."

Yet although native Indians, by the ability, integrity, and zeal with which they have fulfilled their great trust as dispensers of the law, have demonstrated unmistakably their fitness to fill high offices in other departments of the public service, such other high offices, upon grounds the most illogical and almost puerile, are denied them.

One of the *real* reasons for this *circumspection* on the part of the ruling caste will appear when we have come to deal with the late Sir Richard Temple's view upon the matter. So then in our first survey we behold the Indian Empire in industrial pursuits (I refer particularly to manufacture) leading the way, not only for the bulk of the nations of the East, but also for all the great nations of the West; her industrial

activities having permeated the entire land, having overflowed their channels into the contiguous states, ultimately reaching Europe and America. In India itself these activities were reflected by the magnificence and opulence of her cities, by the prosperity and contentment of her teeming millions. Abroad they were discernible in her variegated and highly finished articles of trade (articles of necessity and articles of luxury), that were borne in her own numerous and substantially built fleet.

India was thus a great country; great in material and intellectual riches; but was not less great in the wealth of morals. Possessing these three forces, she flourished in architecture, poetry, sculpture, and philosophy. And now, can it be difficult to conceive how well organized must have been the government of a people so highly cultured? How, over such a wide field of pursuits, all the talents of the people, from the first degree of eminence down to that of mediocrity, must have found their opportunity for development? But in the second survey of the Indian Empire the scene is greatly changed, yea, sadly changed. For now her cities, which were once populous, are comparatively empty, their former grandeur is buried in decay, and her people in dire poverty wander about upon the brink of despair. Her industries of shipping and of fabric, stays of her wealth, and her wealth, the stay of her art, are now at the last gasp in their struggle with extinction.

And it is by means of protection against Indian goods in the English market, and of free trade for British goods in the Indian market, that English manufactures and English shipping have achieved this tragic end. India's power of production and of distribution being now broken, and thereby her widest doors of opportunity being now closed, her sons, are all but excluded from the only remaining door of opportunity, viz., the public service.

It will be remembered that we started this part of our discussion with the statement, that in order to estimate the adequacy or inadequacy of opportunity of the Indian under British rule, we need only to compare the present condition of his institutions with the past condition. This we have now done, we have considered the two important institutions of manufacture and the public service. The former, which



with agriculture was the bulwark of Indian life, has appeared before us in its relation to the past as that which gave employment (material and mental) to millions of the sons of the soil. Therefore the country was rich, was thriving, and was happy. But in its relation to the present, this Indian institution of manufacture has appeared before us as being almost in a state of extinction. The millions which in the past, toiled in comfort and security in the workshops of its cities, roam the country in the present, in uncertainty and discomfort, in quest of a precarious livelihood. For the land is poor, unhappy, and desolate.

The latter Indian institution, the public service, which might be a great field of opportunity to the native, and which, in the past, beckoned him to its chief offices as well as to its minor offices, is to-day closed against him, we are told, except one-fiftieth part, and that the least remunerative. Now, between these two periods of the past and the present, the past of Asiatic rule, the present of European rule, the past representing general prosperity, progress in art, and contentment of the people, the present representing general adversity, deterioration in art, and discontentment of the people, what is the difference? The difference is in the range and quality of employment. In the past, employment was both sufficient in range and profitable in nature, and so the people progressed; but in the present, employment being narrower in range and unprofitable in nature, the people retrogress. So then, the cause why India has not continued to progress being that of narrowed opportunity, I contend that my statement is proved, that lack of opportunity is the reason why, at least, the Indian section of the coloured races of the British Empire has not been more progressive.

Now we turn to the other section of coloured British subjects, and we will take the Negro as our example. India, as we have noticed, represents the section which at the time of its first contact with the hegemonical state possessed a culture of its own. But when the section of which we are now to speak first came into contact with the hegemonical state, it had not a culture of its own. I begin the discussion by noticing some admissions that are made by members of the ruling caste concerning individual members of this Negro class. On the subject of the Ethiopian race, the opinion of

the "Spectator," as we saw before from the excerpt, is in these words :—

"Individuals have advanced to high level, but the race, besides its apparent deficiency in accumulating power, retains in Africa, in Hayti, and in the Southern States deep traces of savagery. . . ."

With regard to these same "black-skinned populations," the excerpt of the "Daily Telegraph" admits that "they have some fluent and effective preachers and agitators." And a reviewer of the first volume of "Glimpses of the Ages," after stating what the aim and scope of the work is, adds this, that "one fancies" that whether the facts of the author's arguments succeed "in convincing his white readers will depend more upon the factors of sympathy and prejudice than upon any logical mode of reasoning." And then he concludes with the maxim that "One swallow does not make a summer." The unanimous admission of these three authorities, whom, I assume, subscribe to the doctrine of the "inferiority" of the Ethiopian race, is that individuals of this race "have advanced to high level," although they also believe that these individual cases are exceptional, and that the rule to which the race conforms represents it as an inferior race. Well, I need hardly say that I endorse the admission that "individuals have advanced to high level" of culture; and with reference to the admission, I proceed to inquire, what opportunities for profitably utilizing their talents are afforded, within the British Empire, to these individuals that "have advanced to high level"?

The medical man who was refused two appointments in England on account of his colour is certainly one of this "advanced" class. And the regulation that was issued in 1902 by the Colonial Office, excluding coloured British medical men from the West African Medical Service, was undoubtedly directed against this "advanced" class. Nor will the reader, after these two examples, be surprised to hear that no coloured British subject may be a commissioned officer either in His Majesty's army or navy. The Republic of France, with its comparatively small constituency of coloured citizens, has had and still has as commissioned officers representatives from among these coloured citizens in her army and navy. And in

the military branch of these services, one at least of these coloured citizens has attained to the rank and position of general. Even in the North American Republic, where prejudice which is founded upon the colour of the skin has become—as far as the Caucasian section of that nation is concerned—a veritable disease, coloured men in both the army and navy receive commissions. But in the British Empire, with its overwhelming preponderance of coloured subjects, whose union with the empire began, at least, three centuries ago, whose share in the accumulation of its boundless wealth is by no means inconsiderable, these coloured subjects, however brilliant may be their parts, are rigidly excluded from the army and navy.

So that although we read in the Queen's Regulations and Admiralty Instructions" concerning naval cadets that "four nominations will be given annually to the colonies," it is to be understood that His Majesty's coloured subjects are ineligible for these nominations, and that they are ineligible on account of the colour of their skin. But it is not even from the higher divisions alone of these two services that the coloured British subject is excluded, for none of them under ordinary circumstances may enter the British navy as seamen.

Under special circumstances individuals, as non-continuous service men, such as stokers, coopers, and carpenters, may be allowed to enter the naval service, but even with respect to them, this is what the "Regulations" say: "Kroomen, or natives of Africa, when entered to supply vacancies in a ship's complement, and employed on skilled labour, and in superior ratings, shall receive fivepence a day less than the full pay established for such ratings as they may fill. They are to be paid on discharge like other Kroomen." This same discrepancy in the navy between the wages of white British subjects and coloured British subjects who perform the same work is likewise observed in the army between the pay of white British regiments and black British regiments. Nor is such a discrepancy confined to these lower grades of the public service, for it has extended also to the very circumscribed area of the higher branch of the public service to which black men are appointed.

Thus, in the West African Medical Service, for example, we

should find, with regard to the few coloured medical men that are still employed in that service, remnants of the past régime, as well as with regard to their predecessors, that whereas they possess the same qualifications that are possessed by their white colleagues, both parties having passed the same kinds of examinations, yet that their pay ranges from £300 to £350 per annum, whilst the pay of the white medical men is from £400 to £500 per annum. To this tune of discrimination between black and white in the British Empire, by which the opportunities of the former class are all but excluded, here is a refrain from South Africa :—

“ It was the wish of Sir Bartle Frere that the natives should be encouraged to fill responsible positions in the Civil Service, and to aid in the administration of the country. There is a tendency to narrow down their position to one of preferential treatment on colour lines. While we can cordially appreciate the necessity of preserving the race ascendancy of the whites in a country inhabited by a preponderating coloured race, such as the Bantu, the employment of men of thorough training, character, and abilities to positions of trust and responsibility should at least find more favour in the future than it has in the past. The opinion of President Roosevelt in the recent agitation over this question in America will perhaps be interesting in its appositeness to these remarks.

“ ‘ It seems to me that it is a good thing from every standpoint to let the coloured man know that if he shows in marked degree the qualities of good citizenship—the qualities which in a white man we feel are entitled to reward—that he will not be cut off from all hope of similar reward.’

“ Colonists can lose nothing by taking a more liberal if careful view of the issues involved in questions of this nature.”

I dissent from the view of this extract regarding the necessity of preserving “ the race ascendancy of the white race.” For race ascendancy is not a natural, but an artificial product. And it is an artificial product which is attainable and maintainable only by the most frightful sacrifice of truth and equity. Nor has the white race any greater right, (human or divine) to ascendancy over the coloured races, than have the coloured races over the white race. Race ascendancy, therefore, is intrinsically immoral. So, in this regard, the only necessity that exists is that of truth and equity, and truth and equity demand the impartial recognition of individual worth.

This, then, is the lot of the coloured "individuals" of the British Empire, who the "Spectator" tells us "have advanced to high level," whom the "Daily Telegraph" has described as "fluent and effective preachers and agitators," and to whom the reviewer, in order to designate their fewness, has referred as the "one swallow that does not make a summer." The great departments of all the Empire—its naval and military ranks, its innumerable appointments, civil and political, its commerce and industries—in their highest aspects—with the radiating branches almost illimitable that make up their sums—these all wait to confer the reward of competence, the reward of wealth, the reward of distinction, or the reward of fame upon the ability, the energy, the aspiration, and the ambition of white British subjects; but to the importunities of coloured British subjects who "have advanced to high level," the only reply of these great departments of the Empire is a gruff and scornful negative. Even in the few minor posts of the higher branches of the public service, such as that of the West African Medical Service, which a disproportionately small number of Negroes have shared with the whites, they have been unfairly treated in the pay they receive. Compared, then, with the lot of the white British subjects, I again ask, What is the chief feature of the lot of the "advanced" British Negro subjects? Is it not lack of opportunity?

Now, leaving these "individuals" who "have advanced to high level," we return to the mass whence they proceeded. Of this mass we have noticed the "Spectator" to say that it, "the race, besides its apparent deficiency in accumulating power, retains in Africa, in Hayti, and in the Southern States deep traces of savagery." In other words, according to this organ, whereas "individuals" of the Negro race "have advanced to high level," the mass of Negroes have not. But has not the advance of "individuals," rather than of the mass or "race," been also a most salient feature in the growth of the people of which the "Spectator" and the "Daily Telegraph" are spokesmen? Thus, take the history of British commercial and industrial development, the history of British literature, the history of the parts in science and art in which Britons have most successfully worked, the departments of naval, military, and political affairs, in short, take the history of all the achievements that have contributed to the present

national position, and it will be found on examination that the authors of those achievements have been individuals, and not the mass of the people. In all these fields the individual rose first, and then raised the mass. Each generation yields its quota of "advanced individuals," and in proportion to their endowments and their numbers—but mainly their endowments—in that proportion is the mass raised. The rise of the mass is much slower than the rise of the "advanced individuals," and it is never so high as their rise. "The Venerable" Bede, Chaucer, Roger Bacon, Newton, Reynolds, Watt, Faraday, Wellington, Nelson, Pitt, etc., have been those among the "advanced individuals" that the British nation has produced, and by whom itself in turn has been raised.

It will be seen, therefore, that in producing "individuals" who "have advanced to high level," the Negro race is following the same ethnic law that England, Germany, France, and all other nations, those of antiquity as well as these of modern times, have followed. So that, with respect to the rise of the mass the two following facts may be considered as being axiomatic: (1) that it is from the mass that the "individuals" who "advance to high level" have sprung; (2) that the areas or strata whence these "advanced individuals" will arise are indeterminable. Now, acting upon these two axioms, the most enlightened states, as if by instinct, will resolve, in the first place, upon producing the greatest possible number of advanced individuals.

And since it is from the mass that the "advanced individuals" proceed, the most enlightened states will resolve, in the second place, to afford to the mass every available advantage for producing these "advanced individuals." I conceive such available advantages to group themselves under the heads of economic and educational facilities. Hence, if these twofold facilities be inadequate, the issues of "advanced individuals" will at least be numerically defective. For thereby the rise of the mass will be defective. And as far as the mass is concerned, such defective facilities will constitute its lack of opportunity.

Thus the question which we shall now proceed to determine is whether the economic and educational facilities which the mass of British Negro subjects possess are sufficient for the

proper discharge of their function, i.e. the production of "advanced individuals." If they be found to be insufficient, then, since such an insufficiency will have resulted in the diminished production of "advanced individuals," by whom the mass is raised, that insufficiency, I repeat, will be to the mass its lack of opportunity. This question will be answered by some of the facts which we have considered before.

In West Africa, according to those facts (p. 160), Sierra Leone, the oldest colony, although possessing a rich soil, yet, on account of the absence of any technical knowledge of agriculture among its inhabitants, is dependent upon the uncultivated products of the poor and barbarous Hinterland. And this Hinterland itself is weighted by the encumbrance of an excessive taxation. As representing the educational state of West Africa, we have observed concerning Lagos (p. 154) that whereas a considerable outlay of the public revenue is expended on Government works, a small and inadequate amount only is spent upon the education of the people. And this shortage of educational facilities prevails in East Africa, as well as in West Africa, and as well also as in India (p. 111). Thus the following quotation from a religious weekly journal relates to East Africa. Referring to two among several East African missionaries who were soon to return to England on furlough (1906), the journal says:—

"We understand that Dr. Hetherwick and Rev. James Henderson will lay before the Colonial Office the urgency of a Government contribution to native education in B.C.A. Twenty-nine thousand pounds is contributed to the revenue annually in hut-taxes, and the missions bear the entire expense of native education."

Concerning South Africa,—as in the cases of Kano and Sokoto, in West Africa (p. 32), where the native owners, in violation of treaty rights, have been stripped of their lands, and saddled with onerous taxes—we have noticed the depriving of the Matabeles and Mashonnas of their lands, and the imposing of penal taxes upon them, in order that they may be forced into the mines. Whilst in the Transvaal, in addition to this form of taxes, the attempt is being made (p. 139) to prevent the native from owning land in his own name. And educationally we have observed the gross inequality (p. 155)

that there is between the facilities that are enjoyed by the whites and the facilities that are enjoyed by the blacks. Lastly, concerning the West Indies, we have noticed that the conditions that prevail in West and South Africa also prevail there, viz. the deprivation to the peasantry of suitable land for cultivation, their lack of technical knowledge of agriculture, and their excessive taxation and deficient educational facilities.

I presume that no one will deny that the confiscation of the people's lands, and then the imposing of penal taxes upon them—as is the case in the Sierra Leone Protectorate, in Northern Nigeria—Kano and Sokoto—and in Rhodesia—Matabeleland and Mashonaland—the discouragement that is offered to the peasantry of the West Indies and to the natives of the Transvaal in their attempts to own land, the absence of technical knowledge of agriculture among the natives of West and South Africa, and among the peasantry of the West Indies—agriculture being in the latter place the chief resource of the people—and the wofully defective system of education among the peoples of all these territories, that all these facts, as indicating the economic and educational facilities of the mass of the British Negroes, are insufficient.

Therefore, according to the proposition with which we started, that if the economic and educational facilities which the mass of the British Negroes possesses, be found to be insufficient, such an insufficiency will constitute their lack of opportunity—since these insufficient facilities will have hindered the due increase of “advanced individuals”—I conclude that lack of opportunity is the reason why the mass of British Negro subjects have not been more progressive.

So, then, we have two great English journals boldly affirming the incapacity of the Negro race; and one of these journals in its declaration against social equality between black and white, expresses its disapproval of an act of courtesy that was shown by the President of the United States to a distinguished man of colour, a citizen of the American Republic.

From the statements of these two journals affirming the incapacity of the Negro we have deduced six proofs (p. 192) that are advanced in support of the incapacity. Further, we have examined these proofs in detail, and they have all, I believe, been refuted (p. 228). On the other hand, I have stated that whereas the failure which has been affirmed of the British



Negro, of the American Negro, and of the Haytian Negro, has been disproved,—and thereby the mental incapacity to which that failure is said to be due, has been likewise disproved—that in my judgment the Negro in both the British Empire and the American Republic has not progressed as he might have been reasonably expected to do. Having reserved the American Negro for future consideration, we determined to find the reason why the British Negro has not been more progressive.

I asserted that such a backwardness could be accounted for by one of three alternatives, of which that only of lack of opportunity is valid. We therefore proceeded to demonstrate the proposition, that lack of opportunity is the reason why the British Negro has not been more progressive. In order that the demonstration may be the more convincing, I enlarged the scope of the proposition, by which its demonstration is made to apply to all the coloured races of the British Empire, instead of the Negro section alone. We thus considered these races (1) as they are represented by the Indian division, (2) as they are represented by the class of Negroes that are admitted by the advocates of Negro incapacity as those who “have advanced to high level,” (3) as they are represented by the mass of the Negro race.

In regard to India, we saw that previous to, and during the earlier part of her subjection to British rule, she at least supported her people in comfort; that she did so by means of the following institutions, viz. her manufacturing and agricultural industries, and by all the branches of the public services of her states, which gave employment to many of her sons. We saw that of these three institutions that of her manufactures was deliberately destroyed by the unfair competition of British manufactures. That her public offices, having been reserved, for the most part, for the sons of the hegemonial state, are practically unavailable to the sons of the soil; that the institution of agriculture has been only partially improved. That thereby the deprivation to India—partially and completely—of the two industries, while the third institution is rendered inadequate to her needs, constitutes in her case that lack of opportunity that has retarded her progress.

With respect to the class of Negroes that “have advanced to high level,” we have seen that whereas Englishmen admit that

the members of this class have so risen, at the same time they rigidly exclude these members from places of trust, of distinction, and of emolument, and that they permit them to enter only a very few of the minor places, the same exclusion being more or less applicable to every other pursuit of life. Therefore I concluded that such an exclusion and restriction constitutes to this class, lack of opportunity. And with respect to the mass of British Negro subjects, we have seen that it is it that produces the advanced class of Negroes, by which itself in turn is to be raised ; and that in order to produce this class it must have at its command sufficient economic and educational facilities. But the confiscation of the lands of some of the members of this class, and the prevention of others of them from acquiring lands, the restriction of the educational advantages of the whole class, and the oppressive taxation that is imposed upon it, all these, as we have also seen, afford to the class insufficient facilities for producing its quota of " advanced individuals " ; thereby they afford to it insufficient facilities for procuring its own elevation. And we have also said that this insufficiency, in the case of this class, constitutes its lack of opportunity.

Of all the tribunals that may belong to any state, that which is known as public opinion is the most powerful. And so whatever there be that is most influential in either creating or controlling public opinion deserves the closest attention. British public opinion, generally speaking, is the effect of three distinct forces, viz. the pulpit, politics, and the press. The parts which form the general effect of the action of these forces are unequal ; therefore in producing this general effect the action that is put forth by each force must be likewise unequal. According to the relative action that is put forth in the creation or control of British public opinion, by the three forces that have just now been named, I place the press first, politics second, and the pulpit last.

And the press, as occupying this pre-eminence, shall alone engage our attention here. The spheres of operation of the British press are national, or the affairs of the United Kingdom, imperial, or the affairs of the Empire, and international. National affairs, imperial affairs, and international affairs are directed by one or other of two political parties, that has been chosen by the constituencies of the United Kingdom. The

relation of these two parties to each other is that of perpetual opposition. In this attitude, each with unflinching zeal strives to magnify the sins of omission of the other, and to minimize or conceal from view its own sins of commission. The great ally, or indeed the manipulator of these two parties, which are to a large extent automatons, is the press.

And so the press exists as two sections, of which each section is devoted to the fortunes of one or other of the two great political parties. Now, since each section of the press is devoted to one or other of the two political parties, it follows that the chief work of each section, by expatiating upon the virtues of its own party, and upon the vices of the rival party, is to maintain the ascendancy of its party. This being the case, the main object of the British press, as well as the press of all states in which party government prevails, is not to preach and to teach truth, but to preach and to teach about a party; a party whose ascendancy is not infrequently in opposition to truth. Therefore, truth is followed by the press only so far as it does not come into conflict with party interest.

In regard to every public question that is discussed, nine out of every ten are discussed upon party lines, so that if one should desire to get at the truth, he would probably find it outside of and midway between the conclusions of the party organs. Now, if truth be to moral life what air is to physical life, viz. its vital principle; further, if the teaching of the press as the prime generator of public opinion, be the chief kind of atmosphere that is breathed by the moral life of the nation, and if party exigency, rather than the interest of truth, be the first consideration of the press, then, in these three facts, there is the history for an infallible diagnosis of the nation's moral health. And of these three facts, the second and third, in my judgment, constitute to the British nation one of its greatest perils.

But besides this attitude of the British press, by which the welfare of truth is subordinated to the welfare of party in questions of national, imperial, and international importance, there is another attitude. This other attitude of the British press applies to the two great communities of the Empire, the coloured and the colourless. The relations of these communities, which to some extent live side by side, are the reverse of cordial. For the endeavour of the colourless section, which

also is the smaller section, is to rob the coloured section, which also is the larger section, of every right that it possesses.

In the struggle between the two sections, the British press, as the press of the hegemonical state, has had to take sides. And now we perceive this press, in an attitude which is distinct from that wherein we have been viewing it. We perceive it now not as a sectional or party instrument, but as a combined force, allied with the colourless section against the coloured section. The scope of its teaching is still sectional, that is to say, that the teaching is directed to furthering the interests of the whole white section of the Empire, instead of to furthering the interests of the whole Empire. Thus it no longer appears as the mouthpiece of two white sections which, in friendly rivalry for the privilege of promoting the well-being of the whole white section, are opposed to each other, but it appears as the champion of the whole white section in its determined effort to oppress and tyrannize over the whole coloured section.

And so, whereas in party politics we have the two sections of the press, each in opposition to the other, devoting its energies primarily to the work of maintaining the prestige of its party, in this imperial aspect we have the two sections in combination, devoting their energies primarily to the work of maintaining, at all cost, the prestige of their race. Truth, in consequence, is at a discount, for such an effort is incompatible with the dictates of truth. In the support of the colourless portion of the Empire against the coloured portion of the Empire there is no case that more strikingly illustrates the union of the sectional British press than the recent massacre of natives in Natal by the Natal Government.

As an example, while the Conservative portion of the London press was wildly jubilant in its support of the enormities and pretensions of the Natal Government, the Liberal portion busied itself in order to prove that every step which was taken in the matter by the Imperial Government was in strict accord with the constitution. Thus the inhumanity, not to say the barbarity, of the Natal Government concerned neither section of the London press. The one section rejoiced in the atrocity, the other section was silent about it. There was no clear and emphatic denunciation of the infamous wrong; therefore the inference is unavoidable that, as is the case with the general

native policy of the Natal Colony, both sections approved of this special application of that policy.

Again, as showing how completely truth is ignored by both sections of the British press, in the endeavour to maintain the supremacy of the whites at the expense of the rights of the non-whites, there are no more striking examples than the two with which the "Daily Telegraph" and the "Spectator" have supplied us. From the seven fallacies of those examples, these two organs have had the assurance to pass the sentence of political, of social, and of industrial annihilation upon forty-three millions of Negro subjects of the British Empire. But, on the one hand, can it be thought that it was honestly believed by these two great journals that the incapacity which they alleged to be the cause of the social, industrial, and political failure of the Negro has been proved by the reasons which we have recently considered, and which have been disproved? And, on the other hand, can it be believed that these two great organs have been ignorant of the fact that incapacity was not the cause of the Negro's failure, but that lack of opportunity was the cause—a cause, therefore, for which the British Government and not the Negro is responsible?

I confess that inasmuch as these journals have admitted that individual Negroes have "risen to high level," I am unable to understand how they could have believed that the backwardness of the British Negro was the result of the incapacity of the Negro race. Further, inasmuch as these journals must also have known that the avenues of opportunity have been practically closed to the individual Negroes who "have advanced to high level" in the British Empire, and that these avenues have likewise been practically closed to the mass of Negroes which should have produced such "individuals," who, in their turn, should have raised the mass—these journals, I say, could not have been ignorant of the fact that the failure of the British Negro is not due to his racial incapacity, but rather to his lack of opportunity.

So, then, we must either conclude that the "Daily Telegraph" and "Spectator" believed their seven fallacies to be genuine proofs of the incapacity of the Negro race, that they further believed the advancement to a high level which has been made by individuals to be proof of the incapacity of the Negro race, and that they believed the lack of opportunity of the

individual Negroes who have advanced to a high level, as well as of the mass of Negroes which has not so advanced, to be still further proofs of the incapacity of the Negro race, I say that we must either conclude thus, or else we must conclude that these organs did not so believe. If we conclude that they believed their seven fallacies to be genuine proofs of the incapacity of the Negro race, that they believed the advancement of individuals to a high level to be proof of the incapacity of the Negro, that they believed the denial of opportunity to these individuals, and to the mass, to be also proofs of the incapacity of the Negro, then we must exclude these journals not only from "the stronger type of white ability," but even from the weaker type of white ability.

On the other hand, if we deny to these organs these beliefs, then, inasmuch as overtly or covertly they adduced them as their beliefs, we must accuse them of deceit, we must accuse them of making false statements against the Negro, in order that the white section of the Empire, whose henchmen they are, may, with the semblance of right, continue its sinister work of exploiting the non-white section. Ineptitude, then, or deception, is the characteristic of the work of the British press, in relation to the interests of the coloured and colourless sections of the Empire. And I have no doubt that the latter of these two characteristics is the true one. Therefore as the chief creator and controller of public opinion, it is not difficult to conceive what must be the effect of this work of the press upon the national character. And I have no hesitation in saying that the present discordant relations that prevail between the British people and the coloured peoples of the Empire, to the detriment of the former no less than to the detriment of the latter, is primarily the work of the British press; and that in the endeavour to uphold the "supremacy" of the white section of the Empire, by making the coloured section, and chiefly the Negro, to stink in the nostrils of the rest of the world, through an unexampled campaign of lies, the British press is aiming a terrible and even a fatal blow at the very heart of the Empire.

## IX

### Change of Policy

AS far as the coloured British subject is concerned, the England of the fifties, the sixties, the seventies, and of even the early eighties, is not the England of to-day. In the preceding chapter I have referred to the ill-treatment which coloured men now more or less habitually receive in England ; and illustrations of this ill-treatment have been supplied there. Thus the cases of persecution and of porcine snobbery that describe the conduct of English and Scotch students towards their coloured fellow students are among those illustrations. And the quasi-compassionate and complacent announcement of the English reviewer (p. 180), that " it is hard in any circumstances for the white to regard the black without a touch of contempt," forms also a part of those illustrations.

But besides these facts which socially relate to the present attitude of Englishmen towards coloured British subjects, we have noticed also other facts that relate to the opportunity for progress that is afforded to these coloured subjects. Such other facts as the exclusion of all men of colour—either as commissioned officers or of the ranks—from the British army and navy ; and their exclusion from nearly all the other higher divisions of the public service throughout the Empire. And now, for the purpose of indicating more specifically the present attitude of Englishmen, politically, towards coloured British subjects, I will mention two examples.

A few years ago a conflict that had been proceeding between the Colonial Office and the representatives of the Maltese people, and which was of sufficient importance to engage the attention and to enlist the support of the Italian press on behalf of the Maltese, resulted in the transmission of the following dispatch by Mr. Chamberlain, who at the time was Secretary of

State for the Colonies, dated the 4th of June, 1903, to the Governor of Malta :—

“Should the elected members persist in their policy of refusing absolutely necessary votes of money, it would be impossible to continue indefinitely the practice of passing orders in Council ; and that His Majesty’s Government would be compelled to revise the constitution of Malta in such a manner as to secure control of finances by the Imperial Government.”

Of this intimation or ultimatum the permanent reduction of the elected members of the Maltese Legislative Council from nine to six was the outcome, and the real significance of the change that was thus made in the constitution of Malta will be understood, I think, when it is observed in the light of an earlier dispatch that Mr. Chamberlain sent in the year 1899 to the Governor of Jamaica. In that earlier dispatch there occurs the following command :—

“I must instruct you . . . before the Legislative Council is summoned to fill up the full number of nominated members, and to retain them, using at your discretion the power given you by the constitution to declare measures of paramount importance. *You will give the Council and the public to understand that this step is taken by my express instruction.*”<sup>1</sup>

Both these extracts relate to peoples which, in the one case, dwell in the Mediterranean Sea, and in the other case in the Caribbean Sea ; they relate to peoples that were enjoying a measure of representative government, but a measure of representative government which, by the placing of non-elected or official members in a permanent majority in the Legislative Councils is now reduced almost to absolute impotence. With regard to Malta, Mr. Chamberlain supported his action by this reason. “It is impossible,” he states, “that the Government educational establishment should be closed in consequence of the action of the elected members.” The subject of dispute between the elected members and the Colonial Office which led the former to refuse to pass the votes for education was the language or languages that should be made compulsory in the schools. As I understand the case, the elected members contended that in dictating what language

<sup>1</sup> The italics are mine.



should be made compulsory in the schools of Malta, the Imperial Government was infringing upon the rights of the people. But with regard to Jamaica, Mr. Chamberlain stayed himself upon the plea that that Government was in a permanent minority. However, in both cases these different causes were made to produce the same result, that is, the suppression of representative government. But Mr. Chamberlain's anxiety to maintain educational efficiency among the Maltese—an anxiety which no doubt is akin to that which prompted his crusade in South Africa against "polygamy,"—may be rightly estimated by the recommendation which he made in 1899 to the Jamaica Government.

For after that Government had already reduced the education vote of the colony, Mr. Chamberlain recommended that it should make a further reduction in that vote, at the same time forbidding that any reduction—which, under the exceptional circumstances, some of the officials desired—should be made in the salaries of the Government officials. Mr. Chamberlain's fear lest the Maltese should suffer educationally will perhaps be also appreciated when the fact is told that while directing or sanctioning, in November, 1902, advances of £20,000 to the non-taxing planter of Jamaica from the taxes that were paid into the treasury by the tax-paying peasant, he closed the schools, as I have related before, to one half of the children of the island who belonged to this tax-paying class. So that, whereas in 1903 Mr. Chamberlain, fearing lest young Malta should grow up in ignorance, hastens to suppress representative government in that island, in 1899 upon the pretext of an empty exchequer he closed the schools of Jamaica to one-half of its children. But in 1902, with this half of young Jamaica growing up in ignorance, he caused £20,000 to be taken from the taxes which their parents had paid to Government and to be given the dying industry of sugar, which contributes nothing to the general revenue. Further, to Mr. Chamberlain's condemnation and abrogation of the measure of representative government that Jamaica had enjoyed up to 1899, are opposed the facts that since 1883, when that form of government was restored to the colony, it had not been found unworkable. That of the system of Crown government which he has practically reintroduced, and by which the people have lost all control over the revenue of the island, this is the record—a record

which is embodied in the following resolution that the Jamaica Council adopted in 1882, on the eve of the retrocession of representative government to the colony :—

“ That the expenditure of the island during the fifteen years of Crown Government has been in excess in the aggregate to the extent of £2,000,000 over any similar period in the history of the colony, without, in the opinion of the Council, any adequate advantage being derived therefrom.”

At a meeting that was convened in Kingston, Jamaica, in 1899, in order to protest against Mr. Chamberlain's retrogressive move, in putting the people's representatives in the Legislative Council in a permanent minority, one of the resolutions which was passed was that :—

“ This meeting protests against the reintroduction of Crown Government in Jamaica by Mr. Chamberlain, the same being government by paid officials who are not in sympathy with the people of the country, do not know their needs, view all questions affecting the country from a very narrow standpoint, and who are not at all prepared to place the interest of the people above the interest of the public service.”

As Secretary of State for the Colonies, a predecessor of Mr. Chamberlain, Lord Derby, through whom the retrocession of representative government to Jamaica was made, observed, in 1883, to a deputation of persons who were interested in the West Indies, and who had waited upon him, that :—

“ It is quite clear that in a colony like Jamaica, with a large and intelligent populace, and within a short distance of the United States, a despotic or quasi-despotic government cannot be otherwise than a provisional and transitory state.”

Now, I would ask the question, that if the majority of the peoples of Malta and of Jamaica had been white people, so that for all practical purposes those communities might be called white communities, and in Malta a contention like that which arose between the Maltese and the Colonial Office had arisen, and in Jamaica a condition like that upon which Mr. Chamberlain based the revocation of representative government had existed, whether that contention in Malta and that condition in Jamaica would have been regarded by the Imperial Government as reasons sufficient for withdrawing

from those communities representative government? Whether the ostensible causes that have brought about the annulment of representative government in these two coloured communities have not existed in the white colonies of the British Empire, without the annulment of their representative institutions?

From the facts, therefore, that whereas circumstances similar to those that are alleged to have caused the effacement of representative government in Malta and in Jamaica have transpired in white colonies of the British Empire without the effacement of their representative institutions; that whereas within the British Empire white colonies which have recently been formed have had representative institutions, while coloured colonies which are older are denied representative institutions; and that whereas two of the very few coloured colonies which have had representative institutions have now been deprived of them, I affirm that the same policy of exclusion and of repression which is being pursued by Great Britain, socially and economically, in relation to the coloured section of the Empire, is that also which is being pursued by her politically in relation to this coloured section.

But this aspect of the subject, which consists of social, economic, and political parts, represents the present relation of Great Britain to her coloured states. What, then, has been her past relation with these states? Socially that relation may be summed up in the declaration which Englishmen as late as the early eighties were wont to make. It was this, "We know no man by his colour." But contrast this declaration with the "primary" and "secondary" questions proposed by a London evening paper during the discussion of the subject in its columns, viz. "Ought a negro to be treated as a white man in a public restaurant?" "How far is it fair to ourselves and advisable to treat negroes as equals?" Economically Britain's former relation with her coloured states was represented by the following announcement of 1858 which I quoted before as having been made when the Imperial Government assumed direct control over the Indian Empire, and by two cases that we also noticed:—

"And it is our further will, that as far as may be possible our subjects, of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service, the duties of which

they may be qualified by their education, ability, and integrity duly to discharge."

The two cases are the appointments of two West Africans to the British army in 1859, as assistant surgeons. These gentlemen, after attaining to the rank of surgeon-major, retired in 1881 on pensions. The spirit which is represented by this extract and these cases generally characterized all the relations that existed between the United Kingdom and her coloured states. Now, contrast this spirit with the fact that to-day, it is not only that no coloured British subject may enter the British army or navy as a commissioned officer, but it is also that he may not enter those services even as an ordinary soldier or sailor.

Politically the past relation between the hegemonical state and the coloured states of the British Empire is illustrated by the declaration of policy of 1865, which has also been quoted already, and which was drawn up in regard to West Africa. It proceeds:—

"That all further extension, or assumption of government, or new treaties offering any protection to native tribes, would be inexpedient, and that the object of our policy should be to encourage in the natives the exercise of those qualities which may render it possible for us more and more to transfer to them the administration of all governments, with a view to an ultimate withdrawal from all, except probably Sierra Leone."

But compare this attitude of the Imperial Government of 1865 with the attitude of the Imperial Government of the present time, namely, the attitude by which representative government in Malta and in Jamaica are practically abolished, and will it not appear that while the Imperial Government said in 1865:

"*The object of our policy should be to encourage in the natives the exercise of those qualities which may render it possible for us more and more to transfer to them the administration of all governments, with a view to an ultimate withdrawal from all,*" etc.:

It says in 1907:

"*The object of our policy should be to discourage in the natives the exercise of those qualities which may render it possible for us . . . to transfer to them the administration of all*

governments, with a view to an ultimate withdrawal from all," etc.

On these grounds, which indicate the present and past attitudes of the senior partner of the British Empire towards the coloured section of the junior partners, it could not, I think, be successfully denied that whereas the term *opportunity* sums up the past attitude, the term *lack of opportunity* sums up the present attitude. And it is these opposite or contradictory attitudes which characterize the present and past relations of the senior member of the Empire towards the coloured section of the junior members which have led me to state at the outset that as far as the coloured British subject is concerned, the England of the fifties, the sixties, the seventies, and of even the early eighties, is not the England of to-day. But this fact suggests an important question. The question which it suggests is this, To what is England's change of policy towards the coloured races of the British Empire due ?

The following extract which occurs in the course of a review of the first volume of this work may help us to answer this question. The reviewer proceeds :—

“As for the alleged inferiority of the negro, Mr. Scholes produces a certain amount of evidence to show the hasty generalizations of anthropologists a generation ago were ill-founded. Indeed, in view of the extraordinary capacity displayed by a race once regarded as inferior—the Japanese—few minds to-day would be inclined to assert as universally true the proposition that the white peoples are the chosen race, and that the black or yellow man must to all time be content with a subordinate position in the world's economy. This, however, does not render altogether unjust the conduct of England and the United States, ‘whereby the latter nation has practically disfranchised its coloured citizens, and the former nation renders unattainable the eligibility of its coloured subjects for exercising that franchise,’ as Mr. Scholes seems to imagine.

“The point is not whether the negro is permanently inferior to the white, but whether he is at present fitted to exercise a power that has only been granted to a few white nations after a prolonged political training, and whether it would not be madness to make over the control of such a country as the Transvaal, for example, to the most backward intellectually, though the most numerous of the peoples

inhabiting it. This is the real question, and Mr. Scholes fails to face it, whence the practical value of his work to the student or politician is small.”

In reply to the last sentence of the quotation, I may remark that the first volume of this work was not intended to discuss the subject of native franchise. The native franchise touches the question of the fitness or unfitness of the recipient to exercise that right. If the recipient be unfit to exercise it, such unfitness may be accidental or natural. If it be accidental it is remedial, but if it be natural it is irremediable.

With regard to the Ethiopian, the Caucasian has averred a general and natural unfitness. Hence the first volume has been devoted to examining the proofs of this allegation; for such unfitness of the Negro affects not only his use of the franchise, but all those other relations between man and man. Thus the question of the native franchise is not fundamental, but collateral. Therefore, in discussing the fundamental question of the Negroes' "unfitness" to live on terms of perfect equality with the Caucasian, instead of the collateral question of the franchise, "the practical value" of the work "to the student or politician" ought not to be small on that account, as the reviewer affirms that it is.

As to the reviewer's denial that the superiority of the colourless race and the inferiority of the coloured races is the question at issue, I have only to reply that it is most assuredly the question at issue, and to add that if the Japanese War has shown the white man that the superiority which he has been arrogating to himself, and the inferiority which he has been attributing to the coloured races, are baseless, he should frankly acknowledge his error, rather than attempt to deny that the position which involves his error is the one that he had occupied. But I pass to the position which the reviewer would have us believe to be the one that Englishmen have occupied. It is embraced by these words:—

“The point is not whether the negro is permanently inferior to the white, but whether he is at present fitted to exercise a power that has only been granted to a few white nations, after a prolonged political training, and whether it would not be madness to make over the control of such a country as the Transvaal, for example, to the most backward intellectually, though the most numerous of the peoples inhabiting it.”

Thus, to the question which has been propounded, concerning the cause of Britain's change of policy towards the native races of the British Empire, the answer which Englishmen, according to this reviewer, would give would be the unreadiness of the natives to co-operate with them in the management of public affairs. Such an answer implies that the Imperial Government is willing that the coloured British subject should so co-operate.

Well, if the unreadiness of the native—that is the mass—be really the reason why he has not been given the vote, for example, as the reviewer assures us that it is, and if England be willing—as the reviewer's assurance implies—that this class, as well as the other classes of the Empire, should co-operate with her in management of the affairs of the Empire, then, granted that the mass of natives of the Empire is not ready for the vote, the question would arise whether this mass, whose co-operation England professes herself as being willing to have, is being prepared by England for that co-operation. If, then, the profession be sincere, we should expect to find that this mass of coloured British subjects are being treated kindly, we should expect to find that they are being treated justly, and we should expect to find that, by their possession of educational, industrial, and other facilities they are being encouraged to enter the path of progress.

But according to the inquiries which have been made already into the matter, is this class of British subjects being treated kindly, are they being treated justly, and are they, by possessing educational, industrial, and other facilities, being encouraged to enter the path of progress? No! they are not. Then the assurance of the reviewer is insincere, and the backwardness of the native, as it relates to this class, is not the real reason why he is denied political co-operation with the colourless section of the Empire. Further, the coloured races of the British Empire do not consist only of the mass which is thus said to be politically unqualified to exercise those higher rights of citizenship, but they also consist of those coloured subjects who have been described for us as individuals that "have advanced to high level"; therefore, if the reviewer's statement be honest, that accidental unfitness is the cause which prevents the mass of coloured British subjects from exercising the political rights of citizenship, then, since the ac-

cidental disqualification of the mass does not apply to this advanced class of individuals, we should find it enjoying those rights and privileges that are enjoyed by white subjects of the Empire. Hence, with respect to this advanced class, in its relation to those rights and privileges, I will ask two questions, that shall refer to the Transvaal, it being the example that the reviewer has adduced.

First, whether the individuals of the Negro race who have "advanced to a high level," and who dwell in the Transvaal, are not able to use the franchise aright? Second, whether this class, according to the constitution which was given to the Transvaal last year (1906) by the British Government, has not been deliberately excluded from the franchise? Concerning the first of these two questions, I believe no unprejudiced person would deny that this advanced class of individuals are competent to exercise the rights of the franchise. And concerning the second question, the answer, of course, is that this advanced class of natives of the Transvaal Colony has been denied the franchise. Now, these two statements being true, that in the Transvaal a class of coloured inhabitants who are competent to use the franchise are not allowed by the British Government to use it, then the assertion of the reviewer that the coloured subjects of the Empire are denied the use of the vote only because they are unqualified, cannot be true, for here is one section which is qualified and yet it is denied the vote. As far as British rule applies to the coloured section of the Empire, there is nothing that shows its injustice more clearly than this conferrence of representative institutions upon the Transvaal Colony, in which qualified coloured British subjects are ignored. Roughly speaking, those by whom these institutions are to be enjoyed in the Transvaal consist of two classes, the foreign element and the Africander or Boer element. Of the foreign element the majority are interested in the gold industry, and of the Boer element the majority are farmers. Now, the description that is usually applied to this majority of the foreign element is that it is composed of the scum of the earth. And judging from the fact that in other regions it is such a stratum that the discovery of gold has invariably attracted, I cannot believe that the Transvaal would be the exception; thereby I am indisposed to regard this description as inaccurate. And the description that is usually applied to



the majority of the Boers is that they are ignorant. So, then, of the two classes that make up the Transvaal electorate, to which representative government has just been given, the majority of the one is reckless or irresponsible, and the majority of the other is ignorant. Therefore, will it be contended that the people which are composed of these two classes is more fit for self-government than the enlightened section of the coloured inhabitants of the Transvaal, to whom self-government has been denied? Or will it be contended that this white population of the Transvaal are more deserving of self-government than the people of India and of the other coloured states of the British Empire? To refuse the franchise to all the coloured peoples of the Empire for the reason that it "has only been granted to a few white nations after a prolonged political training," is an utterly unsound argument; for rather than making the probationary period of the whites the criterion for conferring political rights upon the blacks, the fitness of the blacks should be the criterion. And the class of the blacks which is made up of "individuals that have advanced to a high level" are as much entitled to enfranchisement as are the community of whites that are enfranchised. Summarized, the reviewer's statement seems to be this, that politically the differentiation between the white and non-white sections of the Empire is done in the interests of the latter.

Of course, the pretence which this explanation implies—that the white man was born to rule, and that the non-white man was born to be ruled—is only so much bunkum; it is part of that elaborate system of deception by which the white man has contrived to maintain his ascendancy. "The white man was born to rule." Since the beginning of history has the white man been the ruler of the world? And as an ingredient, is habitual injustice a proof of ability to rule? But in professing, as this explanation also connotes, that the coloured states of the Empire are being ruled for the benefit of the native inhabitants, Englishmen have reached the very acme of hypocrisy. For, as it is abundantly shown by the examples that we have already considered, Englishmen rule the coloured section of the Empire, not in the interest of the ruled, but in the interest of the rulers. Adverting in this connection to another reason which is offered by Englishmen in extenuation of their rule of absolutism over the coloured races, the reason

that without such a rule the coloured peoples would devour one another, I will say that internecine strifes are not the worst calamities by which peoples may be overtaken, and by which the coloured peoples of the British Empire have been overtaken; a calamity which is greater by far than these is that wherein any people are habitually despised and systematically maligned by their more advanced neighbours. Every coloured man in the British Empire who retains a spark of self-respect will prefer that he had been left alone in savagery, with his manhood intact—for the coloured men of the British Empire are as much men as are Englishmen—than that, with his manhood outraged, he should be a subject of the first Empire in the world.

Well, according to the reviewer, the Russo-Japanese War has somewhat modified the extreme opinion of Englishmen in regard to the superiority which they claim for themselves and the inferiority which they attribute to the coloured races. And so they now say that the unfitness of the coloured British subject for utilizing the franchise, owing to his lack of training, is their only reason for withholding it from him, and not because of any superiority on their part, or of any inferiority on the part of the coloured races. But in the first place if the action of the colourless section of the Empire towards the coloured section bore out the statement that the lack of training of the coloured section was the sole bar to its co-operation with the colourless section, then, instead of the colourless section strewing the path of the coloured section with every kind of obstruction, as it now does, it would have given the mass, by means of adequate training, a fair course for advancement to the position of co-operation. And if the action of the colourless section of the Empire towards the coloured section, in the second place, bore out the statement that the lack of training of the coloured section was the sole bar to its co-operation with the colourless section, then the colourless section would have co-operated already with the "individuals" among the coloured races "that have advanced to a high level," instead of ignoring and despising them, as is its wont. But in both of these respects the colourless section has failed lamentably. Thus, the present position which the reviewer, and those who associate themselves with him in that position, occupy is no more reasonable than was the original extreme position, which they profess to

have abandoned. Now we continue our search for the answer to our question. That answer is given, I think, in the following notice of an interview that a representative of a well-known London magazine had with the late Sir Richard Temple, shortly before his decease a few years ago.

The competence of Sir R. Temple to announce the present policy of Great Britain in regard to the coloured states of the Empire could not, I believe, be successfully contested. For many years he filled high official positions in the Indian Empire; he was Resident at Hyderabad, Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, and retiring as Governor of Bombay, he afterwards became a Member of Parliament. The subject of the interview was India. Having been asked how far he thought that the natives should be allowed a share in the government of the country, Sir R. Temple replied thus:—

“Well, that all depends, first upon whether the policy of the government is meant, or the administration of the government. Which do you mean?”

“Let us say administration,” the interviewer answered.

“Then in one sense,” Sir R. Temple continued, “the natives already have the predominant share in the civil administration; inasmuch as in numerical bulk of employés the natives far outnumber the English. Speaking roughly, I should say that there are at least a thousand natives to one Englishman. When people in England speak of the share of the natives in the administrative government, the answer is that they have it almost altogether; the English being only the directors and commanders, while the rank and file and many of the intermediary ranks are native. This seems to be forgotten by the people who speak about India, but who don't know it. The fact is, the bulk of the salaries defrayed in India are paid to natives, and not to the English.

“But I think that possibly you who know India mean by the administration something more than a share in the command and control of the administration.”

“Yes, that is so,” the interviewer replied. “What share is it that they have in the control?”

“Well,” rejoined Sir R. Temple, “their share in such control is, and ought to be, very limited. For example, the native may enter the Imperial Civil Service by competitive examination in England. Such men have the same status and privileges as their English brother officers, only they are yet but few. If by any chance they were to become numerous,

the question would have to be reconsidered. In the same way eminent members of the native Bar are from time to time appointed to judicial positions on the Bench of the High Court in the Presidencies.

"But such appointments are by selection, and such native judges are quite in a small minority, as compared with the English . . ."

"And could no larger share be allotted to them?" asked the interviewer, "feeling that all the same, they had more than sufficient already."

"That," Sir R. Temple responded, "is a question which touches the springs of British power in India, therefore I must speak plainly, if at all, because though I am most friendly with the upper and educated classes of natives, and in my time have done as much as most men to promote their cause, yet I could not press that so far as it is done by English people—that is so far as to touch the springs of British power.

"British rule may be, and I believe it is, the best in the world, but it is alien to the natives and can be maintained only by British brain and nerve, as well as by British strong arm. Thus it is that command in most European districts, into which India is divided, must be European, so must the general supervision, so must the provincial governments. This is needful not only for resolute and effective government in time of peace, but also for national safety in time of danger. India is the land of dangerous assaults. The European in civil command must be like the ironclad, fitted for perilous conditions of every sort. If, for example, the army only were under the command of the English, and civil administration *entirely* native, the risk would be too great to contemplate.

"The troops are scattered here and there over a vast area, and that area might administratively fall to pieces. Moreover, even in profound peace the fiscal and financial problems of Indian administration are too important to be left to any but European hands. Even if the control of civil justice could be left entirely to native—which is very questionable, certainly the criminal could not, nor the police. But there is another branch of the subject, viz. the policy of the Government. Well, I should divide this policy into three parts: (1) the supreme executive; (2) the legislative; (3) the municipal, including everything that is called local government in England, which is a term never used in India, or if it were, it would mean something entirely different. . . . Now, as regards the supreme executive, that must be English abso-

lutely, for that includes the councils of the Indian Empire, so long as British rule shall endure.

“Next, in legislation the natives ought to have a share, which, small at first, would gradually increase according as they shall rise in political fitness. They sit as members of the several legislative councils, either nominated or elected. It has always been difficult though desirable to get some mode of election instead of nomination. Measures have been proposed from time to time, and some steps taken, but I don't recollect how that point stands now. It would require official verification as to how far natives are elected to legislative power and under what conditions. I hope it will be found that they are so more or less.

“In the third section, viz. the municipal and all that concerns local government, in the English sense of the word—the natives have the predominant share, subject only to general supervision of Englishmen. Not only the municipal itself, but also the district bodies are constituted throughout the interior of the country, and these members—hundreds, nay thousands, in numbers—are more or less elected.”

In these extracts there are at least three noteworthy facts that should be observed: (1) the rigid limitation of the number of natives who are allowed to fill those higher offices that are opened to their class; (2) the rigid exclusion of natives from the great bulk of the higher offices; (3) the maintenance of British power.

About these extracts one thing that commands admiration is their candour. Of course there is present in them that characteristic conceit of the Anglo-Saxon, by which he has persuaded himself to believe that the power to rule began with himself, and must end with himself; that in the coloured races—although he has announced concerning the African protectorates that the natives must be ruled through their chiefs—this power is nil. Thus we have such statements as these: “Even if the control of civil justice could be left entirely to natives—which is very questionable—certainly the criminal could not, nor the police.” Yet the extracts are frank; for in them there is not that attempt to make us believe that the unfitness of the Indian to fill the higher public offices is the cause of their fewness in those offices, as the reviewer has attempted to make us believe with respect to the granting of the franchise to the coloured British subject. Thus Sir R.

Temple tells us that natives may enter the Indian Civil Service by competitive examination, which is held in England, but that "if by any chance they were to become numerous, the question would have to be reconsidered."

In other words, steps are taken by the British authorities to prevent many Indians from passing the examinations which they are invited to England to pass. We are further told that in judicial appointments the same process of numerical limitation is followed. That municipally, whereas a way has been found to introduce the principle of representation among the Indian people, of which, as a result, "hundreds, nay, thousands," of members have been "more or less elected," politically, after more than a century of British rule, no way of representation has been found; and so, as a consequence, the natives who sit in the legislative councils are many of them nominated, and thereby are non-elected members. Finally, we learn from Sir Richard Temple that the reason why in most European districts in India command must be European, why the general supervision of the provincial governments must likewise be European, why the administrative power must be under British control, and also why the supreme power must be "absolutely so," is that "the springs of British power" may not be touched.

This, then, is what I conceive to be the answer to our question of the cause of England's change of policy towards the coloured British subject, viz. the maintenance of "the springs of British power." But the policy which was declared in 1865 as that which should guide Great Britain in her relations with the coloured races of the Empire, "That the object of our policy should be to encourage in the natives the exercise of those qualities which may render it possible for us more and more to transfer to them the administration of all the governments, with a view to an ultimate withdrawal from all," etc., does it "touch the springs of British power"? What are the exemplifications of this announcement of policy? Is there any state, or are there any states in the British Empire which have been encouraged in the exercise of those qualities that rendered it possible for the parent state to transfer to them the administration of all the governments? Yes, they are those white communities of the Empire that are designated as the self-governing colonies. So, then, it will be seen from the

facts of the last extract that at least as late as 1865 Britain's intention was to pursue the same policy towards the coloured colonies and dependencies of the Empire as that she was pursuing or that she had pursued towards her white colonies. That policy was that those coloured colonies and dependencies should be trained for self-government. But the self-government that has been conferred upon these white self-governing colonies, has it impaired "the springs of British power"?

Of course the term "power" is equivocal, and as such it has more than one meaning. For example, in the case of Great Britain, besides the power that she derives from the political and commercial ties that exist between herself and her self-governing colonies, she also derives power from the ties of attachment of those self-governing states to the throne. But in regard to the coloured British subject, "power" as it is derived from loyal attachment to the Crown cannot have been the sense in which the late Sir Richard Temple employed it, for there is no reason to believe that if coloured communities were self-governing they would be less loyal to the throne than are the colourless communities. What, then, may be the meaning which Sir R. Temple intended to convey in his use of the phrase "the springs of British power"? It is that of absolutism or despotism. And that this term of absolutism or despotism was that which Sir Richard Temple meant is borne out by statements such as these:—

"British rule . . . can be maintained only by British brain and nerve, as well as by British strong arm. Thus it is that command in most of the European districts into which India is divided must be European, so must the general supervision, so must the provincial governments. This is needful, not only for *resolute government in time of peace*, but also for national safety in time of danger."

That absolutism was Sir Richard Temple's meaning of the term "power" in his use of the phrase "the springs of British power" is also borne out by the facts that whereas in the higher public offices of India the larger representation of natives as tending in the direction of self-government and liberalism was opposed by Sir R. Temple, the exclusion and limitation of natives as tending in the direction of absolutism and despotism was approved by Sir R. Temple. So, then,

Great Britain abandoned her avowed intention to prepare the coloured colonies and dependencies of the Empire for self-government, as she has prepared the white colonies for self-government, in order that she may establish over these coloured colonies and dependencies a despotism. In other words, for the intention of training these coloured communities for self-government, Great Britain has substituted the fact of a despotism.

And this change is in order that she may be able with the greater facility to exploit these communities for her own aggrandizement. In these his remarks that I have quoted Sir R. Temple has furnished us with the reason for England's change of policy regarding the coloured communities of the British Empire, that reason being that she may rule them despotically, and thereby subserve their interests to her own. And Mr. Blathwayt, in his article from which I have already made a quotation, has furnished us with the method by which the despotism is established and maintained. That method, in a word, is separation. He announces that :—

“ We rule our dependencies—India, South Africa, the West Indies, Ceylon, Australia, the Straits Settlements—by the rigid enforcement of the superiority of the white man.”

And again, that

“ The suppression of the black man is a stern duty.”

It is thus perceived by the British people that the separation of the colourless section of the Empire from the coloured section—for separation is the root-meaning of “ superiority ” and “ inferiority ”—is indispensable to the existence of its despotism. In an earlier chapter I have represented the relations that exist between the governing section of the British Empire and the governed section as those of the partners of a great firm. Here I may represent such relations as those that subsist—as far as the coloured British subject is concerned—between a foster-parent and his foster-children.

It cannot be conceived that if the foster-parent and his foster-children be united in sympathy of purpose and in sympathy of aim, the former would endeavour to sacrifice the prospects and hopes of the latter to his own ends. For example, that he would supply his wards with bad and in-



sufficient food, clothe them with rude and unhealthy apparel, restrict their educational facilities and waste their patrimonies ; in short, that he would deliberately neglect to prepare his clients for the great battle of life. For the committal of a sacrilege so monstrous there must have existed between the two parties a divided purpose and clashing aims. That is to say, there must first be separation. Similarly, in order that Britain, the foster-parent of the coloured races of the British Empire, should abandon the purpose of his great trust—which is to prepare his clients for the battle of life, viz. self-government—to prepare them for this destiny by throwing open to them, under his governance, every door of opportunity, as he declared in 1858 that he would do, he must first have separated himself from them in the union of sympathy of purpose, and in the union of sympathy of aim, by which he and they had been bound together. That sympathy of purpose and sympathy of aim gave expression to the policy of 1865.

And among the acts, political and economic, embraced by that separation are the severe limitation of natives as regards their number, and as in the case of India, with respect to their appointment to the very few higher offices that they may enter ; their exclusion from the army and navy, and from the great bulk of the higher public offices, as is the case in India and in the West African medical service ; the imposition of excessive taxes upon them, as is in India, the West Indies, and South and West Africa ; the restriction of their educational facilities and industrial training, as is the case in these places ; and the exclusion of the native from the land, as is the case in Africa and the West Indies. For upon the more gifted of these coloured clients the effect of all this exclusion and obstruction must be that of repressing their legitimate aspirations and ambitions, and of discouraging their laudable endeavours ; whereas upon the mass it must be that of making it abjectly poor, grossly ignorant, and altogether helpless. And the talents, ambition, and energy of the more intelligent of the governed section, being thus shut off from the great vistas of achievements, the masses existing in poverty, ignorance, and helplessness, while the governing section increases, in wealth, in intelligence, in power, and in mighty deeds, it will at once be discerned how wide must be the gulf that will divide the two sections.

Socially, the acts that are embraced by the policy of separation are such as that of the English lady in India, in anger and in flight from a dinner-party, followed by her husband, and the acclamation of Anglo-Indian society, because her host, the Governor of Bombay, had asked that she might be taken in to dinner by an Indian gentleman of "very high class." They are such acts as that of the young English gentleman, by profession a soldier, who enraged and outraged at finding a native Indian gentleman—a judge of the Supreme Court—in the compartment of the railway carriage that he had for the moment vacated, hurls him out, bag and baggage, upon the platform, with the very edifying and highly refined speech: "D—n your cheek! Out you go, you black brute!" Also they are such acts as that of the wife of the Governor of Jamaica, at the agricultural show, when she ordered the removal of a woman—"well dressed" and "well behaved"—from the seat that she occupied in proximity to the Governor's party—the seat for which she had paid—because she was black. They are such acts, too, as the malicious and mendacious aspersions by great journalistic organs of Britain, of the colonies, and of the dependencies; they are such acts as the insults, disabilities, and humiliations to which persons of colour are subjected; insults, disabilities, and humiliations, which in the mother country are somewhat restrained, find, in the colonies and dependencies, bald and ribald manifestations.

Nor can it be a cause for surprise that in their advocacy of separation from the coloured section of the Empire the colourless section should thunder out its anathemas against conjugal unions between members of these sections. It is thus that Mr. Blathwayt, one of the most redoubtable prophets of the new evangel of the Anglo-Saxon, says:—

"In the Southern States of America, I believe, and in South Africa also, I understand it is a penal offence for a white woman to be seen even talking to a black man; while personally speaking," he continues, "I consider that the white woman who can degrade herself to enter into marriage with a coloured person places herself outside the pale of decent society. There is one satisfaction, and that is that her punishment is swift, sure, and unerring."

If it be not penal for a white woman to be tied to a white

man who is capable of writing this arrant nonsense—the outpourings of a disordered mind—then by what law of reason should it be penal for a white woman to be wedded to a Negro? These mental midgets who, by feeding the flames of racial enmity with the fuel of verbal dissonance, strive to preserve their own social existence are the barnacles of the ship of state. These, then, are the acts which separation as the handmaid of absolutism has prescribed.

## X

### The Cause of the Change of Policy

**I**N this division of the theme "The position of the coloured subject within the British Empire," in relation to which our observations have been restricted to the position of these subjects at the heart of the Empire, we have been like one who in a valley is studying the configuration of a country. He sees one meadow here, a clump of trees there, a hillock yonder, and a river elsewhere, but he is without a right knowledge of the relation which these parts bear to one another and to the whole country until he gains the summit of the mountain. So in noticing Britain's change of policy towards the coloured races of the Empire, their exclusion from the land, their limited educational facilities, etc., we fail to see the relation which these parts bear to one another and to the whole British policy until we gain the summit of the mountain exploitation. Then we perceive that the lower peak absolutism merges into the highest peak exploitation, that the lowest peak separation merges into the higher peak absolutism, and that this lowest peak separation passes down into the valley to form those political, economic, and social phenomena which we have been examining.

In other words, exploitation is achieved by absolutism, absolutism is achieved by separation, and separation by those political, social, and economic tactics of exclusion, limitation, and imposition that we have been considering. Thus these all constitute not heterogeneous entities, but a homogeneous community. The maintenance of "the springs of British power," I have said, is the cause, that is to say, the implicative cause, of Britain's change of policy towards the coloured states of the Empire, therefore exploitation founded upon absolutism, absolutism founded upon separation, and separation founded

upon ostracism, insults, and humiliation, etc., is the explanatory cause of Britain's change of policy towards these coloured states.

But although exploitation is the explicative cause of Britain's change of policy toward her coloured states, it is not the only explicative cause, for there are at least two other causes. One is the uncompromising attitude of the white colonies, and the other is Anglo-American friendship. With respect to the attitude of the colonists, I will take South Africa as my illustration. The position of Great Britain towards the coloured races of the Empire down to, say, the early eighties of last century has been more or less on the line of her proclamation of 1858 and of the Parliamentary Report of 1865. And the implicit belief which the great bulk of the natives still have in her impartiality, and in her readiness to defend their interest against the aggressions of the white colonists, has been inspired during this earlier period. But whilst the mother country was thus sympathetic to the coloured subjects of the Empire, and was faithfully striving to discharge her duty towards them, the attitude of the white colonists as a whole—Britons as well as Boers—to these coloured subjects was that of hostility.

The natural feeling of strength to override weakness, of knowledge to override ignorance, of power to override impotence, and of wealth to override poverty, was fostered by the South African colonists in regard to the native in South Africa, till it crystallized into this general sentiment of hostility. And as an outcome of the hostility, wars upon the flimsiest pretexts are waged against the native; his lands are seized, proscriptive laws enacted against him, and the general trend of colonial practice is to hamper his progress, that, failing to be their peer, he may remain their slave. This being the mood of the colonist, any expression or deed of the mother country respecting the rights of the native, acting like an irritant upon his temper, would be hotly resented.

For the sensitiveness of the colonist upon the "native question" several reasons are responsible; among these reasons there is the love of ease. The native being always kept at the foot of the ladder, by withholding from him the stimuli to ambition and emulation, his services will be available to the colonists for the drudgery of colonial life. And included with this availableness of service is the advantage of cheapness.

Another and perhaps the most powerful reason for the resentful sensitiveness of the South African colonists to criticism against their attitude to the native is the numerical increase of the native ; for he is said to outnumber the whites in the proportion of eight to one. The whites thus argue that if they should equip the blacks with the weapons of competition and emulation, these, reinforced by the numerical strength of the blacks, would necessarily cause the ultimate transference, of power from the former to the latter. And so, that humane and just treatment of the blacks is incompatible with the supremacy of the whites. Thus the sentiment of the home country, which had been for the humane and just treatment of the natives, and the sentiment of the colonists, which, upon the ground that such treatment is incompatible with their supremacy, has been for the inhumane and unjust treatment of the natives, have stood in irreconcilable conflict ; for the difference between the mother country and the colonists concerning this matter was not upon the application of a principle, but upon the principle itself. Therefore before there could be a permanently harmonious co-operation between the mother country and the colony, one or other of the two parties upon this subject of the native must abandon its attitude.

Now, which side will make the surrender ? Which side is in the right and which is in the wrong ? Assuredly the mother country is in the right. Well, then, since she is in the right, it is the colony that must give way. But has the younger state given way to the older state, has the less responsible state given way to the more responsible state, has expediency given way to principle, has wrong given way to right ? No ! It is the other way ; it is the older state that has given way to the younger state, it is the more responsible that has given way to the less responsible, it is principle that has given way to expediency, it is right that has given way to wrong. Of this surrender let me give some examples. Concerning the late Anglo-Boer War, it was trumpeted from the platform, from the pulpit, and from the press—of both England and of South Africa—and of the press both religious and lay, that one of the reasons for the war was the improvement of the condition of the native.

It was in this sense that Mr. Chamberlain, the chief sponsor for that strife, addressing the House of Commons in October, 1899, said :—

“ We have talked of grievances, hitherto we have confined ourselves to the grievances of the whites. The House will bear in mind when we granted the Convention in 1884 we undertook the protection of the natives of the Transvaal. Those natives had been our subjects. They were the majority of the inhabitants, and we retroceded them to the Transvaal, the natives whom we had promised to protect. Had we kept our promise? Sir, the treatment of the natives of the Transvaal has been disgraceful, it has been brutal, it has been unworthy of a civilized Power. Why have we not complained? In 1896 I drafted a dispatch, and I sent it to Sir Hercules Robinson, and I instructed him to make representations to the Transvaal as to their conduct to Malaboch and other chiefs. Then the Raid came, and I had to telegraph instructions that that dispatch could not with propriety be presented at the time. That is the reason why I have not made complaints, and why there is therefore very little correspondence in the Blue Book about the native grievance; but do not think for a moment that we have at any time kept our promise to the native. We have heard a great deal about the Great Trek. . . . The Great Trek took place mainly and chiefly because, in the words of the Boers themselves, and you can prove it from their own language, they wanted to wallop their own ‘niggers.’ ”

In view of these broken pledges of the past, and in view of his present ill-treatment, his “brutal” ill-treatment—to which Mr. Chamberlain has referred—the native was now assured—in Great Britain and in South Africa—that by the war he would be made a free man. The only condition that was demanded of the native, as that which he should fulfil, in order to obtain the boon, was that he should witness the drama, not as an active, but as a passive spectator. It is unnecessary to say—since the fact is so well known—that on the part of the native this stipulation was observed to the very letter. Well, the tumult of war ended in the repose of peace. But where is the native? And where is the redemption that the war should bring him? It is changed into an indictment, and that indictment is preferred against him by an authority no less important than he by whom the words of the last quotation were uttered. This is the indictment:—

“ While every civilized nation in the world—and I include the people of India and other Asiatic communities—recog-

nizes the duty and obligation of labour, the African alone amongst the great races of the world has been taught by centuries of baneful experience that the only honourable employment for a man is fighting, that labour is the work of slaves. We have abolished slavery in theory, but I think it would surprise some of the philanthropists at home to hear that we are encouraging it in another form. The Kaffir goes to work at intervals ; like other people, he works for an object, but his object is to secure power of living in idleness ever after. He makes his money and buys what he calls a wife . . . who works to keep him in idleness."

For the offences which are mentioned in this quotation, the native, without being allowed to speak in his own defence, was penalized by a poll-tax of £2 per head.

And in the train of this penal policy—thus inaugurated against the native at the close of the war by the chief guarantor of the millennium upon which the native should then enter—there has since appeared, in the legislative acts passed by the Transvaal Government, a measure excluding the native as a voter from municipal and political elections. But these discriminating acts against the native have been so completely approved by the British people, that they form a part of the constitution which has since been granted to the Transvaal (1906) by the present Radical Government. Further, as we have noticed before, the proposal has also been made that the native should not own land except in the name of the Commissioner for Native Affairs.

In these remarks one thing which stands out in clear relief is that the South African native has not been fairly treated by the white colonist. And in connection with this fact, we have seen that the promise of amendment which was made to the native as one of the objects for which the war was undertaken has not only not been fulfilled, but that, if anything, the position of the native is now even worse than it was before the war. Now it will not be reasonably denied, I think, that in these facts there is a substantial cause for native discontent and for native "unrest." This being the case, one would naturally have expected that native "unrest" would at once have turned public attention to this substantial cause, with a view to its removal. But instead of such a straightforward and honourable course, what have we? We have



what is described in the following paragraphs, and that appeared in the daily press, on February the 12th, 1906.

“Natal Rising.—A punitive expedition, consisting of 320 Natal Carabineers and 80 artillerymen, with four guns, will leave here at noon, and a further contingent of 220 men to-morrow.”

“There is a talk of 30,000 British troops being sent out to Bloemfontein, ostensibly as a permanent training for young soldiers for India; but if there is any foundation for the rumour, the reason is that it may be necessary at any moment to be ready against a general rising of natives. It must come, sooner or later, because the richest lands are in the occupation of the natives, and on some pretext or another the white man will get them or perish in the attempt.”

13th of February.—“The real cause of the trouble is the freedom permitted to Ethiopian missionaries to spread their propaganda. The missionaries—though the word is a misnomer, for they should be called ‘intriguers’—are educated coloured men who come over from the States, and they preach the doctrine of equality. They go further, even; they preach that the absolute proprietorship of the land should be vested in the native. I have seen these Ethiopians, whose insolence is intolerable, swaggering along the side-walk in Durban to show that they disregard the law that forbids black men to walk on the pavement. It is a dangerous thing that the Ethiopians should be permitted to stir up the people as they do, and I think that the Government should take some measure to prohibit them entering South Africa.”

Lastly: “The Society” (the Aborigines Protection Society) “have already addressed a letter to Lord Elgin protesting against the poll-tax measure, which they point out imposes a tax of £1 per year upon all adult males in the colony, of whom about nine-elevenths are natives, in addition to the existing hut-tax of 17s. a year. They consider the imposition vexatious and unjust, especially in view of the fact that the South African Native Affairs’ Commission went no further than to recommend the raising of the hut-tax itself from 17s. to £1.”

These quotations tell us of an actual rising of natives in the Natal colony, and of a prospective general rising of natives in South Africa. They give us two causes as having produced the actual rising, viz. (a) Ethiopianism, and (b) the imposition of a poll-tax. They give us one cause that will produce the prospective rising, viz. the illegal seizure of native lands by

colonists. Lastly, they furnish us with the remedy that has been adopted for the actual rising, and the remedy that is likely to be adopted for the prospective rising. The remedy for the actual rising is the dispatch of troops to the affected area, and the remedy for the prospective general rising is the rumour of the quartering of 30,000 troops at Bloemfontein. Now of the two causes that are given with regard to the rising in Natal, which is true? Is Ethiopianism the cause, or is the poll-tax the cause? The memorial which was presented to Mr. Chamberlain during his visit to South Africa, three or four years ago, by the committee that was appointed by the South African Native Congress, and from which I have already made extracts in this volume, has this to say upon the subject of Ethiopianism:—

“The question of loyalty,” it proceeds to say, “raises the larger question of the indebtedness of the native races to the Government and people of Great Britain. How much is implied in the thought that out of the self-sacrificing faith of the Christian nations, foremost among whom are the people of the British Isles, the Gospel of Salvation has been brought to the people that sit in darkness and the shadow of death, cannot be adequately expressed. No mere words can describe the spiritual blessings brought by the messengers of peace and goodwill from the Church Catholic, in fulfilment of the Divine Commission.

“The strides which education and Christianity are making are giving rise to fresh impulses, and creating a demand for reforms in the religious and educative methods of the past; but the old conservatism looks askance at the movements generated by these impulses, both in church and mission field. Some of the clergy have failed in great part to catch the spirit of the times, and charges involving the loyalty of the people have been made, and being taken up by the anti-native Press, have been fully used to create suspicion and alarm. Doubtless much blame is attached to the conduct of unrestrained men taking upon themselves responsibilities for which many of them are eminently unfitted by character and culture, and entering the mission field as preachers and teachers when their knowledge is circumscribed. Thus complaints are rife of interference with vested interests, of the invasion of ecclesiasti-

cal rights, of trespassing within ministerial preserves, of setting up opposition churches and mission schools, of proselytizing parishioners, and in other ways creating schism and division amongst the churches. These church secessions are responsible for much bitterness, but as they have been interpreted as aiming at the eventual overthrow of the established authority of the Government and the white clergy, it would perhaps be well for us to emphasize the fact, as already explained to the Prime Minister of Cape Colony, that these movements are purely a matter concerning those churches affected, and have no anti-racial significance. The black races are too conscious of their dependence upon the white missionaries, and of their obligations towards the British race, and the benefits to be derived by their presence in the general control and guidance of the civil and religious affairs of the country, to harbour foolish notions of political ascendancy.

The idea is too palpably absurd to carry weight with well-informed minds, and tends to obscure the real issues and to injure the people as a class. The common law of the country is amply sufficient to protect the rights of the individual or the church."

In the autumn of 1905 I had the pleasure of meeting one of the members of the committee that presented the memorial to Mr. Chamberlain, and I found him to be a Christian gentleman and a scholar. My conversation with this gentleman on the topic of Ethiopianism has left no doubt whatever upon my mind concerning the truthfulness of the statement which is now quoted.

Here too are the words of the venerable Bishop Turner upon the same theme. Bishop Turner, if not the founder of the work that is being carried on in South Africa by his Church, visited South Africa in its interests, at its incipiency. And as a distinguished leader of his Church, he is known throughout the United States. Bishop Turner proceeds:—

"A full and satisfactory letter has just arrived from President Elder Mokone, of Pretoria, South Africa, which we could not publish, as private matters are in it, but he expresses both hope and fears for our Church in the Transvaal, South Africa. . . . If so many false rumours had not been set afloat about our connection with the politics of that country, we would be delighted to visit that section of our Church. How any one

could associate our name with antagonizing the interests of Great Britain in any portion of the globe is a mystery to us, when no man on earth has been more lavish in his compliments of that great nation than we have been, and have wished a thousand times that our government in the United States could pattern after her in her principles of justice and general equity.

“The African Methodist Episcopal Church” (the Church with which Bishop Turner is connected) “has been operating in Canada, in Bermuda, and several of the West India Islands for over fifty years, and no charge has ever been made against her or any of her prelates about meddling with politics or the interest of the British Government until here and late. We have no time to meddle with the affairs of nations, we can scarcely contribute our mite in helping to educate and Christianize the black race; then we would not say a word against the English Government if we could, for we know nothing to antagonize.”

The real truth about Ethiopianism is, that it teaches the native that he is a man. The atmosphere which surrounds the activities of the colourless man is so completely impregnated with the spirit of Caucasian superiority, that it would be a miracle if the missionary enterprise of the Caucasian should escape that influence. Such a miracle has not occurred, hence the missionary enterprise of the Caucasian, like all his other activities, is influenced by the spirit of Caucasian superiority. Upon the coloured races—which are the chief objects of Caucasian missionary enterprise—the effect of this influence is an unhealthy depreciation of themselves and an equally unhealthy exaltation of the colourless man.

Such an effect, in the highest sense, is demoralizing to both the coloured man and the colourless man; but in the lowest sense, it is indispensable to the marvellous pretensions of superiority of the colourless man. Therefore, as these pretensions and the interests they support, in this lowest sense, are the things that are most valued by the colourless man, and as Ethiopianism, by tending to give the native right views of himself and right views of the white man, threatens to destroy these pretensions and their debasing interests, it is tabooed and anathematized by the colourless man. From these facts, then, the facts that are contained in the last two quotations just given and the facts with respect to the real reason why

Ethiopianism is opposed, we may exclude Ethiopianism as being the cause of the native rising in Natal.

The other reason which is given is the imposition of a poll-tax of one pound upon the native, in addition to the previously existing hut-tax of seventeen shillings per annum. And this additional tax was against the recommendation of the South African Commission for Native Affairs. That it was the poll-tax which was responsible for the native disturbance in Natal is further supported by the following remarks of the "Natal Times" of the 27th of February, 1906:—

"In apportioning the blame for the present condition of native affairs in Natal," says the "Critic," "there appears to be a distinct desire on the part of the Government of that colony to burke inquiry. . . . That Ethiopianism does not savour of sweetness to those who have to deal with natives, I have no doubt; but if the imposition of the poll-tax is not the head and front of the offending, why is all reference to it so carefully avoided? The Hon. F. R. Moor finds himself in the rôle of Cassandra to-day. He was vehement in his opposition to the tax, and prophetic as to the results of its imposition."

But concerning the imposition of this poll-tax upon the natives of Natal, even if this precise information had not been given, I should have been prepared for the tax. And this upon the ground that since the Anglo-Boer War a similar tax has been imposed upon the natives of the Transvaal. And as for the immoderate weight of this tax, I need only point out how thoroughly it is in keeping with the mode of taxation in the Sierra Leone Protectorate, in India, and in the West Indies. Indeed, it is part of an economic system, and that system is taxation not according to property and representation, but according to race. Well then, relating to the native rising in Natal, I think that we have seen by the extracts that it is founded upon a real grievance. But what is the remedy that is prescribed? "A punitive expedition" of 320 Natal Carabineers and 80 artillerymen, and "tomorrow" "a further contingent of 220 men." The native is coerced into breaking the law, and then punished for breaking it. But in dealing with the native peoples the use of punitive expeditions in the British Empire is much too frequent. The British authorities appear to be quite oblivious of the fact that, like themselves, these peoples are rational beings. Behind

this rough palliative there lies the enactment of an oppressive tax, and behind that harsh enactment again there is the presence of accumulated wrongs. Therefore, it is the righting and the preventing of these wrongs that is the true remedy of native "unrest," and that is the true remedy of native "rising."

The parallel to this punitive expedition is the quartering of British troops at Bloemfontein in anticipation of a general native rising. This announcement, according to the extracts, is only a rumour, but it refers to events which are so familiar to British Empire that it may not be lightly dismissed. And the cause of this expected native rising will be the seizure of native lands—as has been frequently the case before—by the white colonists. Here then again a just grievance will have been caused to the natives. Indeed, the case of the native is not unlike that of a man whose valuables having excited the cupidity of burglars, they resolve to break into his house and plunder them. But suppose that in such a case the authorities had had information concerning the intention of the burglars. What object would determine their action? Would it not be to prevent the robbery? Could it be imagined that the detectives would aim at hiding themselves in the house of the possible victim of the robbery, in order to arrest him for assaulting the burglars?

But the massing of troops at Bloemfontein in order to shoot down the natives for defending their lands is, precisely what the Imperial Government, as it is constantly doing, intends again to do. Instead of concentrating troops at Bloemfontein in order to protect the bandits from the consequence of their guilt, the British Government should have taken measures to protect the natives from the rapacity of the bandits. But according to the present policy, when the colourless subject, coveting the property of the coloured subject, and gratifying the passion he proceeds to violence in order to obtain it, the British Government in inattention waits until the coloured subject in defence of his property moves on its behalf, then with agility and with a drawn sword it obstructs his advance. Thus in circumstances of the most flagrant aggression, punitive expeditions are the coloured subjects' only redress. And so, whereas in Natal a punitive expedition is sent to punish the blacks for breaking an extraordinary law, in Bloemfontein

troops are massed to defend the whites in their resolve to break an ordinary law.

And that this procedure is not sectional, but imperial, is borne out by the following statement that appeared in the daily press, on the 26th of January, 1906:—

“At a meeting of the executive of the West Indian Committee yesterday afternoon a letter was read from Lord Elgin, informing the Committee that a white force of artillery and engineers would be retained in Jamaica. . . . This would be in addition to a fast cruiser to be permanently stationed in the West Indies, which will also be visited annually by a cruiser squadron.”

I must remark in passing that the name “West Indian Committee” is mischievously misleading, for whereas according to its natural meaning it would seem to connote the existence of a committee that represents the interests of all classes of the British West Indies, according to its actual meaning, it denotes the existence of a committee that represents the interests of one class of the British West Indies against the interests of another class.

According to its merits, the name of this committee should be, The West Indian Planter Committee. The conditions—social, political, and economic—which by instancing of Jamaica (p. 123) I have endeavoured to show as those that generally prevail throughout the British West Indies, have created between the plutocracy and the peasantry a feeling of latent hostility. The former of these two classes being aware that from the days of slavery onward it has systematically oppressed the latter class, and being also aware that it is overwhelmingly outnumbered by those whom it has oppressed, lives in fear of reprisals by them. And owing to this fear of the peasantry, the plutocracy seeks instinctively to entrench itself behind the protection of armed force. Thus should any circumstance at any time threaten to precipitate, or actually precipitate, a conflict between itself and the peasantry—a conflict, however, that tact, patience, and self-control could have averted—having the British press always ready to place its case favourably before the British public however bad that case may be; having also the resources of the British army and navy at its command, it—the plutocracy—incon-

tinently turns these resources against the defenceless peasantry. Such are the circumstances and such the reasons that have called forth Lord Elgin's letter.

The cause of the present paroxysm by which the British West Indian plutocrat has been seized, and which has led his vigilant committee to move that his body-guard may be increased, is the riot in British Guiana in 1905. During this outbreak, I am credibly informed, Negroes were shot down, one for merely brandishing a cutlass, another for throwing a stone, and others for no offence whatever. The authorities, panic-stricken, commanded the police to fire upon the people, when milder measures had been enough. The Governor promised that under the direction of the Chief Justice, Sir Henry Bovell, an exhaustive inquiry would be made into the cause of the riot. But in its fulfilment, this promise of an exhaustive inquiry under the presidency of the Chief Justice shrank into the investigation of a coroner's inquest, under the presidency of junior magistrate. Nor was even this court—so greatly circumscribed in its function—free from the taint of jobbery. For its approaches, bristling with maxim guns, were also patrolled by armed sailors. And so, how many witnesses were there who, although able and willing to give evidence of what they had seen, would have been sufficiently enthusiastic to encounter these armed barriers? Nor was there even any special invitation issued to the people to come and state what they knew about the riot. Whereas, by his questions to the few witnesses that were present at the court, as well as his address to the jury—in which was indicated the verdict they should give—the Attorney General appeared more like one who held a brief for the Government, than an official of the Government who, in order that it might arrive at a just decision concerning a most important public matter, sought for facts. But what matters it; these people who have thus been mowed down like grass, are they not only blacks? So, in the cases of both the civilized Negro of the West Indies and of the savage Negro of Natal, that is to say, in the case of all the coloured subjects of the British Empire whom these two places represent, the settling of misunderstanding is by artillery, carabineers, and engineers, or, in a word, it is by force.

But what have we been observing about South Africa?



We have observed that the native of South Africa has a just grievance; a grievance of which the existence has been acknowledged by the colonists of South Africa and the people of Great Britain; that he has a chronic grievance, a grievance that time, rather than diminishing, has increased. We have observed further that before and during the Anglo-Boer War, lavish and reiterated promises were made to the native by Englishmen at home and by the British section of the South African colonists, that as a result of the war this grievance would be redressed. Still further, we have observed that notwithstanding these promises, and to the promisee, notwithstanding the favourable termination of the war, which was to have been to the native a veritable cornucopia, the natives' lot is now declared to be worse than it was before the war. Here, then, is a cause—a monstrous deception—and so, a substantial cause for unrest among the natives.

But even this substantial cause is not all that we have observed, for in addition, we have noticed that an oppressive poll-tax of £1 had been imposed upon the native, besides his original hut-tax of 17s. Thus, if the former grievance of the native were a sufficient cause for any unrest that might have appeared among them, how much more is that cause increased when this poll-tax is added. Yet is it this increased and most strikingly apparent cause which is officially given, by both the colonial and English press, as that which accounts for the present unrest among the natives? No! What is it then that is said to have produced this unrest? It is Ethiopianism. Thus, in the same way as the true cause of Indian famine, viz. extreme poverty, the result of excessive taxation is obscured by the false plea of "over-population" and "deficient rainfall," and in the same way as the true cause of the comparative backwardness of the coloured British subject, viz. lack of opportunity, is obscured by the false plea of natural incapacity, so here we have the true cause of native discontent, "unrest," or "native rising," viz. tyranny, oppression, and deception, obscured by the false plea of Ethiopianism.

I have now furnished the examples which would bear out my assertion that instead of the colonists abandoning their unjust attitude towards the native races, in imitation of the juster attitude of the mother country towards those races,

it is the mother country that has abandoned her juster attitude towards the native races, in imitation of the unjust attitude of the colonists towards those races. Thus we have seen that the mother country, in common with the colonists, after solemnly promising to the natives that at the close of the war they should receive better treatment, deliberately repudiated her pledges when the time for their fulfilment arrived. That in common with the colonists, the mother country did not only thus deliberately break her engagement to the native that the war should secure to him better treatment, but in deference to the colonists (the mine-owners), she has forced the natives of the Transvaal, by means of a penal poll-tax, into the mines; and that to all her coloured subjects of that colony, although they contribute a large proportion to the general revenue—the taxes which the natives of Cape Colony, the Transvaal, the Orange River Colony, Basutoland, and Natal contribute being £700,000 per annum—she has consented to deny to them electoral rights, civil and political. Further, we have seen that after breaking her plighted word to the native, and remaining passive when the colonists further oppress him with an irritating tax, a tax that goads him into breaking the law, the mother country dispatches, or was ready to dispatch, troops to slaughter the native. Lastly, we have seen that this abandonment of principle in the treatment of the native races of the Empire is not sectional, but Imperial. Thus has England, concerning the native, surrendered the right of her former policy, for the wrong of colonial policy, thus has she relinquished the noble policy of principle, for the ignoble policy of expediency.

But why such a surrender? Because the colonists are stronger than the native. Race has had little, if anything, to do with the surrender, for if the strength which is possessed by the colonists had been possessed by the natives, and the weakness of the natives had been possessed by the colonists, the mother country had most probably made to the native the same surrender that she has made to the colonists. Primarily, therefore, this surrender is the surrender of principle to power. It is the case of a very strong boy, whom we will call A, a moderately strong boy whom we will call B, and a weak little boy whom we will call C. B wishes to possess C's marbles; he has no right to them, but

coveting them, and having the strength to obtain them by force, he essays to do so. Against great odds, little C pluckily defends his property. During the contest, A arrives upon the scene. Ascertaining the cause of the strife, at first he is indignant and scandalized at B's avarice and poltroonery. And so he begins to defend little C against his ungallant foe; but reflecting that as B is the stronger of the combatants his friendship might be useful at some future time, A at once changes his attitude, and joins B in maltreating C. This, then, viz. the uncompromising attitude of the white colonial states of the Empire, is the second cause of Britain's change of policy towards her coloured colonial states. We pass now to the consideration of the third, or last cause, that is, Anglo-American friendship.

The third cause of Britain's change of policy concerning the coloured states of the Empire, viz. friendship with the United States, has two conditions. These two conditions are not unlike those which we have noticed under the head of South Africa; for, like the South African conditions, they too are an irreconcilable attitude and an abject surrender. Under the topic of South Africa we saw that originally the attitude of the mother country with regard to the coloured races was more or less—and at least in intention—that of just treatment; but that the attitude of the colonists, then, as well as now, toward these coloured races has been on the whole that of unjust treatment. We saw also that this difference of attitude between the mother country and the colonies, regarding the treatment of the coloured races, was fundamental and irreconcilable, that as such it was inimical to an harmonious cooperation of the two sides, and that its removal was practicable only by the abandonment of the character of its native policy by one or other of these sides. Of course the position of the mother country in regard to the character of its native policy was right, while the position of the colonists in regard to the character of their native policy was wrong. Therefore one would have expected that the colonies would have yielded up their wrong position in favour of the right position of the mother country. But we have seen that as a matter of fact it was not the colonies that surrendered their unjust native policy for the juster native policy of the mother country, but that it was the mother country that surrendered its

juster native policy for the unjust native policy of the colonies.

Similarly, the attitude of England and the United States with regard to the treatment of the coloured races was as divergent as was the attitude of England and her white colonies. And this divergence between England and the United States rested upon the same grounds as that between England and her white colonies ; viz. on the one side the juster treatment of the coloured races, and on the other side the unjust treatment of these races. Thus the same irreconcilable attitude that originally characterized the native policy of England and the native policy of her white colonies also characterized the native policy of England and the native policy of the United States. Hence, as in the former case, a complete harmony of sentiment between England and America could be practicable only by one or the other nation abandoning its position in regard to the coloured races. And here again the same spectacle which we witnessed between England and South Africa is repeated concerning England and the United States. The attitude of the United States has been unjust, the attitude of England has been comparatively just, but, as in the case of South Africa, England surrendered her juster position for the unjust position of America. And what might be called the official declaration of the surrender of England's former policy in favour of the policy of the United States, with respect to the treatment of the coloured races, was made by the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, who was then Secretary of State for the Colonies, in a memorable speech in May, 1898.

After avowing that the position of England was to be that of "isolation," and after urging the drawing together of the different parts of the Empire into a closer union, as the first accompaniment of its isolation, Mr. Chamberlain proceeds as follows to enunciate the second accompaniment of England's isolation :—

"It is to establish and to maintain bonds of permanent unity with our kinsmen across the Atlantic. They are a powerful and generous nation. They speak our language, they are bred of our race. Their laws, their literature, their standpoint upon every question are the same as ours ; their feeling, their interest in the cause of humanity and the peaceful development of the world are identical with ours. I do

not know what the future has in store for us. I do not know what arrangements may be possible with us, but this I know and feel, that the closer, the more cordial, the fuller, and the more definite those arrangements are, with the consent of both peoples, the better it will be for both and for the world. And I even go so far as to say that, terrible as war may be, even war itself would be cheaply purchased if in a great and noble cause the Stars and Stripes and the Union Jack should wave together over an Anglo-Saxon alliance."

The following demonstration is a striking result of Mr. Chamberlain's declaration, for at the time of its occurrence the Anglo-American alliance was being vociferously boomed.

One evening in the summer of 1899, I think it was, passing through a certain street in London, my attention was arrested by certain startling headlines that appeared upon the news-boards. However, owing to the fact that in the afterpart of the day it is not quite unusual for news to be announced by harbingers of this class, I was led, I suppose, soon to forget the portents. But in the morning of the next day I noticed that upon the news-boards the headlines which had relieved those of the previous evening were of a character no less sensational than they. Of these headlines the subjoined were their tenor: "The Black Scandal," "The Black Peril," "Nemesis," "The Black Menace," etc. Suspecting that some national crisis had arisen, I was now thoroughly alarmed; for it appeared to me that nothing less momentous could have sufficed to lash the London press into this frenzy of commotion. My utter amazement, therefore, may be imagined when, upon reading the newspapers that forenoon I discovered that nothing more extraordinary, that nothing more calamitous had occurred than that a black man had married a white woman. At this spectacle of the great London press, or rather of a lion in hot pursuit after a flea, how I recalled those words that were once so familiar to Englishmen, "We know no man by his colour." But, as I have observed already, at the time of the marriage that called forth this tumultuous and unseemly outcry, the advocacy of an Anglo-American alliance was upon the very crest of the wave. Surely, then, to whomsoever an Anglo-American alliance had been a boon, to the coloured races it had been a bane. As is the case with not a few marriages in these days, the marriage of Lobenguela—the bridegroom of the

marriage to which I have just alluded—ended in the divorce court. And the court, during the trial, was reported to have remarked about the petitioner to the suit, that “This woman has chosen to marry a savage, and now she is sorry for it.” In this case the proof of the defendant’s savagery—according to the evidence that was given before the court—consisted in the cruel and even brutal treatment of his wife; for he had struck and had kicked her. But on the selfsame day—the 28th of January, 1902—that the report of Lobenguela’s ill-treatment of his wife appeared in the papers, there appeared also the following analogous case, in which an Englishman had ill-treated his fiancée.

Thus we read :—

“Before Mr. Plowden, at Marylebone, was an ex-soldier, named William Parsons, aged twenty-five, who . . . was charged with assaulting Harriet Anne Cooke . . . and also with assaulting John Blades, a young man living at the same address, and a police-constable named Carter. . . . The prosecutrix, Miss Cooke, who had a bad black eye and a nasty wound on her forehead, said that the prisoner was her sweetheart, and that they had been engaged about nine months. On Saturday night he went with her to do the marketing, and all went happily as could be until they reached her home, when they had a few words about a certain woman, and he, losing his temper, struck her several blows on the forehead, stunning her. She verily believed he intended to kill her, for he had frequently threatened her.”

So, then, if we take the remarks which the court made upon Lobenguela’s case, and the statement which is given in the news of the police court about this case of this Englishman, we get these two syllogisms :

All men who ill-use their wives or sweethearts are savages.

Some black men ill-use their wives or sweethearts.

Ergo, some black men are savages. Again :

All men who ill-use their wives or sweethearts are savages.

Some white men ill-use their wives or sweethearts.

Ergo, no white men are savages.

I give these two examples, not only as the kind of reasoning that supports the stricture which the court passed upon Lobenguela, but as the kind also that supports the arguments that we have already traversed, in both the present and previous volumes.

As an obeisance to the Euro-American gallery, in pursuance of Anglo-American friendship—the substitute for an Anglo-American alliance—the next instance to which I shall allude occurs in the review of an Afro-American magazine by an Englishman :—

“The October–November number of this magazine,” the reviewer proceeds, “has been sent to us for review. We understand it to be one of the organs of the negro race in the United States of America. It is published in Philadelphia. Somehow the tone and contents of this magazine will be likely to grate on the sensibilities of most members of the — Society, who are genuinely interested in the future of the negro race. The ideas therein advocated seem to be out of harmony—as indeed is most American culture—with the real capabilities and destiny of the negro.”

I have now come to two eminent men, both of whom, in literature as well as in politics, fill distinguished places. I refer to the Right Hon. John Morley, M.P., and the Right Hon. James Bryce, who is now the British Ambassador to Washington. Of Mr. Morley I will quote from a speech which he delivered before his constituency in January, 1905 ; and of Mr. Bryce I will quote from his Romanes Lecture, entitled, “The Relations of the Advanced and the Backward Races of Mankind,” which was delivered at Oxford in 1902.

With reference to Mr. Morley, after he had spoken of the relation between capital and labour in the United States, he was reported to have continued thus :—

“Another serious, suggestive, and apparently almost insoluble problem in the United States was the enormous multiplication and gradual advance northward of the freed black population of the South. If that movement went on there might at the end of this century be a population of something like sixty millions or eighty millions of coloured people in the United States. This was retribution that followed wrong. What, did it come from Africa ? Africans were brought into the Southern States to work the land. . . . People might have to wait even fifty years or a hundred years before heaven sent the bill ; but what sort of eventual harvest could be expected when the foundations of a state were laid upon an inferior civilization ” ?

“The ideas therein advocated seem to be out of harmony—as indeed is most American culture—with the real capa-

bilities of the negro." . . . "What sort of eventual harvest could be expected when the foundations of a state were laid upon an inferior civilization ? "

This statement of the reviewer of the Afro-American magazine, and this question with which the quotation ends, that is taken from Mr. Morley's speech, are of one meaning, that is to say, they both imply that the American Negro is unfit to cooperate on terms of equality with the Euro-American in the common work of their national progress. But whilst these two Englishmen have thus discoursed about the Afro-American, the following is what the Euro-American has related about him :—

"The study of the negro population of the United States recently published by the Census Bureau " (says the " Philadelphia Sunday Post ") "discloses some facts that show clearly that the coloured race is steadily developing a complete social and industrial system of its own. There is hardly a branch of industry in which negroes are unrepresented, and that statement includes women as well as men. A large city could be founded without a single white man in it, and yet lack no trade or profession. It is noteworthy that the proportion of self-supporting negroes is much larger than that of self-supporting whites. Of all over ten years old, 84·1 per cent of the coloured males and 40·7 per cent of the coloured females are engaged in occupations for gain, against 79·5 per cent of the white males and 16 per cent of white females similarly occupied " (vol. i., p. 263).

Now this testimony, as I have said, is that of the Euro-American concerning the Afro-American, nor is it a testimony that is devoid of proof, for it is founded upon the authority of official data ; it is founded, as we are told, upon the report of the Census Bureau of the United States. Under these circumstances, therefore, we are bound to attach greater weight to the evidence of the Euro-American witness than to the evidence of the two Englishmen, and this even though one of these witnesses upon other grounds is so eminently qualified. Well, upon the data furnished by the United States Census Bureau, what does the Euro-American relate about the Afro-American? Among other things he relates " that there is hardly a branch of industry in which negroes are unrepresented ; that this fact refers not only to men, but also to women." Such a statement is striking enough, yet it is not all, for the witness proceeds to



make the more striking statement—after enumerating the different industries, trades, professions, etc., in which Negroes are engaged, and the number of Negroes that follow each pursuit—that “a large city could be founded” by Negroes, “without a single white man in it, and yet lack no trade or profession.”

And in the concluding part of the quotation this Euro-American witness, with his statement still resting upon the authority of official records, rises to the climax of his evidence by declaring “that the proportion of self-supporting negroes is much larger than that of the self-supporting whites,” giving, at the same time, the figures that sustain this last statement. Now, in all seriousness—for it is a most serious matter, seeing that in it the happiness of millions of human beings is involved—I ask whether the civilization of these Negroes who could found “a large modern city,” built and equipped, can be justly and truthfully described—as Mr. Morley has described it—as an inferior civilization, upon which, if the foundations of a state were laid, disaster to that state would be the result? Or again, I would ask whether the civilization of these Negroes who could found “a large,” modern “city,” built and equipped, can be justly and truthfully described as the English reviewer of the *Afro-American* magazine has described it, as being out of harmony with American culture?

And why should Mr. Morley have designated the “enormous multiplication and gradual advance northwards of the freed black population of the south” as a “serious, suggestive, and apparently almost insoluble problem”? A problem is a matter which is difficult of solution, or settlement; or it is a question whose issue involves doubt. With this definition, then, before our minds, can a problem, in the case of the Afro-American, be candidly said to exist? Given a people that has so completely assimilated Euro-American culture that it could build and equip “a large,” modern “city,” without the presence of a Euro-American, a people whose power of self-support surpasses that of the Euro-American twenty-eight times, concerning such a people, can a problem at all, much less a “serious, suggestive, and apparently almost insoluble problem,” be truthfully said to exist? Until now, since his freedom, or rather his semi-freedom, had the coloured American remained impervious to the influences of progress around him,

had he shown no capacity for adjusting himself to the results of that progress, much less for contributing to its onward march, then, the description of his position by Mr. Morley, as a problem, had been justified, but, since the opposite fact is the case, Mr. Morley's description is not justified.

It is upon economic grounds, and upon those grounds alone (I venture to think), that a reasonable apprehension could be felt about the migration of the coloured American—if that migration be abnormal—from the south to the north. Such an apprehension, however, in order to be free from the reproach of insincerity, must first have impelled those who profess to share it to the endeavour to remove the causes of which the abnormal migration of these citizens of colour from the south to the north is the result. But I perceive that it is not upon economic grounds that Mr. Morley is apprehensive of the exodus of the Afro-American from the south to the north. The grounds upon which the apprehension of this statesman rests, with regard to this migration, are, I believe, these, that as representing an inferior civilization, the migration coming into contact with the superior civilization of the North—which is the stronghold of Euro-American civilization—tends to corrupt and to enervate that civilization, that thereby it tends to destroy the superior Euro-American civilization. But is such a view borne out by the description which the Euro-American has given of the civilization of the Afro-American? By stating that the Afro-American alone could build and furnish a large, modern city, the description of the Euro-American has proved the fact that the civilization of the Afro-American is not antagonistic to, but is identical with his own civilization.

Is Mr. Morley's view, then, borne out by this description and proof of the Euro-American? I venture to say that it is not, and I venture to add that by this description and proof of the Euro-American Mr. Morley's view is discredited and falsified. A national question should be looked at from a national, rather than from a racial standpoint. And looked at from the former standpoint, "the enormous multiplication of the black population"—a population that is capable of building and equipping "a large," modern "city," without the aid of the colourless man—a population, moreover, whose power of self-support is greater than that of the other section of the community—is rather a cause for exultation than for apprehension.

For the national power, by such a "multiplication," is enhanced. In a speech to his constituency in October, 1905, Mr. Morley was reported to have said:—

"He thought that what was called efficiency would not bring them the millennium. He wished to speak with all respect of efficiency, but it was not a principle. It was a catchword. He would not take efficiency as the kind of maxim that a free, democratic, self-governing community should imitate and cherish. What was wanted was not efficiency in Whitehall, but will and driving power, and that could only come from *a resolute and determined adherence in the minds and hearts of the people of the country to those claims of humanity, justice, and freedom which marked the difference between the progressive countries and countries that were not progressive.*"<sup>1</sup>

By his pronouncement respecting the migration of the Afro-American from the south to the north, and respecting the character of the civilization of the Afro-American, Mr. Morley has virtually endorsed the method of treatment which the Euro-American metes out to the Afro-American. But is that method of treatment according to the claims of humanity, justice, and freedom? Upon what is that treatment professed to be founded? Upon the natural superiority of the colourless American and the natural inferiority of the coloured American. But if without the Euro-American the Afro-American could build and furnish a large city, and if his power of self-support is greater than the self-support of the Euro-American—as the Euro-American himself has declared to be the case—is the superiority of the Euro-American to the Afro-American established? Then, is Mr. Morley's endorsement of the pretended superiority of the Euro-American in accordance with justice?

Once more, Mr. Morley must have known that the race question in America on which he had taken sides affected the happiness of millions of American citizens, and that, owing to his position as a distinguished statesman and man of letters, his attitude on the question would tend either to encourage or to discourage the antipathy—the baseless and criminal antipathy—which the question had bred in the minds of the other section of American citizens against these millions of American citizens.

<sup>1</sup> The italics are the author's.

From the erroneous, though popular, view which Mr. Morley espouses, it is evident that he has taken sides upon this burning question without having first examined it. Is his conduct, therefore, in accordance with that justice which he advocates?

We pass now to the Right Hon. James Bryce. On the subject of the collisions and strifes that are likely to arise when advanced peoples come into contact with peoples that are less advanced, Mr. Bryce proceeds to say (The Romanes Lecture, p. 34) :—

“Where the contact already exists a further question arises : Can the evils incident to it be mitigated through leading the advanced and the backward races to blend by intermarriage, a method slow but sure, and one by which many nations have been brought to unity and strength out of elements originally hostile? This is a question which Nature usually answers, settling the matter by the attractions or repulsions she implants. Yet legislation may so far affect it as to make it deserve to be pondered by those who are confronted by such a problem. We have already noted that races which are near one another in physical aspect and structure tend to mix, and that the race produced by their mixture is equal or superior to either of the progenitors. We have also noted that where races are dissimilar in aspect, and especially in colour, one at least is generally repelled by the other, so that there is little admixture by intermarriage. This is more plainly the case as regards whites (especially North European whites) and blacks than it is as regards other races.

“We have further been led to conclude, though more doubtfully, for the data are imperfect, that the mixture of races very dissimilar, and especially of European whites with blacks, tends rather to lower than to improve the stock. That it should be lower than the higher progenitor seems natural. But does it show a marked improvement upon the inferior progenitor? May not the new mixed race stand, not halfway between the two parent stocks, but nearer the lower than the higher? Should this view be correct, it dissuades any attempt to mix races so diverse as are the white Europeans and the negroes. The wisest men among the coloured people of the Southern States of America do not desire the intermarriage of their race with the whites. They prefer to develop it as a separate people, on its own lines, though, of course, by the help of the whites. The negro race in America is not wanting

in intelligence. It is fond of learning. It has already made a considerable advance. It will cultivate self-respect better by standing on its own feet than by seeking blood alliances with whites, who would usually be of the meaner sort."

In his pursuance of the subject of contact between the "Advanced and Backward Races," Mr. Bryce has arrived at conclusions that are unfavourable to intermarriages between the black and white races. In the next volume of this work, viz. the third volume, I hope to deal fully with the subject of intermarriage; then the opportunity will be taken to review Mr. Bryce's arguments in this lecture relative to the subject. Accordingly I shall content myself at present by remarking in the first place that the United States is the example upon which Mr. Bryce has based his conclusion against intermarriages between black and white; and by remarking in the next place that Mr. Bryce is by no means certain about the data with which his example is supposed to be furnished. With respect to Mr. Bryce's example, viz. the United States, I would say that there the question of all questions is the so-called "race question." This question, therefore, which looms so largely before the national imagination must be regarded as being of the most extreme importance. And because of this extreme importance of the question, any arguments that are adduced in order that they might one way or another contribute to its settlement should have as their irreducible minimum the support of facts. Well, in his lecture from which I have reproduced the above paragraph, Mr. Bryce has made a contribution to this "race question" in the United States, which must be considered as important. However, the importance of the contribution centres not in its subjective, but in its objective relation. In other words, it is not the character of this contribution, but the character of the contributor that gives it its importance. For it is the contribution of a philosophic historian and of an eminent statesman.

On these grounds, then, and because of these grounds, the pronouncement of Mr. Bryce upon this omnipotent and omnipresent "race question," the question that bulks so large in the public mind of America, will have had great influence upon the opinion of the country. Knowing that such an effect is inseparable from his commanding position, one would have ex-

pected—as one had the right to expect—that Mr. Bryce would be determined that his pronouncement should be the result of ascertained facts. But upon what sort of data has our eminent authority based his far-reaching assertions concerning this most momentous question? Listen! “We have been led to conclude,” he says, “though more doubtfully, for the data are imperfect, that the mixture of races very dissimilar,” etc. So that this popular authority has essayed to influence the public opinion of the English-speaking peoples, and particularly the Euro-American section, by means of data which he affirms to be “imperfect.”

The foisting of doubtful and “imperfect” data upon a community may be permissible when the subject which is treated is not of grave import. In that case the dubiety and imperfection of the data may be permissible, either because the discussion is purely academic, or because no reliable data are available. But should the subject be gravely important—as, for example, a subject which involves the peace or the dispeace of a nation—then the foisting of doubtful and “imperfect” data cannot either on academic ground, or on the ground of the unavailability of reliable data, be permissible. For, in the first place, a subject of such seriousness admits of no academic discussion; in the second place, where there are no reliable data available, such a subject enjoins the observance of silence until reliable data should be procured.

But if a gravely serious subject which is founded upon doubtful and “imperfect” data (upon data, however, which alone were available) is intolerant of discussion, on account of the imperfection of its data, then how much more intolerant must discussion be to such a subject when in place of imperfect data, perfect data were available.

That Mr. Bryce, then, should have undertaken to discuss a subject of such grave seriousness as the “race question” of the United States by means of data that are doubtful and “imperfect” is a moral crime, a moral crime of which the heinousness, rather than being diminished, is increased by the confession that the author has reached his conclusion “more doubtfully,” because his data are imperfect. For among his race, the average reader, with his strong bias towards the conclusions at which Mr. Bryce has arrived, will not be deterred by this feeble qualification from pressing his conclusions to their

widest limits. What would be said of the man who in the darkness of night lures vessels to disaster upon the rocks by means of false lights? And what should be said of the statesman and historian who, to the peril of a nation writhing in the darkness of prejudice, passion, and ignorance—regarding a question of the most vital importance—hoists the false lights of doubtful and “imperfect” facts?

But in this matter—as will be perceived—Mr. Bryce’s action and the action of Mr. Morley are alike. Contrary to what one has a right to expect of them, as men of probity, as men of disciplined intellects, as men who are accustomed to examine, to sift, and to weigh facts, particularly facts of history, they have pronounced upon a national question,—against which, in relentless fury, and with the fiercest animosity, storms of passion dash themselves—the one contrary to ascertained facts, the other upon doubtful and “imperfect” facts.

Thus by the great weight of their authority these two distinguished men support and stimulate the excesses of an irrational, an ungoverned, and an ignoble prejudice. But upon what theory might this deplorable lapse of these two eminent men be explained? Upon the theory of Anglo-American friendship. By means, then, of this theory we are able to harmonize the procedures of Mr. Morley and Mr. Bryce, with the critique of the Afro-American magazine by the English reviewer, and these with the immoderate and hollow outcry of the London press against Lobenguela’s marriage; these, again, with the protest of the “Spectator” against the entertaining of Mr. Booker Washington by President Roosevelt; and these, again, with the commiseration of the “Daily Telegraph” towards the Euro-American in his troubles about the “negro problem”; and further we are able to harmonize all these with that change whereby Englishmen who were wont to say, “We know no man by his colour,” now say, “It is hard in any circumstances for the white man to regard the black without a touch of contempt.”

And the theory of Anglo-American friendship having harmonized these diverse instances is itself established by them as their cause. Further, Anglo-American friendship, as we have seen before, is analogous to Anglo-colonial friendship. And as the latter is governed by the rule of the fittest to help—

the rule which I illustrated by the conduct of A, the biggest boy, who out of consideration for the service that B, the lesser boy, might render him, joined B to maltreat little C—so also must the former be governed by that rule. Thereby, as the friendship of the Euro-American would be more useful to England than the friendship of the Afro-American would be, abandoning her former position with respect to the nature of the dispute that exists between the two American sections, England takes the side of the stronger against the weaker. Thus is Anglo-American friendship a cause of England's change of policy towards the coloured races. Therefore the causes of England's change of policy towards the coloured races of the Empire, or the reason why England has abandoned the spirit as well as the letter of her proclamation of 1858, and her declaration of 1865, are primarily three—the desire to exploit these races, the desire to have the support of the white colonies, and the desire to have the friendship of the Euro-Americans.



## XI

# Upon the Empire, the Effects of Britain's Present Policy

### (a) DEMORALIZATION AND DEVITALIZATION

**E**QUALLY as important are the effects of Britain's change of policy concerning the coloured races of the Empire as are the causes of that change of policy. Accordingly, we now pass to the consideration of this subject, viz. the effects of Britain's change of policy concerning coloured British subjects. A unique and most significant Blue Book was issued in March, 1906, by the Board of Works Department of His Majesty's Government. The subject of the Blue Book is the census of the British Empire, that is to say: an Empire that embraces a fourth of the entire globe and a third of the human race. Therefore, it is not a cause for surprise that the compilation of this singular record—apart from the South African War which delayed its progress—should have occupied several years. Well, the huge mass of humanity, which is brought before us by the Imperial census, may be divided politically into two sections.

One of these sections being the governing peoples, and the other section being the governed peoples, a most striking if not the most striking fact, in connection with these two sections of peoples, is the enormous disparity that there is between their sizes. Thus the number of the governing class is 54 millions, while the number of the governed class is 344 millions. Now, as to this overwhelming majority that forms the governed class, the following facts with respect to their entrance into the Empire have been expressed and implied in the first volume of this work, and in the earlier part of the present volume. First of all there is the contract which the parent state voluntarily entered into with the coloured daugh-

ter states, the contract that is embodied in the proclamation of 1858 and in the Parliamentary minute of 1865, the contract by which the parent state undertook to prepare these daughter states for self-government, and by which she engaged that in the meantime these daughter states, in all the pursuits of life, should be given equal opportunity with the parent state. Then there is the fact that the coloured races which constitute the enormous majority of the British Empire have entered it through the doors of slavery, of friendly treaties that were concluded with native rulers, or through the door of conquests that were made by the hegemonical state. Force is therefore the direct or indirect instrument by which these peoples have been brought into the Empire.

Passing into the Empire through the doors of "friendly treaties," or war, or slavery, these coloured subjects have taken with them great possessions of territory. And these territories form a very large part of the Empire. The coloured subjects that entered the Empire by the door of slavery have by purchase acquired the lands which they occupy. The coloured states that have been incorporated with the British Empire through friendly treaties or war, have been either indifferently organized at the time of the incorporation, or have been unorganized. But whether indifferently organized, or entirely unorganized, these states after their absorption into the Empire have all been organized on the model of the hegemonical state. For the maintenance of their political, economic, and social life, these coloured communities which have thus been organized, require thousands of public officials, and these officials are drawn almost exclusively from the hegemonical state.

Besides, after the expiration of their terms of service, which vary according to climatic conditions, these officials retire upon pensions that are provided from the funds of the governments that they served. Therefore, in salaries and pensions alone, the tribute which is paid by these coloured states to the hegemonical state, is very large. But in addition to this, these coloured states, as markets, absorb a considerable part of the surplus manufactures of the parent state. And through their railway systems, and their telegraphic and telephonic plants, etc., by providing interest upon the capital that is invested in these enterprises—capital which is held in the

hegemonical state—they afford a profitable, and at the same time a safe field for speculative ventures.

Again, by the protection which their commodious harbours give to the ships of the Imperial fleet, by their support of the garrisons that are billeted upon them—European as well as native—and by the coaling-stations, dockyards, etc., that they supply, these coloured states make to the defence of the Empire a liberal and substantial contribution. But since these native states, in all that appertain to their statuses—civil, political, and commercial—as civilized communities, are kept up wholly by their coloured inhabitants, it will be readily perceived, that in official salaries and pensions, in dividends on railways and other securities, in the maintenance of garrisons, and the support of barracks, dockyards, and coaling-stations, they must pay directly and indirectly to the mother country an annual tribute of a very high figure. And for the vast annual payments which these coloured states thus make to the parent state, what do they receive in return? They receive protection of life and property, educational advantages—more or less perfect, but on the whole less rather than more—and instruction in the Christian faith.

But we have also seen, in the case of India, that her native industries have been deliberately destroyed, in order that they might be supplanted by British industries. That although there are thousands of native Indians, graduates of colleges and universities, and among them some of the brightest intellects that might be found anywhere, yet these men are almost entirely excluded from the great bulk of the higher public offices of their country. In this latter respect, we have noticed the same exclusion in regard to South Africa, in regard to West Africa—whose medical service none now may enter but persons of “European parentage,”—and in regard to all the branches of the services of the British army and navy.

Further, in the British West Indies, we have seen what we likewise saw in British India, and in British East, West, and South Africa—namely, a lamentable deficiency in primary education. Agriculturally, we have noticed concerning these colonies, dependencies, and protectorates that notwithstanding the illimitable possibilities which a rich soil and a bountiful climate have conferred upon them, to-day they linger at the stage of primitive culture. Politically we have seen that

whereas free institutions have been sedulously withheld from almost all of these coloured states, from two of the very few of them that were given this boon, that is, Malta and Jamaica, it has been summarily withdrawn. That as regards land, the policy of the hegemonical state towards the peoples of the coloured states has been to deprive those of their lands who have lands, and to prevent those who are without lands from acquiring lands. That at the same time the native peoples of all these states are bound in the fetters of a tyrannous system of taxation. Socially, too, we have observed that the governing peoples of the Empire, divesting themselves of those obligations of courtesy and respect that man owes to man, and silencing the sentiments of friendship and esteem as responses to the appeals of intellect and character, are intent upon humiliating and degrading the governed peoples. And so, although the governed observe to them these obligations with punctilious deliberation they do not scruple to assail these victims with the vilest slander, the bitterest taunts, and the coarsest abuse.

We thus have, as it were, a triangle, of which one angle is represented by the voluntary compact entered into by England with the coloured states of the Empire, to the effect that like the white subordinate states they would be trained for self-government, and that in the interval they should enjoy the rights of equal opportunity. Of which, another angle is represented by the manner in which these coloured states have fulfilled their portion of the compact—the fulfilment embracing courtesy, respect, co-operation subordinately in the maintenance of the Empire, and the contributing of an enormous annual tribute directly or indirectly to the hegemonical state. And of which the third angle of the triangle is represented by the manner in which the hegemonical state has observed its own side of the contract. The manner on the part of the peoples of the hegemonical state towards the peoples of the coloured states, embracing incivility, abuse, defamation, scorn, ostracism, defective educational and industrial facilities, the withholding of political rights, excessive taxation, and general impoverishment and oppression.

Now, on the part of the hegemonical state in regard to the coloured states, as is indicated by this triangular representa-

tion, there exists a most serious breach of contract. And what have we noticed to be the cause or causes of such a breach of contract? First, the desire of the hegemonical state to exploit the subordinate coloured states. Next, the desire of the hegemonical state to have the friendship of the white subordinate states of the Empire; and third, the desire of the hegemonical state to have also the friendship of the Euro-American. This, then, in regard to the coloured races is the complete picture of the situation as it exists at the present time in the British Empire.

But are we able to draw any augury from these circumstances which constitute this present situation in the British Empire of what their general effects upon the Empire are likely to be? I think that we are able to draw such an augury. Let us proceed then to the attempt. Exploitation of the coloured states is what we have seen to be the root cause of Britain's change of policy towards these states. Accordingly I purpose to inquire what probable effects the policy of exploitation is likely to have upon the British Empire? Exploitation, as I have said before, is founded upon absolutism, absolutism is founded upon separation, and separation is founded upon misrepresentations, ostracism, insults, humiliations, etc. With the desire to use the lands and inhabitants of the coloured states, mainly for her own enrichment, England could not possibly have carried out her compact of 1858 and 1865. For this would have meant the granting of equal opportunities to these states, and subsequently the granting to them of free institutions. And as no coloured state, even as no white state, which possessed the power to make its voice heard—by means such as those that free institutions afford—would allow its resources to be systematically carried off to a distant state without receiving a fair equivalent in return, therefore, it became an absolute necessity that such effective means of representation should be withheld from the great bulk of the coloured states which had not had them, and that they should be suppressed, where it is practicable to do so, in the very few coloured states which were in a measure enjoying such means.

For, as regards government, absolutism is the alternative of representation. Again, with the desire to use the lands and inhabitants of the coloured states for her own enrichment,

England could not carry out the pledges of 1858 and 1865 that she made to those states. For this would have meant the social recognition of the inhabitants of those states, and that according to the standard that prevails in white communities. And with the approximation of the sentiments and interests of the members of the hegemonical state, to the sentiments and interest of the members of the coloured states, resulting in mutual respect, mutual esteem, and friendship, the hegemonical state could not dream of expecting, much less of suggesting that these coloured states should be simply her economic and political reservoirs. Hence towards the realization of the policy of exploitation, separation between the parent and these coloured daughter states became an indispensable course. Further, separation between the members of the hegemonical state and the members of the coloured daughter states could not be compatible on both sides with the ordinary observance of the decencies and amenities of social life.

Therefore, in order to secure separation, the side by which it is desired has had to employ weapons so foul in character, as misrepresentation, defamation, exaggeration, insults, and abuse, for it is by this class of instruments alone that separation between the two great sections of the Empire could have been achieved and maintained. Thus absolutism, separation, and the incessant inflammation of the baser passion, are the absolute essentials of exploitation. But since separation, as a policy of the Empire, is an essential ingredient of exploitation, can exploitation be a real boon? The coloured races of the British Empire, as we have seen, are numerically the preponderating section, but notwithstanding this they are generally considered to be of no more importance than cyphers. It is in this manner that Mr. Chamberlain, in referring to the inhabitants of the British Empire, in May the 16th, 1903, said:—

“Just let us consider what Empire is. Here in the United Kingdom there are forty millions of us; outside there are ten millions. How long do you suppose that this proportion of population is going to endure?”

So that according to this widely prevalent view, the real population of the Empire is 54 millions. However, despite the wide acceptance which this opinion enjoys, I venture to assert that even though a latent one, the coloured

peoples of the Empire are a tremendous force. That they are a force which is charged with incomprehensible possibilities.

In its distribution of blood to the body, suppose that the heart possessed the power of cutting off at will, the blood supply of any member of the organism. Suppose that in the exercise of this prerogative it should lessen the blood supply of the feet and hands, and that being endowed with the function of speech, it should proceed in this manner to justify its action. "Members of the extremities," it observes, "you must be aware of the very secondary part that you take in the work of the organism. You do not plan like my colleague, the brain, nor do you toil so incessantly as my colleagues, the eyes, the ears, and the tongue. At the direction of the brain some of you work—walk, run, jump, skip, swim—etc., but after you have completed the task that is imposed, you pass into repose. And as compared with the work which my colleagues, the lungs, and myself, also, accomplish, working year in and year out, without even so much as a minute's intermission, your work bears to it no relation whatever. Therefore upon the subject, consulting with the colleagues whom I have just named, I have reached the resolution to reduce your supply of blood by a half, and to add the same to the supplies of those members whose labours in the economy are so much more arduous than your own. But, O, members of the extremities, I wish you to be assured that as Director-General of the Commissariat Department of the economy, I am moved to this step under a deep sense of my responsibility, and by the strong conviction that the well-being of the economy will be thereby enhanced."

Now, would such a diminution of the blood supply of these parts really contribute to the general well-being of the economy? No, it would not. And for the reasons that Nature, by an irrevocable law, has established a fixed proportion of blood as the lawful and indispensable share of every part of the organism. That by its reform the heart would interfere with Nature's appropriations, with the result that the extremities being insufficiently nourished they would become devitalized; that, becoming devitalized, they would be peculiarly susceptible to disease, and that to the whole organism such a susceptibility would be to increase the danger of disease.

And to the parts of which the supply of blood has been increased at the expense of the members of the extremities, the results would be that being nourished to excess, they would become surfeited with blood, and being surfeited with this nourishment, they would become torpid and indolent. In other words, the extremities from deficient supply of blood would become underfed, devitalized, and the prey of every passing germ of disease. And from a superfluous supply of blood the other parts would become overfed, sluggish, and inefficient. So that the organs whose blood supply had been excessively increased would be no better off than the organs whose blood supply had been excessively decreased. The moral, then, is that for the efficiency of the whole, every part must be given its lawful share. And from the fact that in the organism, the well-being of the parts affirm the well-being of the whole, the state is not unlike the organism.

Now, then, in the state, what is there that might be described as its blood supply? It is the practice of the equality of opportunity for all. And the law which governs this practice by which the state secures its maximum of nourishment is as invariable, and is as inflexible, as that which governs the blood supply of the organism. That is to say, that in the state the element of equal opportunity for all can no more be withdrawn from one section of the state and be added to another section without the diminished area becoming devitalized and the increased area becoming demoralized, than can the blood supply of the body be drawn off from certain organs and be added to certain other organs without the former becoming atrophied and the latter becoming hypertrophied.

And as it is by the invariable observance of this law of proportionate distribution that the body and mind conjointly are able to attain to their maximum development, so is it by the invariable observance of this same law that the state is able to attain to its maximum development. Now, from what has been said already concerning the British Empire, the assertion will not be surprising, I think, that in the British Empire the application of this fundamental principle of success—the fundamental principle of equal opportunity for all, or of proportionate distribution—is arbitrary and unnatural. Like the heart which I have supposed to have diminished the blood supply of the extremities, in order to increase the blood supply of other



organs, England has diminished the opportunities of the non-white section of the Empire, in order to increase the opportunities of the white section.

And with what results? In the governed states, the famines and discontent of India, the chronic unrest of the South Africa and Nigeria, the poverty of the great mass of coloured British subjects, the general stagnation of coloured British states, the lack of the spirit of enterprise, of initiative, and of self-reliance among coloured British subjects, and the diminished virility of the governing state. Thus in the former case it is devitalization, and in the latter case it is demoralization. In the interference with the law of proportionate distribution or of equal opportunity by the British Government, the latter of these two results, viz. diminished virility, or demoralization, which shall still further be enlarged upon as we proceed, appears in the change that has taken hold of the British character, a change by which, towards the weak, discourtesy is substituted for courtesy, antipathy is substituted for sympathy, disingenuousness is substituted for ingenuousness, injustice is substituted for justice; whereas towards the strong, the originals of these substitutes are effusively observed. If this description of the coloured section of the Empire be true, then devitalization must be the correct designation of its condition. And if this description of the colourless section of the Empire be true, then demoralization must be the correct designation of its condition. Thus the two bearers of the British Empire—the white and the non-white—are each of them stricken with a carbuncle. And yet our Imperialists jubilate about the progress of the Empire. The progress of the Empire is apparent, not real. But for these conditions of devitalization and demoralization who are chiefly responsible? There are three chief respondents, and they are the press, the politician, and the pulpit. The press has been alluded to already, and the pulpit will be treated of in a subsequent volume. Here, then, I will refer to the politician.

In this category Mr. Chamberlain has been already quoted as having said that the population of the British Empire is fifty million whites. And Sir Edward Grey as having said "that it was upon the proportion of white men in a country that its value to the Empire depended." That Mr. Chamberlain, who as a

Radical would have said that the British Empire consists of 398 millions, now says as a hyper-Conservative that the British Empire consists of fifty millions, is perfectly intelligible, for, whereas converts are generally moderate, perverts are always fanatics. But that Sir Edward Grey, as a statesman who professes Liberal principles, should be found to give expression to this reactionary idea of Mr. Chamberlain—except upon the theory of the apostasy of Liberalism, which many of the facts that have been adduced already in this volume seem to support—is altogether inexplicable.

This monstrous statement of Sir Edward Grey, which is as incongruous as it is monstrous, is the result of a narrow range of vision. I am aware that it is the popular range, that it is the range by which—according to the present outlook of the British Empire—a statesman is adjudged as being “great”—since successful statesmanship, from this outlook, is the keeping of the colourless sections of the Empire in good fellowship, and is the preserving of peace between the “civilized” states—yet I make bold to say that it is a narrow range, that it is a very narrow range; that great statesmanship does not look at a part of the state as if it were the whole, but that it looks at the part of the state as that which is related to the whole. A great statesman avoids every expression and action that would divide or that would encourage the division of the state into hostile camps, for he believes that a house which is divided against itself cannot stand.

Again, a great statesman is not the creature of a caucus, a cabal, or a clique, of the state, but is the leader, the well-wisher, the sympathizer, the defender, and the servant of the whole state. But I have said that Sir Edward Grey’s statement is not only monstrous, but incongruous—“ . . . it was upon the population of white men in a country that its value depended.” Well, then, let all the native peoples be expelled from the British possessions in the East Indies, in the West Indies, and in Africa, etc., let the white man alone remain in them, and then see what would be the value of those possessions to the Empire. Let it be said once and for all, that the coloured races, whose presence in the Empire British statesmen affect to ignore, are the bones and sinews of the coloured states, and are an arm of the Empire. If a man may justifiably be elated in being the owner of one arm instead of two arms, then let

British statesmen imagine, and rejoice, that the British Empire is blessed with one instead of two arms.

One of the pictures with which the late Hon. Frederick Douglass has furnished us in his "Life and Times of Frederick Douglass," will serve, I think, as a further illustration of the condition of the British Empire. Referring to the luxury of the "Great House" of Colonel Edward Lloyd, the owner of a large plantation on the River Wye, in the state of Maryland, to whom his master, Captain Aaron Anthony, was chief clerk and butler, Douglass continues :—

"The highly-favoured inmate of this mansion was literally arrayed in 'purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day.' The table of this house groaned under the blood-bought luxuries gathered with painstaking care at home and abroad. Fields, forests, rivers, and seas were made tributary. Immense wealth and its lavish expenditure filled the great house with all that could please the eye or tempt the taste. Fish, flesh, and fowl were in profusion. Chickens of all breeds, ducks of all kinds, wild and tame, the common and the huge Muscovite; Guinea fowls, turkeys, geese, and pea-fowls; all were fat and fattening for the destined vortex. Here the graceful swan, the mongrel, the black-necked wild goose, partridges, quails, pheasants, pigeons, and choice waterfowl, with all their varieties, were caught in this huge net. Beef, veal, mutton, and venison, of the most select kinds and quality, rolled in bounteous profusion to this grand consumer.

"The teeming millions of the Chesapeake Bay, its rock perch, drums, crocus, trout, oysters, crabs, and terrapin were drawn hither to adorn the glittering table. The dairy, too, the finest then on the eastern shore of Maryland, supplied by cattle of the best English stock, imported for the express purpose, poured its rich donations of fragrant cheese, golden butter, and delicious cream to heighten the attractions of the gorgeous, unending round of feasting. Nor were the fruits of the earth overlooked. The fertile garden, many acres in size, constituting a separate establishment distinct from the common farm, with its scientific gardener direct from Scotland, a Mr. McDermott, and four men under his direction, was not behind, either in the abundance or in the delicacy of its contributions. The tender asparagus, the crispy celery, and the delicate cauliflower, egg plants, beets, lettuce, parsnips, peas, and French beans, early and late; radishes, cantelopes, melons of all kinds; and the fruits of all climes and of every description,

from the hardy apple of the north to the lemon and orange of the south, culminated at this point. Here were gathered figs, raisins, almonds, grapes from Spain, wines and brandies from France, teas of various flavour from China, and rich aromatic coffee from Java, all conspiring to swell the tide of high life, where pride and indolence lounged in magnificence and satiety.

“Behind the tall-backed and elaborately-wrought chairs stood the servants, fifteen in number, carefully selected, not only with a view to their capacity and adeptness, but with regard to their personal appearance, their graceful agility, and pleasing address. Some of these servants, armed with fans, wafted reviving breezes to the overheated brows of the alabaster ladies, whilst others watched with eager eye and fawn-like step, anticipating and supplying wants before they were sufficiently formed to be announced by word or sign. These servants constituted a sort of black aristocracy. They resembled the field hands in nothing except their colour, and in this they held the advantage of a velvet-like glossiness, rich and beautiful. The hair, too, showed the same advantage. The delicately-formed coloured maid rustled in the scarcely-worn silk of her young mistress, while the men servants were equally well attired from the overflowing wardrobe of their young masters, so that in dress, as well as in form and feature, in manner and speech, in tastes and habits, the distance between the favoured few and the sorrow and hunger-smitten multitudes of the quarter and the field was immense.

“The hospitality practised at the Lloyds’ would have astonished and charmed many a health-seeking divine or merchant from the North, viewed from the table and not from the field. Colonel Lloyd was, indeed, a model of generous hospitality. His house was literally an hotel for weeks during the summer months.”

1

But the same donor of this lavish abundance housed his poor slaves in hovels, fed them with coarse meal of corn and tainted meat, and clothed them with rude and scanty raiment. In drenching rain and biting wind—from which their tattered garments failed to shield them—he hurried them on to the toil of the field, and in the laborious round scarcely did he even allow time to the young slave mother to nurse her suckling at the fence corner. Of this picture, then, with which we are supplied by the late Frederick Douglass, the term satisfaction sums up the foreground. A great plantation, a “Great House,” and a great family. Of the family refinement, order, hospitality,

comfort, and wealth are the distinctions. And so deeply wrought into its fibre are these distinctions, that the very servants reflect their mellowing charms. And to the spectator of this brilliant group of qualities is not satisfaction the product? The noiseless movement of a highly-organized and exquisitely-formed domestic mechanism, fulfilling to its guests and spectators with pleasurable effect the self-imposed task of prodigal hospitality. Of such a spectacle is not satisfaction the result? And what guest is there who in the full view of this magnificent display would conclude otherwise than that every department of the great establishment of Edward Lloyd, in varying degree, reflected the comfort of the "Great House." But, alas! this is but the foreground of the picture. What of the background? Ah! now the scene changes, for behind this refinement, this order, this hospitality, this comfort, and this wealth, at the "Great House" of Edward Lloyd—qualities that are so potent as to infect even the servants—there are, in another quarter of the plantation, hundreds of slaves, who, in circumstances that are at the very antipodes of these qualities, pass their time. For they, irrespective of age and of sex, in ill-ventilated and ill-furnished cabins, deprived of every facility for observing the most ordinary decencies of life, are herded together like cattle. They are made to subsist upon the coarsest fare, to wear the roughest and meanest apparel, to engage during long and weary hours in laborious and exhausting toil, and withal are rigorously excluded from the very twilight of knowledge. The foreground and the background of this picture, then, are not in harmony, but in contrast. Now, in the British Empire we are confronted with a picture that is like this one of Lloyd's plantation. The foreground of this Imperial picture is represented by the mechanism of government, and it will be indicated here by one of the governments of the coloured states of the Empire:—

- I. Civil Establishments
  - Governor and Commander-in-Chief.
  - Private Secretary and Aide-de-Camp.
- II. Colonial Secretary's Office.
  - (a) Clerical Staff.
  - (b) Loan Office.

- III. Receiver - General's Department.
  - (a) General Branch.
  - (b) Account „
  - (c) Pay „
  - (d) Receipt „
  - (e) Savings' Bank.
  - (f) Stamp Branch.
  - (g) Distillery Branch.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(h) Inland Revenue Branch.</li> <li>(i) Weights and Measures Branch.</li> <li>IV. Audit Office.</li> <li>V. Public Works Department.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Engineering and Architectural Branch.</li> <li>(b) Electric Branch.</li> <li>(c) Roads and Bridges Branch.</li> </ul> </li> <li>VI. Waterworks.</li> <li>VII. Drainage.</li> <li>VIII. Civil Status Department.</li> <li>IX. Customs Department.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Outdoor Branch.</li> </ul> </li> <li>X. Harbour Department.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Mercantile Marine Office.</li> </ul> </li> <li>XI. Registration Office and Mortgage Department.</li> <li>XII. Archives Office.</li> <li>XIII. Post Office.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Telegraph Branch.</li> </ul> </li> <li>XIV. Immigration Department.</li> <li>XV. Medical and Health Department.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Quarantine Establishments.</li> <li>XVI. Department of Forests and Gardens.</li> <li>XVII. Museum and Public Library.</li> <li>XVIII. Observatory.</li> <li>XIX. Storekeeper-General's Department.</li> <li>XX. Judicial Establishment.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Supreme Court.</li> <li>(b) Master and Registrar's Office.</li> <li>(c) Registry.</li> <li>(d) Procureur - General's Department.</li> <li>(e) District Magistracy.</li> <li>(f) Stipendiary Magistracy.</li> </ul> </li> <li>XXI. Police Department.</li> <li>XXII. Prisons.</li> <li>XXIII. Ecclesiastical.</li> <li>XXIV. Education.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Govt. Schools.</li> <li>(b) Training School.</li> </ul> </li> <li>XXV. Poor Law Commission.</li> <li>XXVI. Railway Department.</li> <li>XXVII. Defence Department.</li> </ul> |
|--|---|

In this list there are all, or nearly all, the appliances of a modern civilized government ; and in the British Empire these appliances are generally diligently used. Therefore, in regard to this Empire, in regard to the governments of its numerous states, we have, in the first place, machineries which are well suited to attain the ends that may be desired. And, in the next place, we have, on the whole, competent and diligent officials to work these machineries of government. Now, upon the average visitor to these states could it be difficult to imagine what would be the effect of this imposing array of political machineries, with their generally competent staff of

official operators? I am speaking especially of coloured states. Could it be reasonably denied that the effect will be satisfaction with, and praise to, the parent state, which is responsible for the equipments? Thus, like the visitors to the sumptuous establishment of Colonel Edward Lloyd, who, on the ground that all its departments in their varying degrees would be on the model of the "Great House," would have had nothing but praise for his plantation, so the average visitors to the coloured states of the British Empire, judging by the excellence of their machineries of governments, and the excellence of their personnels, will have nothing but praise for the hegemonical state.

Yet, as was the case at Lloyd's plantation, there is, in regard to the British Empire, a background as well as a foreground. And what is that background? It is the ignorance of the great mass of the coloured peoples of the British Empire, it is their poverty, their oppression, their degradation, their humiliation, and their vilification. Let those who are ever enlarging upon the excellence of British rule, reflect that their deduction is drawn only from the foreground of the picture, and not from the background as well; that is to say, the contrast between the two. The machinery is not an end, but a means to an end, and it is worthy of praise only to the degree that it fulfils that end. Such an end being, in the case of a government, the greatest good to the greatest number. But it will be remembered that the question with which this part of our inquiry is concerned is this, viz. What are the effects of the policy of exploitation upon the British Empire? We have said that the root cause of Britain's change of policy concerning the coloured states of the Empire is that she may exploit them. But we have seen, on the one hand, that, to a great extent, the wealth of the Empire is contributed by these coloured states.

And, on the other hand, by the illustration of the heart diminishing its blood supply to the extremities, we have seen the closed doors of opportunities against the coloured section by the colourless section. Thus there are three sets of conditions: (1) exploitation, (2) the contribution of wealth to the Empire by the coloured section, (3) the denial of equal opportunities to this coloured section. Now, since the contribution of the coloured section is indispensable to the maintenance of the Empire, and since exploitation necessitates the closing of the doors of opportunity by which alone the contribution of

the coloured section towards the maintenance of the Empire can be indefinitely made, then from this point of view the probable effects of exploitation upon the Empire cannot be good, but bad. And since separation is an essential part of exploitation, can it, likewise, be a real boon? But in regard to the colourless section of the Empire, the effects of these conditions and circumstances, as we have seen, are demoralization, and in regard to the coloured section of the Empire they are devitalization.



## XII

### Upon the Empire, the Effects of Britain's Present Policy

#### (b) MISREPRESENTATION

**B**UT let us proceed to another view of the effects of exploitation. There are benefits, which, because of the brevity of their enjoyment and the severity of the consequences of their enjoyment, are of more than doubtful value. And the benefits of exploitation are among this class. The question that arises here is, What is it that limits the continuance of exploitation? The answer, in the first place, is that exploitation is limited by its own inherent injustice; and, in the next place, that it is limited by the impermanence of its supports. By her alliance and international friendships England is reserving her strength so as to be always able to keep the coloured races of the Empire in their present state of nullity. But the permanent success of this design will depend at least upon two things, upon the stability of such an alliance and friendships, and upon the endurance of the national strength. With regard to the stability of international alliance and friendships, history shows that they are invariably created and controlled by national interest; and that national interest is a most unstable quantity.

Concerning the accuracy of these two deductions, the latest proof that we have had has been with respect to the Triple Alliance; and the Algeciras Conference was the event that furnished this proof. Two nations, therefore, whose interests for the time being are identical, may for their mutual safety against a third nation, or a group of nations, join hands in an alliance. But before the expiration of three, or of even two, decades, the wind of politics or of economics, or of both politics and economics, may have shifted so entirely, and in the change it may

have removed the interests of one of the allies, so far from those of its consort, and so near to those of the suspected foe or foes as to render the alliance but a name only. And of course these same facts also apply to friendships. Therefore, the instability of international alliances and friendships, upon which Britain partly depends for the support of her policy of exploitation of the coloured subjects of the Empire, tends to limit the continuance of exploitation.

Passing to the endurance of the national strength, I must observe that whereas the stream of books, pamphlets, newspaper and magazine articles which deal with the affairs of the Empire, flow on in an undiminished and great volume, yet, in their treatment of the subject, very few of these books, pamphlets, etc., touch upon what might be called the really fundamental concerns of the Empire. In this respect the action of the great body of our literary Imperialists is not unlike that of the members of a family who are about to settle in an extremely insanitary house—a house of which the drains are a perfect nidus for diseased germs, and its system of ventilation the excellent incubator—yet they are concerned only about the furniture with which the house should be supplied. The chairs and tables are to be oaken, the sofas overlaid with a specially imported fabric, the curtains patterned after a particular design, the hassocks covered with velvet of curiously wrought colours, and the door-mats manufactured from an ingeniously prepared fibre.

The main reason why the comparatively trivial issues of the Empire are considered, almost to the complete exclusion of its life and death issues, is, I suppose, in order that the change of policy to which the full discussion of these vital issues would inevitably lead, in regard to the coloured states of the Empire, may be avoided. I do not ask whether such a course be brave, but I ask whether it be wise? Does he who, instead of facing a great crisis that has arisen in his life, tries to ignore its existence or to forget its presence by busying himself with matters of less moment, act, I will not say bravely, but wisely? It is my profound conviction that among those graver imperial questions with which the very existence of the Empire is bound up, that of the status of the coloured races stands in the forefront. I am equally convinced that free, full, and fair discussion of these graver questions is the indispensable pre-

liminary to their solution. It was under the weight of these convictions that I wrote the first volume of this work, it is under that weight that I have carried the present volume to this stage, and it is under the same weight that I now proceed to consider the subject of the endurance of the national strength.

A man who is in the full enjoyment of his powers—physical and intellectual—does not, with enthusiasm, anticipate old age. Yet what man is there who, if the span of his life be sufficiently prolonged, will escape this season of remission? And so constantly is this spectre of decrepitude with the average man that even against his predilection he provides for it.

Similarly a nation in the plenitude of its powers—ethnic, political, and industrial—does not with enthusiasm anticipate the advent of age. Yet what nation is there, from the remotest past and onwards, that has escaped the toll-gate of senility? And if the nations of the present time be wise they will make provision now against this season of quiescence. England has built up a mighty empire, and the English people has shown itself courageous and powerful; yet, even as the empires of Egypt, of Babylon, of the Medes and Persians, of the Greeks, and of the Romans grew old, so will England, in common with her contemporaries, grow old. The instability of international alliances and friendships is one incontrovertible fact, and that the national strength will abate is another incontrovertible fact. Hence, since the policy of exploitation depends, on the one hand, upon these international unions of friendships and alliance, and, on the other hand, upon the national strength, its success cannot be permanent.

And the impermanence of these supports, of international alliance and friendships and of the national strength, limit the continuance of this policy of the exploitation of the coloured British subject. Well, then, with regard to the policy of exploitation, the two following facts, among others, have been established, viz. that the supports upon which the continuance of this policy depends will, sooner or later, be exhausted; and that ridicule, scorn, contempt, vituperation, defamation, misrepresentation, excessive taxation, and the deprivation of equal rights, or, in brief, tyranny and oppression, form a constituent and a primary part of this policy. Now, with respect to this last group, which I have just said is a constituent part of the

policy of exploitation, it cannot be denied that it is characteristically exasperating and provocative. And, it being a primary, constituent part of the policy of exploitation, that policy, therefore, must itself be characteristically exasperating and provocative.

And concerning the policy of exploitation another highly significant fact is that the progress of time will not tend to assuage its very inflammable properties, but rather to increase those properties. And among the events that will increase those exasperating and provocative properties of the policy of exploitation there will be, on the one hand, international competition, and, on the other hand, the progress of the coloured peoples of the Empire. One of the effects of the industrial rivalry which is now proceeding between certain states, will be the overtaking of the older of those industrial states by the younger industrial states. As one of these older industrial states, England will bend every muscle and every nerve—as indeed she is already doing—to maintain her present ascendant place. A result of this endeavour will be an increased demand for material—in the form of specie—for maintaining her naval and military forces, and for raw products for her manufactures.

And as the competition between herself and her industrial rivals grows in keenness, so will these demands rise in exorbitance. The nearly four hundred millions of coloured peoples in the Empire—who are absolutely in the power of England, and whose chief function, according to the colourless section of the Empire, is to minister to the needs of the colourless section—will be made, directly and indirectly, to supply a very large share, indeed the largest share, of these increasing demands. Thus, as the pressure of competition upon her increases, England, in order to relieve that pressure of competition, will exert upon the coloured races a corresponding demand for supplies. On the other hand, imbued with the belief that their destiny is only relatively and not absolutely bound up with that of England—that their destiny and hers are like those of parent and child—the coloured peoples will strive more and more to prepare themselves for their independent existence. England will resent this legitimate ambition of the native races, and will strive to subdue it. But the committal of such an outrage upon their rights, together with England's increasing ex-

actions upon their resources, in order to meet her demands, will make the coloured races in turn intolerant and resentful of England's attitude. England will be resentful of the aspiration of the native races to prepare themselves for a separate existence, because the realization of their hopes would restrict her control over the disposal of their resources.

And so for the purpose of subduing the aspirations of the natives, as well as extorting from them increased toll, England will bring into use against them—and with increasing rigour—all those exasperating, provocative, and inflammable constituents of exploitation. Overpowered by England's strong arm—reinforced by the power of her alliance and friendships—the native peoples will hush, but at the same time hug, their grievances until the period of national exhaustion, allied mutations, or international complications set in, and then their long pent up but just anger (which every species of humiliation, degradation, and tyranny had generated), like tongues of fire swept by the momentum of a hurricane, shall light up the Empire with an appalling rebellion. I write these things not from choice but from constraint, not from pleasure but from duty. For *true* patriotism requires that, whatever one conceive to be the truth which events foreshadow respecting the future of the Empire—however unpalatable and however unpopular that truth may be—it should be spoken, and spoken outright. What I have now said upon the subject of the effects of Britain's change of policy with respect to the coloured peoples of the British Empire may be considered as representing chiefly the political and economic aspects of the question. Accordingly we proceed to notice more particularly the moral aspect. And let me introduce this aspect by means of an allegory.

Among the few great phenomenal figures that the world in all ages has produced is a personage who is a great force in international politics, who is the head of the mercantile world, and who is known as John Bull. Undoubtedly the political eminence of Mr. Bull rests upon his commercial pre-eminence. And this unique support of his political prowess began its epoch-making growth in a very ordinary way. At first small and struggling, but watched over by the assiduous care of diligence, of the faculty of readiness to learn from others, of thrift, of pluck, of prudence, of foresight, and of insight, the

sapling, with its head now towering above all the trees of the forest, has become the mighty oak. But incontestably, the resources which are derived from the patrimonies of the coloured races have been a primary factor in the building up of this world-wide commerce of Mr. Bull. Finding these races, for the most part, in a state of commercial and political infancy, and their countries at the same time abounding in wealth, Mr. Bull, constituting himself their guardian, assumed the management and the responsibility of their affairs. In taking upon himself this rôle, Mr. Bull reiterated the most emphatic declarations, that he was impelled thereto only by motives of the loftiest and purest philanthropy. That thereby he was assuming this rôle of guardian solely to transform these coloured communities into civilized states, into such civilized states as their vast inheritances have decreed that they should become.

But having incorporated the vast establishments of these coloured races with his own business enterprise, having applied their revenues to the extension and consolidation of his own business, and having in the interval started certain of his own children—one by the name of Canada, another called Australia, and a third named South Africa—in businesses of their own, now that the coloured clients were approaching their majority, Mr. Bull called together a conference of savants and men distinguished in other walks of life—all of whom, however, were directly or indirectly interested pecuniarily in his great firm—theologians, anthropologists, historians, anatomists, physiologists, ethnologists, journalists, politicians, etc. etc.—to prove that the coloured races were naturally incapable of managing their patrimonies, and that in the interest of the rest of the world, no less than in the interest of the coloured peoples themselves, their possessions must be absolutely and indefinitely administered by himself.

The assembly met in the largest hall of the town, and its meetings, which were said to occupy several weeks, were reported to be of a very protracted and impressive character. Each day during the first fortnight of the sittings, four lengthy and elaborate dissertations, each occupying four hours, fifteen minutes, and ten seconds, were read by the anatomists. These treatises, with great minuteness of detail, purported to show that there is a difference, both in structure and formation,

between the brain and skull of the coloured and the colourless races. Under the microscope, the physiologists, for purposes of demonstration, had specimens of blood that had been taken from members of the coloured and colourless races, and it was confidently affirmed that a difference between the blood of the two sections of humanity had been discovered. I am not sure whether this difference resides in that part of the blood that is said to be thicker than water, but I suppose that there is a difference, for it has been given a name, and the name was being unfolded by a lecturer on physiology, when the reporter—who unfortunately could remain only five minutes—left the room.

The theologians, with great emphasis, asserted that whereas at the time of the apostles it was unquestionably true that all races of men were of one blood, now it was no longer the fact, for circumstances alter cases. The ethnologists, for the satisfaction of all present, had representatives of the races from every quarter of the globe. The anthropologists had an enormous collection of monkeys, and these represented every known species of the simian family. The historian had all the books that had ever been written upon the subject, and these weighty tomes, which formed an immense library, were placed in a spacious anteroom of the great hall, convenient for reference.

The politicians confined their speeches to the subject of the fiscal policy that Mr. Bull should pursue in the future. The journalists, from large bags, presented copies of cablegrams that had been received from every hamlet, village, town, city, county, and state of the Southern States of the North American Republic, upon the natural unfitness of the coloured races of the British Empire to make laws, and then to obey them. All the dissertations having been read, all the lectures having been delivered, all speeches having been made, and all discussions having ended, the stage of voting arrived. The question that was put was, whether the coloured races of the British Empire whom Providence had placed under the loving care of Mr. Bull were, or will ever be, capable of managing their own affairs; or whether Mr. Bull, out of the necessity of the case, should not continue his great and beneficent work.

By all the members of the conference, who were all directly

or indirectly interested in Mr. Bull's firm, it was unanimously voted that Nature had denied to the coloured races all the essential qualifications of mind, body, and estate, for self-government, that consequently, in the interest of those races themselves, it became a bounden duty upon Mr. Bull to continue his self-denying and self-sacrificing mission. In concluding the proceedings of the historic gathering, the chairman, who like the rest of the members of the assembly was a shareholder in Mr. Bull's business, rising to address the conference, adjusted his pose, looked up at the ceiling, looked down at his boots, took a pinch of snuff, sneezed, yawned, cleared his throat, and finally looking at the audience, said in the course of a singularly self-forgotten speech, that he warmly complimented its members upon the strong sense of justice which, at the cost of so much time, so much money, so much nerve tissue, and especially of brain-cells, had caused it to collect a store of evidence of such astounding magnitude, adding, that in regard to a collection of evidence so prodigious, in regard to the time that had been devoted to its examination, and in regard to the galaxy of talent that had been engaged in that examination, the conclusion which had been reached must be indisputably valid unto the end of time. Mr. Bull was said to have come away from the conference under a profound sense of his responsibility, but that at the same time he was amply sustained by the knowledge of the utterly disinterested character of his mission.

Now what this allegory is intended to emphasize is the fact that the relation of guardianship of the colourless race over the coloured races of the Empire has been changed by the guardian into ownership of his wards. And what I wish particularly to demonstrate is that this change of relation between the coloured and colourless races of the British Empire, as representing a phase of the moral aspect of exploitation, is characterized by two special features, namely, misrepresentation and a dual standard of justice.

In order to illustrate these features, I begin with a subject which, after it had occupied the public mind more or less during the past two years, is now (March, 1906) exciting much controversy. I allude to "Chinese Slavery" in South Africa. And I begin my illustration with the simple question, whether the cause of the present opposition to Chinese labour



in South Africa be mainly due to the fact that it is identical with slavery? Before proceeding further, I may be allowed to say that upon moral and economic grounds I am resolutely opposed to the system of Chinese labour in South Africa, and that upon the former of these two grounds I am opposed to the system because I believe that it does possess the elements of slavery. Proceeding with the subject, I may observe that I do not doubt that a large number of those who in opposition have joined the controversy after its incipency, and who have continued in that attitude till now, have done so only or mainly from the belief that Chinese labour in South Africa is identical with slavery. Nor do I doubt that this slavery element has been a cause of the outcry against Chinese labour by the other class which I have in mind, viz. the class that originated and that has conducted the controversy. But what I do most seriously doubt is that the slavery element of the Chinese labour system in South Africa has been, as it is professed to have been, the main cause of the origin and continuance of the agitation against that system by the class whom I have in mind.

Thus it is my conviction that if the slavery element alone had existed in the Chinese labour system in South Africa, as far as this class is concerned there had been no agitation. Now, then, to the South African question. Whether the cause of the present opposition to Chinese labour in South Africa be mainly due to the fact that it is identical with slavery? That is to say, whether the slavery elements of Chinese labour in South Africa are the real or the main cause of the present controversy? In the form of an answer to this question, I would assert that if the same conditions which are said to make Chinese labour in South Africa a species of slavery, also attend labour that is performed in South Africa or elsewhere in His Majesty's dominions by persons who are not Chinese, and if although these same conditions are known to attend labour that is performed in these places by these persons, yet there has been no controversy, then I shall conclude that in the case of Chinese labour these conditions cannot have been the main cause of the present controversy.

For if these conditions had been the main cause of the present controversy, they should have given rise to similar controversies in regard to non-Chinese labour. As instances

that the same conditions by which Chinese labour in South Africa is called, and is rightly called slavery, attend the labour which other coloured peoples perform in the British Empire, I will adduce coolie labour in the West Indies and Kaffir labour in South Africa. Coolie or East Indian indentured labour is imported to the West Indies under contract to work for a certain number of years. During the period of their contract the personal liberty of these indentured labourers is restrained beyond the limits of free men.

For example, the emigrant may not move about without a pass. And I myself have seen East Indian coolies in Jamaica accosted by constables, beaten with sticks, and locked up, because, being without passes, they were suspected to be running away from the estates to which they were indentured. In the present controversy, I have observed that in defence of indentured coolie labour in the British West Indies, and in condemnation of Chinese labour in South Africa, it has been repeatedly stated, both in print and on the platform, that whereas Indian coolie labour is mild, Chinese coolie labour is harsh. And the chief point of superiority of Indian indentured labour to Chinese indentured labour—according to these criticisms—is in the fact that the Indian coolie is accompanied to the West Indies by his wife, whereas the Chinese coolie is unaccompanied to South Africa by his wife. On the whole, I agree with the contention that the features of Chinese indenture are harsher than those of East Indian indenture. Still, I submit that the degree of the harshness or of the mildness with which these labourers are treated is not the question.

For in West Indian and North American slavery, for example, there were also these degrees, yet did the mild treatment which some slaves received from their owners make the system under which they existed other than slavery? Certainly not. Similarly, the milder treatment alone of the indentured East Indian cannot make the system under which he labours a free system, nor can the harsher treatment alone of the indentured Chinese make the system under which he labours a slave system. The real question of the controversy as it relates to these two systems of indentured labour, it seems to me, is this, do both systems put upon the person of the indentured labourer arbitrary and extraordinary

restraint? In the case of the Chinese nearly all are agreed that his system does put upon him such restraints. And in the case of the East Indian, I submit that one is entitled to conclude, from the example which I have given of personal violence and of restraint to liberty, which I myself have seen him suffer, that his system too puts upon his person arbitrary and extraordinary restraint. And so it might be further concluded that the system of the indentured East Indian in the West Indies and the system of the indentured Chinese in South Africa are both forms of slavery.

We now pass to Kaffir labour in South Africa. One thing that has been most noticeable about the present controversy has been the fact that whereas the labour of the East Indian who is indentured in the far West Indies has been persistently held up to view in order that the abomination of the labour of the Chinese who is indentured in South Africa might be discerned by the contrast, the subject of the labour of the Kaffir, who like the Chinese is indentured in South Africa, has been studiously avoided. But there must certainly be a reason why this pertinent subject of Kaffir labour should have been studiously avoided. That reason is an inconsistency. And it is upon the demonstration of this inconsistency that my assertion is based, that misrepresentation is a feature of the changed relation which exists between the governed and the governing sections of the Empire.

But besides the passive relations of class and locality that subsist between Chinese and Kaffir labour—both being indentured, and both existing in South Africa—there are also certain active relations between these two forms of labour. And the close resemblance that there is between these active relations—a resemblance that is even more close than that which exists between the passive relations—reveals the inconsistency of the Chinese labour controversy, which, in the endeavour to discredit Chinese labour in South Africa by East Indian labour in the West Indies, has ignored Kaffir labour in South Africa. Now, in pursuance of this close resemblance between Chinese labour and Kaffir labour in South Africa, I begin with a resolution that was debated last night (the 21st of March, 1906) in the House of Commons:—

“That this House expresses its disapproval of the conduct of Lord Milner, as High Commissioner of South Africa and

Governor of the Transvaal, in authorizing the flogging of Chinese labourers in breach of the law, in violation of treaty obligations, and without the sanction or knowledge of His Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies."

Unless the House of Commons had completely abandoned its great function as the chief protector of the Empire, it could not easily have refused to discuss this resolution, a resolution which one of its members, through his mindfulness of its great responsibility, had submitted to its notice. And in devoting its time to considering this resolution, the Commons have acknowledged that the subject of the resolution is of grave importance. But is this grave offence of flogging Chinese labourers at the instance of the King's representative—that is to say, at the instance of him in whom the humblest inhabitant of South Africa should have had a protector—confined to Chinese alone? By no means! The Kaffir labourers in South Africa are also flogged.

And what about the other matter which is regarded, and which is rightly regarded, as the crowning infamy of the system of Chinese labour in South Africa, i.e. the enforced celibacy of the labourers? Is celibacy enforced among the Kaffirs also? Certainly. Here, then, are the two cardinal points around which the storm of the controversy rages concerning "Chinese slavery" in South Africa, two cardinal points which, although existing also in Kaffir "slavery" in South Africa, are in that case condoned, whereas in the case of Chinese "slavery" in South Africa they are condemned. But do even these cardinal points exhaust the resemblance that there is between Chinese "slavery" and Kaffir "slavery"? No, they do not. For the Kaffir slaves, like the Chinese slaves, live in compounds, away from their homes, away from their friends, and are cut off from the outside world. Like the Chinese slaves, they too are imprisoned, they too are compelled to work when they are sick. And their wages are arbitrarily stopped at the end of their contract. In short, the identity between "Chinese slavery" and Kaffir slavery is complete. And now, is it not a most singular thing that whereas these two systems of slavery exist side by side, and whereas they are in every respect the same, yet that only one of them should be singled out for execration? There

must surely be a reason for this extraordinary discrimination. But in the case of the Chinese, surely that reason cannot be slavery, for in the case of the Kaffir the same kind of slavery exists without being singled out for execration. What, then, is the reason why the Chinese slavery should be condemned and the Kaffir slavery should be condoned? We proceed to solve the riddle. Let me repeat here our proposition—that if the same conditions which are said to make Chinese labour in South Africa a species of slavery also attend labour that is performed in South Africa or elsewhere in His Majesty's dominions by persons who are not Chinese, and if although these same conditions are known to attend labour that is performed in these places by these persons yet there has been no controversy, then I shall conclude that in the case of Chinese labour these conditions cannot have been the main cause of the present controversy.

Well, we have seen that labour of the character of Chinese labour, which is defined, and rightly defined, as slavery, is performed in both the British West Indies and South Africa by persons who are not Chinese. We have seen in the next place that although these species of slavery are known to exist in South Africa and the West Indies, yet that they have called forth no controversy. Therefore, from the above proposition, I conclude that the conditions of slavery which are present in the system of Chinese labour in South Africa cannot have been the main cause of the present controversy. But if these slavery conditions that attend the system of "Chinese slavery" in South Africa be not the main cause of the present agitation, then what is its main cause? The main cause of the present agitation, I believe, is that Chinese labour has displaced white labour. Thus the statement of the real issue is not slave labour versus free labour, but yellow labour versus white labour. I am certainly of the opinion that the British working man, as a subject of this realm, has the prior right to the labour market in South Africa. And how much is that right increased when the sacrifices in which he has been involved in connection with the late war in South Africa are taken into account. But at the same time I also most strongly contend that the real cause of the dissatisfaction should have been frankly and candidly stated, and that it should not have been hidden under the pretext of slavery. Therefore it is the

carrying on of this labour campaign under the name of Chinese slavery that constitutes the inconsistency which we set out to demonstrate. And it is this inconsistency that constitutes the misrepresentation that has been described as a feature of the changed relation between the governing and governed classes of the Empire.

The setting forth, then, of slavery as the real cause of the present agitation, when that cause is that yellow labour has displaced white labour, is my first example of the misrepresentation which I have affirmed to be a characteristic of exploitation or imperialism. And here is another example of misrepresentation, which is among the most recent (1906) that have occurred. It will be remembered that in our discussion of Northern Nigeria (p. 32), we saw that if the dissatisfaction of the Sultan of Sokoto—upon which the British High Commissioner founded his suspicion that the Sultan was unfriendly, upon which he induced the British Government to send an armed force against the Sultan, and upon which the dominions of the Sultan were seized—had really existed, it was justified by the treatment which he had received from the British Government. For after the British Government had entered into a covenant with him, it failed to keep that covenant. Thus, having engaged itself to pay the Sultan of Sokoto an annual subsidy of £1,500, the British Government without warning or explanation suddenly stopped the payment. Then, suspecting that the Sultan was displeased at this breach of contract, it sent an armed force against him, and finally seized his country.

Here, then, are substantial reasons why the natives of the dominions of the late Sultan of Sokoto should have been displeased with the British authorities. The unexplained violation of a solemn compact which had been entered into with their late ruler, the unprovoked invasion of their country by this state that had broken its covenant with their Sultan—a state that was professedly friendly to their country, that was enjoying treaty privileges from their country, that was deriving considerable revenue through those privileges; then the seizure of their country by this professedly friendly state, after it had broken its covenant with them, and had, unprovoked, invaded their country, destroyed their property, slain their people, and driven their ruler into exile—these,

I repeat, are adequate and justifiable reasons why the natives of Sokoto and its environs, should have been greatly incensed against, and highly suspicious of, the British authorities in Nigeria. And these reasons go far to explain the frequent risings of natives in that territory since the British seizure. But even this dark record does not seem to exhaust the reasons, which in rapid succession have convulsed Northern Nigeria with native outbreaks since the Imperial rule has been established.

For in a letter to a London evening paper of the 7th of March, 1906, a gentleman who had lived in Northern Nigeria two years has said, concerning the present rising there :—

“It is just a case of cause and effect; the rising in Sokoto results from long-standing unrest, occasioned by successive disputes; the real cause is unequal and excessive taxation.”

There need not be the slightest difficulty in accepting the uncorroborated statement made by this gentleman. For “excessive taxation” of the native communities of the British Empire is not an unfamiliar phenomenon. We have seen it in the case of the British West Indian peasantry, in the case of the poverty-stricken natives of the Sierra Leone Protectorate, in the case of the Indian rayat, in the case of the natives of the Transvaal, and in the case of the natives of Natal. Therefore, the statement concerning the “excessive taxation” of the Nigerian natives is amply confirmed by all these cases. So, then, in the instances of a breach of covenant with natives of Northern Nigeria, of an unprovoked armed attack upon their country, of the seizure of that country, and then as the climax to this series of outrages, the manacling of these natives with an “excessive taxation,” we have the most cogent reasons for the present unrest (1906), and for the present rising among the natives of Northern Nigeria. But has the press of this country given these reasons as the cause of the present rising in Nigeria? No! Altogether ignoring these tangible reasons as the cause, the press has advanced this visionary reason, viz. religious fanaticism. “A new Mahdi.” That is to say that the Northern Nigeria native outbreaks are neither political nor economic, but are purely religious.

Similarly in the preceding chapter we observed that in ac-

counting for the unrest that there was among the natives of Natal, the long-standing and constantly accumulating grievances of these natives, in common with the grievances of other natives of South Africa, but which, in the case of the Natal natives, an iniquitous poll-tax had raised to the breaking point of endurance—have been deliberately set aside by the British press as being even a factor in the cause of the unrest, and that instead of such grievances, Ethiopianism is given as the cause. In like manner we have observed in a preceding chapter concerning the British West Indian peasantry, that whereas their deprivation of suitable lands for cultivation, excessive taxation, and defective educational facilities, are among the real causes of their backwardness, the ruling class has advanced indolence and natural incapacity as the real cause. Concerning India we have observed that whereas the famine scourge there is due to the extreme poverty of the people, and that this extreme poverty of the people is due to excessive taxation and other preventable causes, the ruling class asserts that it is due to deficient rainfall and over-population.

And concerning the Transvaal we have noticed that whilst professing that the lack of qualification of the native of the Transvaal is the only reason why they are denied the franchise, the ruling class on the one hand, excludes from the franchise the natives whom it affirms to have reached a high level, and on the other hand withholds from the mass of the natives, the means of qualifying themselves for the franchise. In the attempt to show how uniformly and universally the practice of misrepresentation prevails in the politics of the British Empire, having mentioned West and South Africa, the West Indies and India as illustrations, I will close with the following extract from a London journal of the 17th of April, 1907, relative to Egypt :—

“From our own correspondent.” Paris, Friday night.—“Mustapha Kamel Pasha has contributed another letter from Cairo to the ‘Figaro,’ in which he says that even Lord Cromer imagined that ‘the Egyptian opposition was broken and could never be revived,’ when the Anglo-French entente was concluded; but that three years have sufficed to show him how much he was mistaken. English Imperialists regarded this opposition as purely artificial, but repressive measures have led to an extraordinary development of Nation-



alism, which is not pan-Islamist, but essentially patriotic. Arabi relied on the army. The Nationalists only look to legal methods for support.

"Lord Cromer's resignation," the writer goes on to say, "is a very important event, whatever the cause may be. His sole object for twenty-four years has been to perpetuate the occupation and to Anglicise Egypt. He hoped to win the confidence of Egypt's creditors to conquer the Soudan, and to lull the upper classes by prosperity. With regard to the two first points success was easy, but he has utterly failed in the third attempt. Lord Cromer's system consisted in annihilating the Egyptian element in the Government, he put the Englishman before the Egyptian, and his absolute authority led to the horrible drama of Denshawi. To his sterling qualities unstinting tribute is paid; he has preferred honesty to fortune, but England has now only two courses to adopt. She must fight the Egyptians, or come to an understanding with them for their country's welfare. The Nationalists want the formation of an independent Ministry, limitation of the powers of the English councillors, the creation of a Parliament, radical change in the system of education, and the gradual replacing of foreign officials by capable Egyptians, the capitulations to be reformed, not by mutilation, but by allowing the mixed tribunals to try offences committed by foreigners, and by giving authority to the mixed court to alter, up to a certain point, the regulations and laws relative to Europeans. Will the Government, which has been so generous to the Transvaal, act otherwise in Egypt?"

"Such is the gist of this latest contribution to Nationalist literature."

Now, what are we told by this extract? Among other things we are told that the "sole object" of the twenty-four years' service of the distinguished Englishman who has just laid down his official responsibility, "has been to perpetuate the occupation and to Anglicise Egypt." That his "system consisted in annihilating the Egyptian element in the Government, he put the Englishman before the Egyptian." But are these not practically the same statements that I have been making about other coloured communities of the Empire? Again the extract tells us that the "horrible drama of Denshawi" last year (1906)—viz. the murder of a British officer, the wounding of two British officers, and in reprisal for these crimes, the hanging of four natives, the imprisonment of sixteen other natives—who

also received fifty stripes each—was the result of this policy of the repression of the native. This explanation appears to be eminently reasonable, and the confirmation that it receives from the events in other parts of the Empire makes it quite conclusive. But was this the explanation which the British press gave as accounting for the Egyptian “unrest,” of which the Denshawi “drama” was an incident? No! To what, then, has the British press attributed the Egyptian “unrest”? To “pan-Islamism.” Thus does the Egyptian case of misrepresentation harmonize with the other examples that we have just been noticing. Now, from the subject of misrepresentation, which is the first of the two moral characteristics of exploitation that we proposed to consider here, we pass to that of the dual standards of justice.

## XIII

### Upon the Empire, the Effects of Britain's Present Policy

#### (c) A DUAL STANDARD OF JUSTICE

THE subject of the dual standard of justice which we are now to consider, will be illustrated by certain events of the last three or four days, events which to-day (the 2nd of April, 1906) have culminated in one of the foulest tragedies that history shall ever record. I refer to the events in relation to what is called the "Natal crisis." In connection with "the native rising" in Natal, to which I have alluded on page 289, two white men had been murdered by natives. With respect to these murders twelve natives by court martial have been condemned to death. The death sentence was confirmed by the Governor in Council, and on Friday (the 30th of March, 1906) the twelve natives were to have been shot. But the Earl of Elgin, Secretary of State for the Colonies, being informed by the Governor of Natal of the impending fate of the twelve condemned men, instructed the Governor that execution should be delayed until His Majesty's Government had considered the sentences. Sir Henry McCallum, the Governor of Natal, informed the Prime Minister of the Natal Government of what the Home Government desired. But Mr. Smythe, the Prime Minister, declared that he was unable to comply with the wish of the Imperial Government. Thereupon the Governor, exercising the authority which is vested in him, postponed the execution of the twelve men. In consequence of this intervention of the Imperial Government, the Natal Ministry tendered its resignation to the Governor. Hence the "Natal crisis." The subsidence of the "crisis," as the world well knows, was brought about by the giving way of the Imperial Government to the colonists on the matter of the execution of

the twelve natives. And so these most unfortunate men, on the 3rd of April, 1906, were all of them, shot.

Now, upon the facts that are thus summarized, I purpose to make a few detailed remarks. In touching upon the subject of the "native rising" in Natal, in the previous chapter, I believe that I have shown that the treatment which the South African natives have received from both the white colonists and the Imperial Government, would, in itself, be sufficient to account for any unrest which may at any time appear among them; and that in conjunction with their many years of unredressed grievances, the poll-tax with which the Natal Government has lately saddled them would be an amply sufficient cause for the rising that was said to have happened in February. But fuller information upon the subject has made it manifest that even the great accumulation of antecedent wrongs which the natives of Natal, in common with their brethren in other parts of South Africa have suffered, has not had any part in causing the disturbance which was reported in February (1906). For that disturbance did not involve a hundred natives, much less a tribe. Thus the Natal Government, through its Agent-General in London, has informed the world that

"the outbreak is confined to a party of discontented natives who profess Ethiopianism; a portion of the Militia has been called out, and is engaged in searching for members of the guilty party, who do not number above fifty. All other natives are quiet."

And this opinion of the Agent-General is supported by the following remarks that appeared in the issue of the "Natal Mercury" of the 10th of February, 1906:—

"To call the trouble in the Richmond district a native 'rising' is a grave misuse of words. We should not be at all surprised to find that it has arisen out of some injudicious handling of the situation created by the attempt to collect the tax. It has been understood all along that the natives were to be allowed six months' grace for payment of the tax, and therefore if it was demanded of them several months before they probably considered it due, the feeling against the tax was probably accentuated to the most serious extent."

The column of the punitive expedition which was dispatched under Colonel Mackenzie to subdue this "native rising" was

said to have met with complete success. No correspondents were allowed to accompany the punitive columns. Martial law was proclaimed throughout the colony, press telegrams were censored, the kraals and crops of the "guilty" natives were destroyed, native churches were demolished, two of these "guilty" natives were caught and shot, the kraal of Gobizembe was shelled with shrapnel, heavy fines were inflicted upon a number of chiefs, and all this was done with "the most profound effect upon the natives." Indeed, almost before the "revolution" had been inspired, it had expired.

But let me furnish here a few details that bear out some of these statements. The punitive expedition that was sent out against the natives consisted of two military columns. Of these columns one was under Colonel Mackenzie, and the other under Colonel Leuchars. With respect to Colonel Mackenzie, the "Natal Witness" of the 17th of February, 1906, in an article that was entitled, "Striking Parallels," after alluding to his two telegrams from Richmond, in which he reported that he had shot two of Mveli's men, and that he had destroyed the "kraals and crops of those that were implicated in the late disturbance," likened his action to that of Governor Eyre, adding that if there had been any doubt about sending an Imperial Commission, "there will be none on receipt of the telegrams which we published yesterday by authority." And "The Times of Natal," of the 27th of February, 1906, says:—

"This morning seven or eight seditious natives have been ordered to appear and stand trial with those brought in yesterday. They will probably be brought before Colonel Mackenzie to-day in preliminary examination on the treason charge, and it is safe to say they will not be dealt with lightly."

The "Natal Witness" of the 17th of March, 1906, relates that "Last Monday a number [*sic*] of native prisoners were sentenced to six months imprisonment with twenty-five lashes, which were given in public outside the Court House."

The editor of the "Natal Mercury," in regard to the Richmond disturbance, advocating in his issue of the 10th of February, 1906, "more drastic measures than have yet been tried so as to prevent the spread of the pernicious doctrines that have been preached to the natives under guise of religion," also records the protest that "the destruction of native churches in certain

districts was a wicked step which created a strong and not unjustifiable feeling of injustice in the minds of many of the natives, while the effect was to remove from the supervision of the white missionaries a section of their native followers." Leaving Colonel Mackenzie, we have come to Leuchars. Of the doings of this officer the "Natal Witness" of the 10th of March contains the following from its special "Representative":—

"Colonel Leuchars has adopted a policy that is bound to force the recalcitrant natives into a corner—a policy against which no make-shifts will prevail. A contempt for authority has been shown; the guilty men must be surrendered, and to this one simple issue the situation has been reduced, no matter what may be, in the phrase of Mr. Maydon, the 'mind-movement' of the Natives. As telegraphed to you, Gobizembe, the responsible chief, was given six days in which to produce the men in question. This was practically an ultimatum, and when at the end of the time it was not complied with, Gobizembe's kraal was bombarded. . . . The part taken by the mounted regiments was carried through with zeal and efficiency, though their task was rendered much less difficult owing to the total absence of opposition on the part of the natives. From start to finish, the natives showed not a sign of fight. . . . Meanwhile, some of the N.M.R. were nosing round an adjoining kraal, and there they stumbled across old Gobizembe, who was accompanied by a small following, but no indunas."

Other "representatives" of this paper communicated that "Colonel Leuchars took the words of the indunas that they had tried their best to bring in these men for disobeying the six days' ultimatum. However, the tribe as a whole was being punished; and the representatives of the various sections would have to attend the Court House to-morrow morning in order to hear the proclamation read affecting the disposal of the location, which is very large in area."

It will be remembered that in the last chapter (p. 289) I quoted a statement, in which future dispute between the whites and the blacks in South Africa is predicted, upon the ground that the white man who covets the black man's land would foment a native disturbance, and then use it as a means to seize the natives' land. Now, in the last sentence of the preceding paragraph from which we read that "the representatives

of the various sections " (of natives) " would have to attend the Court House to-morrow morning in order to hear the proclamation read affecting the disposal of the location, which is very large in area," we have a confirmation of that statement. Thus, this wicked incitement of the natives to commit a breach of a wicked law, has as its basis two reasons—to drive the natives to work in the mines in the Transvaal, and to steal his land. And after these deep-dyed infamies, the white man, unabashed, informs the black man that he is his "superior." Superior in what? We continue with Colonel Leuchar's exploits. To the same purpose is the following statement that is supplied from another channel:—

" Pietermaritzburg, 20 June, 1906.—In the Assembly to-day, Mr. Yonge gave notice of a resolution to be submitted to the House, in favour of the revision of the rebels' lands to the Crown, and of the leasing of such lands to Europeans on military tenure."

"The natives were then ordered to disperse; but before taking their departure, the induna, Tshevuza, created some amusement by asking for a receipt for the stock captured belonging to his people. Colonel Leuchars curtly replied, 'No receipt would be issued.'"

"Since Monday, when the voice of the Supreme Chief spoke in the guns, it has been unnecessary for any scouting parties to go out and collect the cattle; but from the farthest location, and from places inaccessible to our troops, cattle, sheep, and goats keep coming in every day and night."

"The O.C. at Mapumulo is calling for tenders, by advertisement, from auctioneers for the sale of all cattle, and of all goats and Kaffir sheep, taken by Colonel Leuchars' Field Force."

Upon the next page is reproduced a copy of the advertisement that announced the sale of this heartless plunder, which, had been committed under the ægis of the Natal Government.

Replying to the strictures in which the Bloemfontein "Friend" asked, in a leading article, whether the officers who have "blown to pieces the houses of persons unconvicted of any crime," and who have raided the cattle of these persons, will be brought to any account, in which the Bloemfontein "Friend" also declares that the Natal Government have "barbarously punished" the natives, that they themselves have

## GOVERNMENT NOTICE.

FOR SALE,  
Under Martial Law.

1,000 HEAD CATTLE,  
Taken by Leuchars' Field Force, will be Sold  
AT GREYTOWN,

On FRIDAY & SATURDAY, March 16 & 17, at 10 a.m. each day. Also—

3,000 SHEEP AND GOATS,

Captured by same Column, will be Sold

At STANGER and VERULAM respectively, on WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, &  
THURSDAY, MARCH 22, at 10 a.m.

By Order,

OFFICER COMMANDING LEUCHARS' FIELD FORCE.

Mapumlo, March 10th, 1906.

O.H.



M.S.

SALE OF 207 HEAD OF MIXED CATTLE  
(FROM COL. MCKENZIE'S COLUMN),  
AT THE OLD BISLEY RANGE, MOUNTAIN RISE,  
FRIDAY AFTERNOON, 23rd inst., at 2.30 p.m.

**M**ESSRS. HOLLIDAY BROS., instructed by the Militia Department, will  
Sell, as above,

207 Head of Mixed Cattle

(From Col. McKenzie's Column).

HOLLIDAY BROS., Auctioneers and Appraisers.

*Witness*, March 16.



committed crime in destroying the huts of the natives, and in confiscating their cattle, the "Natal Witness" affirms that "if it was a crime to assert our authority by the most drastic methods at a period when a large body of natives *was on the very verge of revolting against the supremacy of the white man*, we are ready to account for that crime before the tribunal of public opinion throughout South Africa."

Such is the wanton spoliation with which these legions suppressed a non-existent "revolution," a revolution whose participants are announced by official report to have been but fifty. Between the foray of this punitive expedition and that of the punitive expeditions of the Sierra Leone Protectorate (p. 74) is there not a strong likeness?

The Commissioner for Zululand, as early as 1904 (see "Natal Blue Book on Native Affairs," p. 90), says in his report:—

"Rumours of native unrest were again persistently exploited and disseminated throughout the country until about August. Needless to say, Dinizulu's name was freely associated with the wild reports so circulated, which were a source of considerable and justifiable irritation to him. Although no misapprehension existed in the minds of the officials responsible for the maintenance of good order in the province, or those who really know the Zulus, as to Dinizulu's, the several chiefs', or their tribes' loyalty, the persistent rumours, which there can be but little doubt were in certain, if not many, instances the production of sinister designs, were most provoking, and an insulting recognition of the loyalty and faithfulness the natives displayed throughout the trying period they had recently passed through with such credit to themselves, on the conclusion of the late war. . . . If trouble had ensued, it would have been brought about by the unfounded and ungenerous aspersions so freely sown broadcast. The behaviour of the natives has been all that could be desired. They have been law-abiding, contented, and have cheerfully carried out all Government orders issued to them.

"Allegations of unrest among the tribes south of Zululand were also the subject of official investigation about this time, and were reported by the Under-Secretary for Native Affairs to be 'entirely without foundation,' it having been found impossible 'to trace the source from which they emanated.'"

And Mr. Watt, Minister of Justice, speaking at Durban as late as March, 1906, said that "it ought not to be argued that

the natives were opposed to the Government. It was only the other day that the Government had an offer from the Christian natives of Natal to stand behind them and assist them in every possible way."

The statement, then, that I made, that even the great accumulation of antecedent wrongs which the natives in Natal, in common with the other natives of British South Africa have suffered, has had no part in causing the disturbance of February, 1906, is sustained by these facts, as well as by the fact that the disturbance did not involve a hundred natives, much less a tribe of natives.

To this effect we are officially informed that the guilty natives did not number above fifty persons. So, then, in view of what is to be said further, the fact that we are to remember is, that the number of natives that were concerned in the mêlée, which made white Natal whiter with fear, the contagion of which having spread to this country, caused certain journalists, here as well as in South Africa to mutter, in their delirium, the words "secession," "independence," etc., I say that the number of natives which wrought this sad havoc—physical, mental, and moral—"were not above fifty."

That Colonel Mackenzie should have "met with complete success" against this band, whose equipment of arms was not more formidable than was its equipment of numbers, is not very surprising. What is really surprising is that a community of 100,000 whites, who have at command munitions such as "shrapnel," should have been panic-stricken at the menace of fifty "blacks," whose only munitions are assegais. And this surprise suggests the arithmetical problem, that if the disturbance by fifty Zulus that are armed with assegais, has caused the 100,000 white colonists of Natal to describe the same as a "crisis," a "revolution," etc., has caused them to send military forces against the band of fifty Zulus that are armed with assegais in order to suppress the disturbance, has caused them to forbid that newspaper correspondents should accompany the forces, has caused them to censor telegrams, to proclaim martial law, to shell native dwellings, to destroy native crops, to destroy native churches, and to shoot down natives at sight, what would the disturbance by 50,000 Zulus armed with rifles, have caused?

Well, then, we have seen that the natives who, on this occasion, have been accused in Natal of breaking the law, and

who indirectly have produced that wave of excitement that so recently shook the Empire, as if to its very foundation, were fifty in number. The particulars of the offence which these fifty natives were alleged to have committed, are that the Legislature of Natal, on 9 August, 1905, imposed a poll-tax of £1 per head upon all adult males of that colony who did not pay the hut-tax. The tax should become due in January, 1906, but in the case of the natives, it appears, that the limit of the time for collecting the tax was the end of May, 1906. This tax, with reference to the natives, was in addition to a dog tax of five shillings, a marriage tax of ten shillings, and a fee of one shilling each for passes,<sup>1</sup> which they pay, and these original taxes had already imposed upon the natives a great burden. Therefore this additional tax of one pound occasioned much discontent among them.

Early in February, 1906, a certain chief, Mveli, reported to the local magistrate at Richmond, Natal, that some young men were arming, and that they had declared that it was their intention to resist the payment of the poll-tax. Thereupon Sub-Inspector Hunt, Serjeant Stephens, and twelve mounted police, armed with rifles and revolvers, were dispatched to the disaffected district; assisted by the chief, Mveli, and the head-men of the tribe, they made three arrests. On the 8th of February a party consisting of forty young men, who were armed with assegais, met Sub-Inspector Hunt and his force, and demanded that the prisoners should be released. Serjeant Stephens has reported that in the fog and dust that prevailed at the time he was unable to see anything except that a native had seized the bridle of Hunt's horse. For this obstruction Hunt raised his revolver and shot the native dead. Thereupon a general mêlée ensued, and in it Hunt and a trooper were killed.

Now, from this point our remarks shall be concerned with the murder of sub-Inspector Hunt and his comrade. And in that connection a few comments will be offered upon the seven following points: (1) unjust taxation the primary cause of the disturbance, (2) breach of faith in regard to the time when the tax

<sup>1</sup> In regard to passes, no native, however cultured or respectable, may go in and out of Natal without providing himself with these badges of degradation. The conditions are, one shilling outward, and good for a year; one shilling inward, beyond a year; in default, £5, or three months' imprisonment with hard labour.

should be collected, (3) uncertain identity of the accused murderers, (4) the murder of the two men was unpremeditated, (5) the risks of miscarriage of justice in the trial of the accused, (6) adequate punishment had already been awarded, (7) the illegality of the trial of the accused natives. Concerning the poll-tax, to which I have just now referred, and to which I have referred in the previous chapter, the history is more particularly this, that in the year 1905 a bill was introduced into the Natal Legislature for the purpose of raising the hut-tax from seventeen shillings to a pound. The bill was opposed by the members who have the welfare of the native at heart—and thus, in a real sense, the welfare of the community—on the ground that it would cause the natives to crowd together into fewer huts, and so worsen life among them.

Baffled by this opposition, the framers of the bill succeeded at the end of the session in rushing a bill through the Legislature, imposing a poll-tax of one pound upon each adult male of the colony. Previous to introducing the bill for the poll-tax into the Legislature of Natal in 1904, it was admitted by the public authorities that the natives' contributions to the general revenue were greater than those of the colonists'. And in this connection two things should be observed: first that the natives who constitute nine-tenths of the population of the colony—they being 900,000, while the whites are only 100,000—are entirely without representation. Therefore, in their case, the principle of taxation with representation is entirely ignored. Second, that although the natives contribute the larger part of the revenue of the colony, hardly any of it is used for their benefit. To the eternal shame of the Natal Government, be it said, in regard to education for example, that although its fiscal burdens are borne chiefly by the native portion of the inhabitants, it has not so much even as established elementary schools for the education of the native. Native education in consequence is conducted by Christian missions alone. And even this agency, that in this respect has freed the truant Government of Natal from one of its chief responsibilities, is in its educational work scarcely aided financially by that Government. Nor is it at all surprising, for the native product of the schools is very detestable to the Natal Government. Thus the school that has been founded at Olange Phoenix, near Durban, by Rev. J. L. Dube—a native—for the purpose of

training natives to teach, and of furnishing to them industrial knowledge, although it receives generous support from England and from America, is refused aid by the Natal Government. And to such a depth of paltriness has this colonial Government fallen that it will not so much as allow this native school that is founded by a native, and that is being conducted by its founder, to be examined by its school inspectors. The Crown lands, too, of Natal, that were formerly sold to natives, have been unavailable to them since the close of the Anglo-Boer War. So that now, in the sale of land, the auctioneer is required to declare who is the buyer, and should he be a native or an Indian, the sale is disallowed. Even the native locations are insecure to the native, for appeals are being made to the Government that they should be broken up and sold to Europeans.

Such, then, are the circumstances, and such are the conditions in which this further tax (the poll-tax) was imposed upon the natives of Natal. But the question may be very reasonably asked, if the native makes this larger contribution already to the general revenue of the Natal Colony, then why should the poll-tax have been added further to his burden? The following declaration by the Natal Legislature is the reply to this question :—

“It is the *opinion* of ministers that unless the tension occasioned by the short labour supply in the Transvaal is afforded immediate relief, such as the proposed introduction of Chinese indenture offers, there is grave cause to apprehend that the financial position throughout South Africa will be seriously affected.”

And in the subjoined extract, the statement of the Secretary for Native Affairs, by which the native taxation is accounted for, and which the correspondent of the “Natal Witness” quoted with disapproval, is another meaning of this general declaration of the Natal ministers :—

“It is a mere fiction to say that the Secretary for Native Affairs [for the time being] has hitherto represented native feeling, thought, or interest. The present representative the other day in a speech up-country gave the one great reason for native taxation that it would make them work. He could not be said to represent native ideas when he blurted that out.”

Thus, at least, one of the reasons why this poll-tax was im-

posed upon the Natal natives by the Natal Legislature was that in the interest of the South African gold industry these natives of Natal, like those of the Transvaal, may be forced into the mines. During the present excitement (1906) the Natal colonists have been loud in the protest of their "just treatment" to the natives that are within their jurisdiction. And on the ground of this alleged just treatment they have professed to feel great indignation that their actions concerning the natives should even be called in question. But the denial of every form of representation to the native who contributes the great bulk of the revenue, is that just treatment to the native? Again, the application of the larger share of the revenue that is contributed by the native, exclusively to benefit the whites, without providing for the native so much as primary education, is that just treatment to the native? And the denying to the native all forms of representation, the denying to him every educational facility, whilst at the same time still further increasing his fiscal responsibility, although he already contributes the bulk of the revenue, is that also just treatment to the native? Finally, the employing of the resources of the Government in order to force the native to "work," when already he has supplied the chief part of the revenue, or the employing of these resources in order to coerce him into providing cheap labour for private monopolies, that, too, is it just treatment to the natives? These systematic furtive, and subterranean practices, then, do they accord with that "just treatment to the natives," which white Natal solemnly and dramatically proclaims?

Now we have come to the second point, viz. breach of faith in regard to the time for the collection of the tax. In the paragraph which I have quoted from the "Natal Mercury," and which appears on page 348, we read:—

"It has been understood all along that the natives were to be allowed six months' grace for payment of the tax, and therefore it was demanded of them several months before they probably considered it was due . . ."

Again, "The Times of Natal" of the 15th of February, 1906, says:—

"The limit of the period for payment of the poll-tax in the case of the native is the end of May. It is only February now, and the payment of the tax cannot legally be imposed until the end of May."

So then not only does the Natal Government deny the rights of representation to the native, who bears the larger share of the burden of taxation, not only does the Natal Government deny to the native all educational facilities, not only does the Government of Natal succeed by stealth, in still further increasing the already excessive taxes of the native, and commits the last of these three acts of injustice in order to force the native into the mines of the Transvaal, but besides all this, the Natal Government after ordaining that the new extortionary tax which it had imposed upon the native should become due at such a time, sent an armed force, months before the expiration of the time, to exact the payment of the tax. Now, can any course of action be more provocative than this? And could the Government of Natal have employed means which were more calculated to incite to a breach of the law?

But these negations of good government are among the proofs, I suppose, of the fitness of the white section of the Empire for self-government, and of the unfitness of the non-white section for self-government. This brings us to the third point. That is the identity of the murderers of Sub-Inspector Hunt and the trooper. The murderers have been given as twelve men. But as I have said already, the collision between the police and the natives happened in a mist. Nor is that all, for the police were ambushed. That is to say, that the place at which the collision between the police and the natives occurred was lonely, uninhabited, and perhaps unfrequented. Thus the evidence goes to show that the natives who were present were only the forty men that had ambushed the police for the purpose of releasing their two prisoners. It is most improbable, then, that any of these thirty-nine men—for Hunt had shot one of the forty—gave the evidence against themselves, which led to their arrest. Therefore there arises the question, how were the twelve men identified who were accused of the murder of Sub-Inspector Hunt and the trooper? In answer to this question, we are told that the chief Mveli, who had taken the initiative in bringing the police upon the scene, made a deposition shortly afterwards against those who were said to be implicated in the murder, and according to Reuter's correspondent at Maritzburg, the persons whom this chief incriminated

were "for the most part Christianized natives who have been resentful of his authority, and whom the chief would be glad to get rid of." So that these men were among those, concerning whom Mr. Watt, Minister of Justice, said, "it ought not to be argued that the natives were opposed to the Government. It was only the other day that the Government had an offer from the Christian natives of Natal to stand behind them and assist them in every possible way." Reuter continues: "this chief was entrusted with the hunting down, and the men condemned to death were among those produced by him, on the requirement of the Militia officers."

The police who took part in the affray with the natives were unable to identify their assailants. This most delicate and important work was entrusted to the chief Mveli, who in the first instance had informed the authorities that certain of his young men were arming. And now it is said that in incriminating these twelve men the chief was guided by the enmity which he had had against them, because they had resented his authority. This charge against the chief appears to be so natural, as at least to cast doubt upon the identity of the twelve men who at his instigation were accused of the murders.

That the murder of the two police officers was not premeditated is the subject which constitutes our fourth point for observation. And with respect to this subject, I need only remind the reader that it was after Sub-Inspector Hunt had shot the native who had held the bridle of his horse that the *mêlée* ensued, in which Hunt and his comrade were killed. Thus it seems doubtful, at least, that the murder of the two men had been premeditated. This brings us to the subject of the risks of miscarriage of justice that attended the trial of the twelve accused men, and that is our fifth point. Concerning the trial of the twelve accused natives, we are told that the Attorney-General of the colony expressed the view that the prisoners had had a fair trial. Also that they were legally represented, that evidence was taken of twelve Europeans and twenty-one natives, and that the proceedings lasted eight days.

Here, too, are subjoined a few extracts from the dispatches of Sir Henry McCallum, the Governor, to the Secretary of State for the Colonies.



“On 15 March, at a meeting of ministers, he suggested to them that the charge of murder should be withdrawn in the case of prisoners being tried at Richmond, and that as regards that portion of the indictment it should be dealt with by the civil tribunals. Ministers, however, expressed the opinion that the state of disaffection among natives of this colony was by no means at an end, and that it was only because of prompt measures taken by the Government to deal with such disaffection that a large number of natives were not in open rebellion. Several tribes who had openly defied magistrates had still to be dealt with, and a Militia force was at present proceeding against them. Ministers were convinced that for dealing promptly with natives who had taken up arms the same urgency for trial by court martial then existed as at first, and that any interference with the court martial now sitting would have disastrous effect on natives generally. Further, that such interference would probably conduce to outbreak in the near future, as any sign of weakness or indecision on the part of the Government would immediately be observed by the natives, who, for the most part, are adopting a waiting attitude.

“The Governor’s reply was to the effect that, although prompt measures were still necessary to prevent disaffection spreading amongst the native population, there was not any pressing necessity for continuing to give the commandant of Militia power of life and death in cases tried by court martial, although he was perfectly satisfied with the manner in which he had discharged his duty. He therefore desired to withdraw delegation to the commandant under martial law of the authority to confirm or revise sentences of court martial. In future cases he proposed, as Commander-in-Chief, to consult the Colonial (Governor?), and confirm and revise such sentences himself. He had satisfied himself that the courts martial were being well conducted, and that no injustice would be perpetrated, and as, moreover, he had been impressed with the coolness and judgment displayed by ministers during the present crisis, he did not desire to press home his suggestion that charges of murder should be dealt with by the civil tribunals of the colony.”

In itself it is quite intelligible that the Governor should have suggested to the ministers of Natal “that the charge of murder should be withdrawn . . . and that as regards that portion of the indictment, it should be tried by the civil tribunals.” In itself it is also intelligible that after that the ministers had opposed his suggestion, on the ground of urgency,

the Governor should have replied to their objections by saying, "that although prompt measures were still necessary to prevent disaffection spreading among the native population, yet there was not at present any pressing necessity for continuing to give the commandant of militia power of life and death in cases tried by court-martial."

But in itself it is quite unintelligible that immediately after having thus suggested a civil in place of a military trial, and immediately after having thus defended his suggestion by explaining that "there was not any pressing necessity for continuing to give the commandant of militia power of life and death in cases tried by court-martial," the Governor should have proceeded to say that "he did not desire to press home his suggestion that charges of murder should be dealt with by the civil tribunals of the colony." Giving as his reason, that "he had satisfied himself that the courts-martial were being well conducted and that no injustice would be perpetrated; and as, moreover, he had been impressed with the coolness and judgment displayed by ministers during the present crisis, he did not desire to press home his suggestion that charges of murder should be dealt with by the civil tribunals of the colony."

When the Governor suggested that the civil tribunal of the colony should supersede the court-martial, was he not aware that "no injustice would be perpetrated" by the courts-martial? And was he not also aware of the "coolness and judgment" of the ministers? He must certainly have known these things, for both his suggestion, and then the withdrawal, occurred at the same meeting of March the 15th. Hence we are entitled to conclude that Sir Henry McCallum was convinced that the twelve natives who had been accused of murder, should be tried by the civil courts rather than by courts-martial. And so the question arises, What was it that led Governor McCallum, in this matter, thus to go against his better judgment? The cause, I believe, appears in the last paragraph of his dispatch to Lord Elgin, which I now quote:—

"I trust that, with the additional facts contained in this telegram, your lordship will see your way to withdraw objection. I am afraid that very intense feeling will be excited in the colony by my having suspended execution."

The fear of "that very intense feeling" which would be excited by his action, in having suspended the execution, was evidently the cause of the Governor's extraordinary change of front, in regard to the withdrawal of the charge of murder, and in regard to the court that should try the prisoners. I describe the Governor's change of front as extraordinary, for if it were according to his belief that the charge of murder should be withdrawn, and that the trial of the twelve men properly belonged to the civil courts rather than to the military courts; if also it were his belief that the state of the colony did not render the trial by the civil courts inexpedient, then the mere fact that the commandant of the court-martial discharged his duty well, and that the ministers were cool and sober could not have made the withdrawal of the charge of murder less necessary, and could not have made such a charge as might have been substituted for that of murder less fit for the civil courts.

Sir Henry McCallum has told us that "he had been impressed with the coolness and judgment displayed by ministers during the crisis." But seeing that he, who is officially further from the colonists than the ministers, is so haunted with fear, that he trusted Lord Elgin would withdraw his objection, lest "very intense feeling" should be excited because he had suspended the execution of the twelve natives, are we to suppose that the ministers, who are nearer to the colonists, would have escaped this same fear of that very intense feeling that would be excited? That they did not escape it, is evident from acts such as the following, for which they were responsible, viz. the proclamation of martial law, the censoring of telegrams, the forbidding newspaper correspondents to accompany the military columns, and the resignation of the ministry, because the Imperial Government, in order that it may be more fully informed about the trial of the condemned men, had requested that their execution should be delayed. And all this furore is because forty or fifty natives had collided with a force of police. But if the Governor and the ministry of Natal were so completely influenced by the fear of the "very intense feeling" that would be aroused in the colonists, by the suspension of execution, is it to be supposed that the members of court-martial escaped that influence?

And a feeling which could have caused the Governor to give way on matters so vital as that of securing the withdrawal of the charge of murder against the twelve accused, and of transferring their case to the safer and more reliable procedures of the civil courts, which could have caused the Natal ministry to betray a lack of self-restraint so singular, could not fail to have also had its effect upon the court-martial. This court-martial was a body before which native witnesses, in the face of military demonstrations and under duress, gave their evidence. Then, too, the influence of the dominant feeling for vengeance, by which the community was carried away, being in the case of the members of the court-martial aggravated by their ignorance of law, laid open a very wide door to the miscarriage of justice. In the following description, with which we are supplied by local experts, we have the colonists, whom fear had completely bereft of all self-control, clamouring irresponsibly, and as it were, incoherently, for vengeance against the twelve natives. This flood of extravagant excitement, rising higher and yet higher, at length overwhelms the ministers. But in the onward rush of the deluge, even after the ministers had disappeared beneath its waves, there stood one figure, upright. Unclouded in mind, his mental balance poised, the billows of excitement in their blind rage leap up about him with savage vehemence. Still, unmoved by the onslaught of their fury, he maintains the upright pose. But now comes one terrible monster-wave, in comparison with which all the preceding waves are mere ripples. Look! look! see it dashes itself against the figure. And does the figure move? Yes, but he instantly regains his place. But here comes another member of this family of giant-waves. Onward it rolls in swelling volume. It, too, with its great proportions, lashes the figure. And does the figure this time, move? Yes, and manifestly he struggles to regain his foothold. But there comes a third of these gigantic billows! It comes! it comes! coming in the direction of the figure. See the might of its impetuous rush, its stupendous height, its engulfing sweep. In reckless abandon it hurls its awful weight against the figure. And does the figure survive also this, the mightiest of the monsters? No, he has vanished. Swept clean away. Gone! gone! gone! is Governor McCallum, even as are his ministers, under the

flood of popular frenzy. And where these have fallen, is it conceivable that the members of the court-martial have stood? But with the submergence of the members of the court-martial, there synchronizes the miscarriage of justice. And now for the description.

“A correspondent calls attention to the ‘performances of some of the inhabitants of Inchanga, Scottsville, Nel’s Rust, etc.,’ and expresses the opinion that Natalians ‘will not feel very proud of the behaviour of those who have been running about like a lot of scared rabbits for the edification of their native servants and neighbours.’”

“At a public meeting, 31 March, 1906, the following resolution was passed unanimously: ‘That a resolution be sent to the Government, protesting against their action in commuting the death sentences passed by Colonel McKenzie’s courts martial on the natives found guilty of sedition and insurrection.’”

“Referring to the scare, another correspondent, Mr. W. Hall Walton, J.P., says that ‘the most regrettable feature is that many men have left their farms, thereby inviting natives to steal; yet there have been no thefts or depredations, and as regards the natives, I believe they are in a state of fear as to what will happen. I heard one say, “Where are we going to sleep?” and another, “None but fools could think to fight the Government; it would be only a one day’s fight, and after that our people would starve.” Both of these natives were heads of kraals.’”

“The same paper—the ‘Natal Witness,’ 17 February—gives reports from the ‘Rand Daily Mail’ and the ‘Transvaal Leader’ respecting the ‘suspicious’ exodus of Zulu ‘boys,’ in which it is remarked that ‘as the Natal poll-tax is not to be collected until 31 May, this sudden migration of the Zulus has some significance,’ and an instruction cancelling all travelling passes to Natal is recommended. As if any other comment upon such exodus was justified than this—that when authority goes mad, or seems to do so, every one wishes to be with his own folk.”

“The correspondent of this newspaper at Johannesburg, having returned from a visit to Natal, where he found the authorities much in need of his own expert knowledge, telegraphs:—

“‘. . . If the Natal Government are prepared to grapple with the whole situation, they will avail themselves of the presence of Imperial troops to *test definitely the attitude of the natives* by ordering the immediate collection of all taxes by magistrates,

backed, if necessary, by mobile columns. . . . It is generally agreed that the Kaffirs have no wish to try conclusions with the whites before April or May, when the crops will have been gathered. . . . My plea for vigorous action at the present juncture is due to a desire to save the lives of both whites and blacks [*sic*]. I have reason to believe that Lord Selborne advocates a vigorous policy, which would certainly be approved by the bulk of the [? European] population of Natal.' ”

In a word, panic-stricken, the Natal colonists demanded the blood of the twelve natives, and the ministers, the Governor, and the court-martial had to surrender it. It is not unlikely that this danger of the miscarriage of justice, was the main reason that led Mr. Hofmeyr, of Cape Town, to express his strong objection in the interview which a press correspondent had with him, “to relegating to courts-martial cases which could well be tried by the civil courts.”

Passing to the sixth point, I observe that the punishment which had already been awarded for the murder of the two police officers was sufficient. For besides the destruction of native crops, the shelling of kraals, and the imposition of heavy fines of cattle upon native chiefs, two natives had been shot. And this view that sufficient punishment had already been meted out to the natives for the murder of Hunt and the trooper, Armstrong, is also shared in South Africa. It is thus that the “Pretoria News” of the 30th of March remarks:—

“Surely it was Mr. Smythe and his ministers who acted hastily, autocratically, and unadvisedly, not Lord Elgin. The murders of Hunt and Armstrong have already been amply avenged.”

And now I come to the seventh and last point that we are to touch upon, i.e. that the murder of the two white men having been committed before the time that martial law was proclaimed, renders the trial of the murderers, under martial law, illegal. It was thus that Mr. E. G. Jellicoe, in support of an urgent petition that was before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, on the 2nd of April, 1906, at the instance of Mr. A. Mangana, for special leave to appeal with reference to the postponed execution of the twelve natives of Natal, said:—

“The point he wished to press most strongly on their lord-

ships was that the proclamation could not justify the military court in dealing with an offence committed against the ordinary law of the land."

"Lord James of Hereford inquired what were the authorities relied upon with regard to the point that the proclamation could not be retrospective."

"Mr. Jellicoe said that there was a statement in Mr. Clode's book on Military and Martial Law of the proposition, and the opinion of Lord Abinger, given in the course of a debate in 1826 on national danger, with regard to the case of the Rev. John Smith in Demerara, was referred to."

These seven points, then, that an unjust tax was the primary cause of the collision between the natives and the police; that the payment of the tax was demanded before the expiration of the time which the law allowed; that the identity of the twelve men who were accused of the murders was questionable; that the murder of the police officers was probably not premeditated; that the nature of the court which tried the accused murderers, and the circumstances that attended the trial, furnished grave risks of the miscarriage of justice; that adequate punishment had already been inflicted for the two murders, and that the trial by court martial was illegal; these seven points, I repeat, constitute, in my judgment, very strong reasons for the commutation of the death sentences in the cases of the twelve natives, who were shot last year (1906), under the direction of the Natal Government.

It is also my firm conviction that these seven points are sufficient reasons why His Majesty's Government, by virtue of the power of veto that it possesses, should not only have delayed the execution of the twelve condemned natives, but should have recommended the commutation of their death sentences. And this most serious dereliction suggests some very striking lessons. In his reply of the 30th of March, 1906, to Sir Henry McCallum's telegram of the previous day, from which extracts will be found to begin on page 361, Lord Elgin says:—

"Your telegram of 29 March, giving full information as to the procedure and circumstances of trial and opinion of the Attorney-General thereupon, and your own careful examination of the whole case, and of the evidence against each indi-

vidual prisoner, and the conclusive manner in which the individual guilt of each prisoner was established on which, I doubt not, any mitigating circumstances which differentiate their guilt were considered, has received consideration of His Majesty's Government. . . . In the light of information now furnished, His Majesty's Government recognizes that the decision of this grave matter rests in the hands of your ministers and yourself."

One would have thought that when the Secretary of State for the Colonies in reply to Sir Henry McCallum's telegram, announcing the impending execution of the twelve condemned natives, asked for information, and when he directed that pending the information the execution should be postponed, he intended to review the procedure which had declared for the wholesale slaughter of fourteen lives for two lives.

For if this were not Lord Elgin's intention, then his request for information and for postponement of execution in the meantime, was not only purposeless, but provocative and mischievous. It was provocative in that it meddled with the affairs of the colonists without sufficient reason, and it was mischievous in that it probably raised false hopes in minds of the condemned men. Therefore, if Lord Elgin's intervention meant nothing more than that he should be informed, or that he should be assured "as to the procedure and circumstances of trial and opinion of the Attorney-General thereupon," and "as to" the Governor's "own careful examination of the whole case, and of the evidence against each individual prisoner and the conclusive manner in which the individual guilt of each prisoner was established," etc., if it had no ulterior aims than these, then it was purposeless, and thereby provocative and mischievous. For Lord Elgin should have taken all this for granted; he should have taken the procedure, the opinion of the Attorney-General, and the Governor's "own careful examination," etc., for granted. But I refuse to credit the chief official of one of the great departments of state with an act—I had almost said puerile—with an act so flippant. Hence I am forced to take the only other alternative there is, that alternative being that in his intervention Lord Elgin's intention was to review the circumstances that led up to the arrest of the prisoners, to



review the circumstances of their arrest, and of their trial and condemnation.

And now, having taken this, the only other alternative view of the matter, we are met with the question, What was it that deflected Lord Elgin from his original purpose, of reviewing the cases of the condemned men in the sense just now mentioned, and caused him, instead, only to acquiesce in the condemnation? I say acquiesce, not endorse, for Lord Elgin observed, that

“In the light of the information now furnished, his Majesty’s Government recognize that the decision of this grave matter rests in the hands of your Ministers and yourself.”

He did not review the charges, trial, and sentences, as he must have intended to do, neither did he endorse them, as he should have done had he been satisfied with them, but he simply threw them back with their responsibility—as it were—upon the Natal Governor and his Ministry. Now, in all this, there appears to be the evidence of some irresistible pressure, a pressure, which, against his will, and against his better judgment, induced the Secretary of State for the Colonies to sanction the performance of the ghastly slaughter of the twelve condemned men. And this pressure, I believe, is discerned in the following extracts that relate to the “Natal crisis.” First there is Governor McCallum’s somewhat pathetic appeal to Lord Elgin, which I have quoted already.

“I trust that with the additional facts contained in this telegram your Lordship will see your way to withdraw objection.”

Then there is South African opinion, and of this I begin with Pietermaritzburg. We read:—

“The mayor has called an indignation meeting for tomorrow. The resentment felt against the action of the Imperial Government is increasing hourly.—Durban.”

The “Natal Mercury” said:—

“The Imperial Government’s action is gross interference. It strikes at the very roots of responsible government, and reduces the constitution to a meaningless charter. It is an insult to the Governor, to the Government, and to the colony.

It is a reflection of the gravest kind to Natal's sense of justice and humanity. It is a blunder of the grossest magnitude, committed at a very critical juncture. We will not submit to these interferences, which make firm and just government of the natives impossible. The Imperial Government must abandon its untenable position, or revoke the Natal constitution, because we do not believe that any Natalian will undertake government under the conditions which the Imperial Government are at present imposing. The gravest crisis has been forced upon us. Every man must rally to the support of the Natal Government."

From another source we are further informed that :—

"Telegrams from every part of Natal are unanimous in declaring that the condemned natives must die."

Concerning Cape Town we are informed :—

"The news of the action of the Government regarding Natal has been received with mingled astonishment, indignation, and apprehension."

"The 'Cape Times' doubts whether even from a purely constitutional aspect the interference is warrantable; but in any case, it is impolitic, unwise, and in the present circumstances extremely dangerous."

Of Johannesburg we read :—

"The action of the Imperial Government with regard to the native trouble in Natal has caused considerable excitement here. Apprehensions are felt as to the effect that the Government's intervention will have on the native mind, not only in Natal, but in South Africa generally, and this consideration is likely to cause widespread dissatisfaction among the whites of all classes in all the colonies."

Pretoria said :—

"Public opinion on the Natal crisis strongly supports the attitude of the colony. A prominent Boer to-day declared that should England lose South Africa, it would be due to the Liberal Government's policy."

We have now come to British opinion, and I begin with Sir W. Peace, who has represented the interests of Natal in this country for thirty-one years.

“The action of the Home Government,” said Sir W. Peace, “in interfering with the decision of the Governor and the ministry of the colony will, I fear, bear fruit in catastrophe. . . . It seems to me that the Home Government is going full speed ahead to lose South Africa.”

The following example, which is taken from the leader of a great London journal, reveals the attitude of the larger section of the British press, towards the “Natal crisis.”

“The Government does not seem able to touch anything connected with South Africa without creating deep feeling of resentment among the British colonists. This time it is Natal, which has been roused to wrath by a telegram from the Colonial Office, and it is in the loyal Garden Colony that indignation meetings are being held, though the tide of excitement runs almost as high at Cape Town and Johannesburg as at Durban. A situation has arisen which would be serious at any time, but doubly serious now that all British loyalists south of the Zambesi are anxiously wondering what blunder the Home Government will next commit, and are irritated by recent tactless and provocative speeches.”

Parliamentary opinion is thus given :—

“The grave news from Natal created feelings of serious apprehension among thoughtful members on both sides of the House of Commons. The action of the Colonial Ministry, it was pointed out, was a protest against the interference of the Home Government in a matter of purely local jurisdiction. Such interference was regarded as a new development in our relations with the self-governing colonies which might easily affect the stability of the Empire. The question of immediate concern, however, was deemed to be the safety of the white population. Members familiar with the conditions prevailing in South Africa affirmed that the blacks had lately manifested an insolence and defiance of authority which might at any moment take a dangerous turn, if it became known that the Imperial Government was assuming an attitude of apparent toleration and encouragement. The leaders of the Opposition intend to demand immediate explanation. It was reported that the incident was exciting alarm even among members of the Cabinet.”

I wonder what greater right have the whites to treat the blacks with insolence, than have the blacks to treat the whites

in that manner. This great chorus then, of adverse public opinion—that is composed of the passionate appeal of Governor McCallum, that the Imperial Government would give way to the colony, that is composed of the denunciation of the Imperial interference, and of defiance to the Imperial authority by the colonists of Natal, that is composed of the sympathy of the great bulk of white colonists throughout the Empire, of the larger part of the British press, and of the British Parliament, on behalf of white Natal, that is composed of the apprehension of these two last estates, lest Natal should secede from the Empire, and of their censure of the Imperial Government in consequence—was the force of which the violence of its pressure, unnerving the Government, caused Lord Elgin to relegate to the colony the Imperial authority and Imperial responsibility.

Thus, according to the facts that we have already considered, there were three parties who were involved in the Natal controversy. These were the Imperial Government, the white colonists, and the natives. The relation between the natives and colonists is characterized by the presence of a latent hostility, and this hostility, with regard to the colonists, appears in the systematic practice of obstructing the natives' progress. Therefore, although the natives outnumber the colonists in the proportion of nine to one, and although they contribute the larger part of the revenue, they are nevertheless wholly unrepresented in the colonial legislature, and in consequence they are without a voice in the affairs of the colony. In these highly anomalous conditions, the Imperial Government has been responsible for the just treatment of the natives. Hence, whereas the relation between the natives and colonists has been that of hostile rivals, the relation between the natives and the Imperial Government has been that of wards and guardian. Well then, since the policy of the colonists is to keep down the natives by fair means or by foul means, it is not astonishing that they should have imposed upon him the extortionary tax, that is known as the poll-tax, in addition to his ordinary heavy taxes, in order that he may be forced to the slave labour of the mines, and in order that they may appropriate his lands and his cattle. Neither is it astonishing that in order to justify these acts, the colonists should have enforced the payment of the tax months before the time

which the law had fixed for its collection. Further, it is not astonishing that having committed these grave breaches of equity and of their own law, the colonists should seek to justify their misdeeds by the committal of other excesses.

Therefore, when their highly unjust poll-tax, and their equally unjust procedure of collecting the tax before the time which the law had sanctioned, led to the murder of two white policemen, they avenged the murders by methods that involved the mistaken identity of the accused murderers, punishment out of proportion to the crime that was committed, grave risks of miscarriage of justice, illegality in the form of the trial of the accused murderers, the fact that the murders were not premeditated, and thereby the ignoring of these conditions as extenuating circumstances. I say, then, that in the light of the policy and practice which the Natal colonists have steadfastly pursued towards the natives of the colony, the serious irregularities that have disfigured their acts immediately before, during, and immediately after the recent "crisis," are not at all astonishing. The fact which is really and unmistakably astonishing is that after they had barbarously taken fourteen lives for two, and while they were still being swayed by the vindictiveness to which their savage impulses had given place—as the following excerpts attest—the Natal colonists, with hypocritical mien and pharisaic ostentation, should avow that Lord Elgin's telegram "is a reflection of the gravest kind to Natal's sense of justice and humanity":—

"Reuter's special Telegram:—N'Kandhla Forest (with Colonel Mansel's Column), 13 April, 1906. Bambata and his followers have taken refuge in the caves near Ceteway's grave. . . . The Natal Government offers a reward of £500 for the capture of Bambata, and £20 for each of his followers secured alive or dead."

"An Ethiopian preacher," says a Durban telegram, "has been sentenced to six months' imprisonment and twenty-five lashes, for offering prayers of a seditious character in a native kraal. The prayers were to the effect that the natives should be given strength to drive the whites across the sea."

I hope that this man has continued his prayers.

"The Zulu chiefs, Tilonko and Sikikuku, who were recently

tried by court martial, have been sentenced to ten years' hard labour, and fined 500 head of cattle each."

" Pietermaritzburg, 7th September, 1906.—Mjongo's case will, it is hoped, be the last echo of the Richmond murders. Counsel for the defence urged the jury not to allow hatred of the natives to prejudice their judgment, and contended that Mjongo had exerted his influence to prevent the natives from attacking the police.

" The jury, nevertheless, brought in a verdict of guilty, and Mjongo and two other natives, who are permanently crippled by wounds received during the rising, were sentenced to death. Two jurymen disagreed with the verdict.

" Twenty Kolwas, including all Mjongo's sons, have already suffered the death penalty in connection with the attack on Sub-Inspector Hunt and Trooper Armstrong at Richmond."

" Natal Murderers executed. Pietermaritzburg, 10 October, 1906.—The natives Mjongo, Mjuwu, and Rajana were hanged to-day for the murder of Sub-Inspector Hunt and Trooper Armstrong, of the Natal Police, in February last. They died singing a Kaffir hymn and engaged in prayer. The entire Press of the colony condemns the execution and regrets the Governor's refusal to commute the death sentence.—Reuter."

And this is the same Governor who in the first instance suggested that the charge of murder should be withdrawn against the first twelve natives that were accused, and afterwards executed. The hope which is expressed in one of the preceding extracts that the slaughter of Mjongo and his brother chiefs would bring the bloody drama of Natal to a close, has not been realized, for whereas these chiefs were murdered in 1906, the following extracts bear date 1907 :—

" Dinizulu and the Natal Rising. Pietermaritzburg, 4 January, 1907.—Owing to the serious charges which have been made incriminating Dinizulu in connection with the murder of Mr. Stainbank, and accusing him of complicity in the recent rebellion, the authorities have decided to hold a further investigation. Dinizulu will probably be brought to Pietermaritzburg.—Reuter."

" Sentence on a Rebel. Pietermaritzburg, 4 January.—The son of a Zulu chief has been sentenced to four years' imprisonment for complicity in the recent rebellion. The accused was engaged in pulling a rickshaw in Pietermaritzburg when

he was discovered. The evidence given in his case tended to implicate Dinizulu.—Reuter.”

But amid all this riotous display of passion, the result of serious loss of balance—moral and mental—we are clearly told that Natal Caucasian is fit to govern not only itself, but also Natal Ethiopian :—

“ Natal Native Unrest. Durban, Sunday, 3 March, 1907.—The ‘ Natal Mercury,’ in a carefully-worded leading article on the reports of native disaffection received from trustworthy sources, deploras that, ‘ owing to its weakness, the Native Department is not respected.’ ‘ God forbid,’ says the journal, ‘ that another Mome Gorge (the battle which resulted in Bambata’s defeat last June) should be necessary to secure the respect due to it.’ The journal urges the Native Department to ascertain the real position of affairs, and to inspire the loyalists with confidence in the dominant power. It interprets the drafting of Imperial troops into the country as a sign of weakness, and adds : “ The colonists have proved their ability. Sooner or later the disturbing Zululand element has got to be tackled. This will be the duty of Natal, not that of the Imperial Government. Any misconception as to the responsibility may easily lead to a catastrophe.—Reuter.”

“ 17 March, Durban. Natal Natives.—Growing uneasiness. At a public meeting held to-day at Melmoth, it was decided to urge on the Government the immediate necessity of building a jail and laager for the protection of the district. Several speakers stated that the eyes of the colonists have been opened by the late rebellion, and signs were not wanting that the natives were unrestful, their conduct being, in fact, worse than previous to the rebellion. It was declared that one chief had only to hold up his finger to cause a general rising. A laager, it was asserted, was absolutely necessary, as a place of refuge in case of necessity.”

“ 19 March. Natal Rebels Captured. Pietermaritzburg.—The Natal Police have surrendered, and captured seven rebels at Mapumlo.”

How long will the British Government continue to be sponsor for, and abettor of, the oddities and harlequinades of this grossly intolerant, cruel, and incompetent minority in its mimicry of government ? Well, it was because of the certainty that the white colonists would oppress the natives that the Imperial Government pledged itself to secure for the

native just treatment. And there seems to be every reason to believe that it was in pursuance of that pledge that Lord Elgin, on behalf of the Imperial Government, delayed the execution of the twelve natives who had been condemned to be shot.

But now, what shall be said of the conduct of the Imperial Government in not only abandoning its own paramountcy to 100,000 colonists, but in also absolutely betraying the destiny of 900,000 natives into the hostile hands of those colonists? And the Government that has stooped to this cowardly surrender, that has basely deserted the natives of Natal at a most crucial juncture, is numerically the strongest Government of recent times; moreover, this Government professedly, is not Conservative, but Liberal. And this cruel betrayal of the natives of Natal by the greatest British Government that has existed for nearly a century at the frown of the colourless section of that colony, suggests some very weighty lessons. First and foremost, it suggests the lesson, that whereas conciliation is the principle by which the continued adhesion of the colourless section of the Empire is sought by the parent state, coercion is the principle by which the continued adhesion of the coloured section of the Empire is sought. In the first case it is conciliation at all cost, in the second case it is coercion at all cost. As a result, the rights of the coloured section of the Empire are constantly being sacrificed by the parent state, in order to conciliate the colourless section.

And so the conduct of the white colonists comes into conformity with that of spoilt children, whilst the conduct of the parent state comes into conformity with that of an over-indulgent parent. Cloyed with an excess of attention, of rights, of privileges, and of fulsome flattery, these surfeited offspring are ever whining for an increase of these stimulants. For they well know that compliance with their whims, rests, not upon their lawfulness, but upon the energy and the persistency with which they are pressed. They know that however hollow and however unreasonable might be their cry, if it be sufficiently loud and sufficiently prolonged, it will be liberally rewarded by an over-indulgent parent, and they know that this will be done in violation of the rights of the coloured section.

Thus it was that in Australia—which is a continent that is



said to be capable of supporting more than one hundred millions of people, but which possesses a stationary or dwindling population of less than six millions—a colony (Queensland) for the purpose of securing what is called “*a white Australia*,” was able in 1901 to pass an Act for the forcible deportation of three thousand *coloured labourers*. And that when these coloured British subjects, whom white British subjects had so grievously outraged, appealed to the King that the Act may be disallowed, they were informed that His Majesty's Government had decided that they would not advise the King to disallow the Act. Thus it was also that while white Natal clapped upon each adult male of black Natal the iniquitous slavery tax of one pound per head, in addition to the taxes which they were already paying, the Imperial mother, in silence, looked on; but when white Natal receives from black Natal a blow, that its own rash and unjust act had provoked, bawling out in the bitterness of anguish, the Imperial mother, with strong expressions of grief for the white child, and with rabid expressions of denouncement for the black—in newspaper leaders, magazine articles, etc.—stands ready with her battalions to pounce upon the latter in the defence of the former.

And it has been thus that this impish child with the bleached cuticle, by name Natal, imbued with the courage that the maternal battalions inspire, imposed an unrighteous tax, demanded its payment before the time that itself had fixed; and for the murder of two of its comrades, brought about by these irregularities, it proclaimed martial law, shelled native kraals, destroyed native churches, destroyed native crops, threatened to secede from the maternal home, slew fourteen natives, and is at this moment (the 18th of April, 1906) scouring hill and dale in the hope of finding more natives, for the lash, the chain-gang, and target-practice. Again it is thus that this soft-hearted, if not soft-headed, Imperial mother, who in former days had restrained the truculence of her progeny, is now being dragged at his heels, a silent witness (if a regretful one) of the oddities of his vanity, and the tragedies of his conceit. Yes, Natal, at all cost, must be conciliated; therefore, when it decreed that, as the first instalment, fourteen blacks should be murdered for the murder of two whites, and the parent State seemed to demur, it protested, and

threatened to secede, whereupon the parent State assents to the decree, and apologizes for having demurred. And now, standing with her battalions in reserve, she applauds the colonists, hounding a gallant chief and his band, whose only crime is the refusal to bow the knee to tyranny and to kiss the hand of oppression. And, whereas in Natal, there is this spectacle of the numerically, strongest Government of recent times, abdicating its proud position as the guardian of all, and becoming the tool of one, and that one a factious minority, becoming the tool of this minority against the majority, and in that capacity freely participating in the excesses and the eccentricities of the minority, this same Government also denies to the majority in India the most elementary rights.

Thus we read :—

“Calcutta, 15 April, 1906.—Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee, a well-known Bengali journalist, has been arrested at Barisal, prior to the meeting of a provincial conference, for disregarding a notification under police act issued during the recent unrest, prohibiting processions without licence, and crying ‘Bande mataram.’ The police, armed with sticks, seized Mr. Banerjee. When brought into court an adjournment, asked for the purpose of preparing a defence, was refused, and Mr. Banerjee was convicted and fined 200 rupees for contempt of court in protesting against the magistrate’s remarks.”

Again we read :—

“Calcutta, 15 April, 1906.—Surendra Nath Banerjee, the most powerful Indian popular leader, was arrested yesterday at Barisal, for heading a native procession and shouting the Bengali national cry, and was heavily fined. Banerjee commands an enormous following, and the affair has created an extraordinary sensation.”

The unrest which is alluded to in the first of these two extracts as having been the cause of the “Police Act,” for the contravention of which Mr. Banerjee has been fined, has arisen out of a proposal that was made to the Imperial Government in 1903 by the Indian Government; a proposal that was carried into effect in the autumn of last year (1905), to transfer certain districts of Bengal from the jurisdiction of the Lieu-

tenant-Governor of that Presidency to the Chief Commission of Assam, and of the Central Provinces. And the Indian Government has given these as its reasons for advocating such a change, viz. :—

“the pressing necessity for affording to the Government of Bengal some substantial relief from the constantly increasing burden imposed upon it by the vast population entrusted to the administration, and by the growth of important industrial and commercial interests.”

The great population of Bengal has been unanimously and vehemently opposed to this scheme for the dismemberment of their province. And I venture to think that in regard to the following excerpt, taken from a letter of Babu Sita Nath Roy, Hon. Sec. of Bengal National Chamber of Commerce, to the chief Secretary to the Government of Bengal, dated the 3rd of February, 1904, protesting against the scheme of dismemberment, the reader will agree with me that the Indian protestors have completely ruled out of court the reasons that are assigned by the Indian Government as those that have made the change necessary. In the course of his letter, in answer to the reasons which the Indian Government adduced, and which I have quoted above, Mr. Nath Roy says :—

“The committee venture to think that the true remedy lies in altering the machinery of Government, in creating an Executive Council for assisting the Lieutenant-Governor and devising other means which will lighten the Lieutenant-Governor's burden, without diminishing his responsibility.”

And now comes the blow of the sledge-hammer :—

“While the whole Indian Empire with an area of about 1,700,000 square miles, comprising various races, creeds, and classes with conflicting interests and involving much more onerous responsibilities, has been so long, well, and successfully administered by the Governor-General, assisted by an Executive Council of six members, there is no reason why Bengal should not be efficiently managed, if assisted by an Executive Council of two or three members to whom special departments may be assigned.”

It will be seen that the partition of Bengal has been made in defiance of the wishes of the people ; and this act of the British

Government stands out in striking contrast with its attitude at the time of the Natal "crisis." Of course, the partition of Bengal was not the work of the present Government, but of its predecessor. And upon the accession of the Liberals to power, great hopes were entertained by the Bengalese people that their unanimous wish would now be respected. But their approach to the present Government upon the subject of the partition only elicited the announcement that the case, being closed, would not be reopened. In the case, then, of coloured India, whose loyal support has not a little enriched the Empire, this policy of the late Government would not be reversed, but in the case, for example, of the two white South African colonies, that have recently been at war with England, the policy of the late Government concerning them in regard to constitutional government would be, and has been, reopened and reversed. Similarly, I have mentioned in a preceding chapter (p. 296) that during the riot in British Guiana last autumn (1905) Negroes were needlessly shot down. The native inhabitants of that colony have been anxious that an official inquiry should be made into the circumstances by which such an occurrence was possible in a British colony. To this end they respectfully asked the Home Government for a commission of inquiry, but the answer that has been vouchsafed to them has been that if they wish for a commission they must pay for it. Yet if the colonists who made this request for an inquiry had been white, is it conceivable that in such circumstances it would have been refused them, or that their payment for the inquiry would have been the condition upon which they could have obtained it?

But why should the Imperial Government have abandoned its position of authority at the unreasonable threat and bluster of the smaller section, that is to say 100,000, of a colony of 1,000,000 inhabitants, and why should it have reversed the policy of the late Government in deference to the wishes of the inhabitants of two other colonies that have been lately at war with the state, and yet refused the reasonable and respectful request of a province of nearly eighty million souls, and also refused the reasonable and respectful request of a colony which for nearly one hundred years has been an integral part of the Empire? The reason is that in the two former cases the applicants are colourless, or rather, they are powerful,

whereas in the two latter cases they are coloured, or rather they are powerless ; for Britain's present policy is conciliation for the colourless division of the Empire, and coercion for the coloured division. Thus England is strong against the weak, but weak against the strong. And so whereas in the latter case she is deferential even to the point of servility, in the former case she is scornful, haughty, and arrogant. This, then, is the first lesson which the betrayal of the Natal natives by the Imperial Government suggests. In the second place the betrayal of the Natal natives by the British Government reveals the perilous position which the coloured British subjects occupy. In a mixed colony with a population of a million, of which 100,000 are white, we have seen this white class, for sinister ends, impose upon the native majority of 900,000 a notoriously unjust tax. That tax leads to a serious breach of the peace. Thereupon the strong minority, with a terrible vengeance, proceeds to vindicate the law of the breach of which its own acts were the antecedent cause. Mindful, no doubt, of its obligations to the natives, as well as probably conscious of the circumstances that had led to the breach of the law, also of the unjust proportion between that breach of the law and the punishment with which it had already been visited, His Majesty's Government intervenes.

With a furious resentment, which the outspoken support and the unspoken sympathy of the white colonists throughout the Empire encouraged, and which the largest and most influential part of the British people endorsed, the 100,000 colonists defied the intervention of the Imperial Government. Assailed by this formidable opposition, the Imperial Government, with a majority of 246, but without a backbone, surrendered to the clamour of the colonists as meekly as did Pilate to the clamour of the Jews, the principle which it had essayed to defend ; then it apologizes for seeming to wish to defend the principle, and finally it makes common cause with the colonists against the native. Now, since the conditions in regard to Natal exist with more or less variation, in all the colonies, dependencies, and protectorates of the Empire, with regard to the native population, since there exists among the colourless colonists throughout the Empire towards their coloured fellow-subjects that latent hostility,<sup>5</sup> and coveting of their land, which led the Natal colonists to enact and to pro-

mulgate the unrighteous poll-tax, since British opinion is that the colourless subjects must be conciliated at all cost, and the coloured subjects must be coerced at all cost; and since the British Government, and that a Radical Government, has formally given its adhesion to this principle, it is obvious that the same or similar outrages to those which have recently been, and which are now (1906) being committed upon the natives of Natal, in the name of law and order, may at any time, and in any part of the Empire, be committed by the colourless subject upon the coloured subject.

Thus any body of white men, in any one of the colonies, dependencies, or protectorates of the Empire, having, rightly or wrongly, taken umbrage at any coloured person or persons in that colony, dependency, or protectorate, may proceed to deal with him or with them in the most summary and extreme manner. Before or after they have committed the outrage they may induce the most powerful section of the local press, which is generally identified with the interests of their class, to espouse their cause. Aided by this means, and by that of personal influence, they will then be able to gain to their side the local government, which is always predisposed towards their support. And having gained both the local press and the local legislature, they will cause them to legalize their crime against the coloured subject. From this they will proceed to the third act, of which the performance—judging from the precedent of the Natal "crisis"—will not be difficult. That performance will be to enlist on their behalf the sympathy of the British press and of the British Government. Therefore, in the presence of such a combination, there will be no means of redress to the coloured subject. And this highly probable condition, which the present situation might develop, constitutes, in my judgment, the perilous position of coloured British subjects.

The third lesson which is taught by the betrayal of the cause of the native by the British Government is, that the policy of extreme conciliation is dangerous to the peace of the Empire, and is at the same time, futile. Conciliation, or the policy of winning, as opposed to irritation or the policy of estranging, is the proper policy that the hegemonical state of the Empire should pursue towards the subordinate states. Therefore my objection is

not against what I may call simple conciliation, but against what I have ventured to call conciliation at all cost, or extreme conciliation. It is this form of conciliation, then, that is dangerous, and Natal illustrates the danger. Simple conciliation will follow after in order to win back, or it will yield in order to preserve the continuity of comradeship. But its limit in either of these two directions is at, or outside of, the violation of principle. Thus it was proper that the Imperial Government should have acted towards colonial Natal with that spirit of conciliation that would preserve to the Empire its loyal adhesion, but the limit of that conciliation was the rights of aboriginal Natal. For the facts that white Natal is connected to the parent state by blood, and that certain features of its life move upon a higher plane than black Natal, do not in the very least increase the inherent rights of the former, nor in the very least decrease the inherent rights of the latter. Hence, when white Natal, in the case of the poll-tax, wished to invade the rights of black Natal, the Imperial Government, as the guardian of the latter, should have imposed its veto. And when white Natal hollloas, raves, and fumes, the veto should have been still kept down.

But instead of simple conciliation, the Imperial Government, adopted toward colonial Natal—as it is now adopting toward all white colonists—the policy of extreme conciliation. Thus, in the imposition of the poll-tax, colonial Natal was allowed to commit one violation of native rights, then this one would lead to others of greater gravity, such as those of punishing for the non-payment of the tax before the fixed time for the payment had expired, of the shelling of native villages, the destruction of native churches and of native crops, the imposition of heavy fines, and the slaughter of fourteen natives. But these grosser acts also led to the violation of native rights, which are of the grossest kind, among the examples being the pursuit of Bambaata and the reward of five hundred pounds offered for his head—a reward, however, that was afterwards withdrawn, as well as that of the twenty pounds offered for the head of each of his followers—the extensive military operations, which according to official estimate, slaughtered 3,500 natives, confiscated their sheep, their cattle, and their lands, and visited the sufferings of privation and misery, of famine and of premature death upon helpless

women and innocent children. But who could, if they would, conceive the depth of woe that is summed up in these miseries? Surely, Natal Caucasian and the British Government are verily guilty of the blood of these women and children, and of these thousands of men. The policy of conciliation, at all cost then, has led to one invasion of native rights, and one invasion has led to other invasions, of which the danger of a general native rising is the outcome. So we have these two laws, that abuse is not stationary but progressive, and that in the progressiveness of abuse there lurks the danger of explosion. Now, had the Imperial Government (that is to say, the late Government or the present Government) done its duty by prohibiting the poll-tax, thereby preventing the invasion of native rights, the present threatening danger would not probably have arisen.

And this danger is now aggravated by the fact that having in the circumstances of the Natal "crisis" formally renounced its position of arbiter between the coloured and colourless sections of the Empire, and having become an ally of the colourless section against the coloured section, the Imperial Government will not be allowed henceforth by its ally to resume its function as arbiter. Whereby its restraining influence, which has tended hitherto to minimize, and which has actually minimized friction between the white British subject and the coloured British subject, is now not only lost in that respect, but is converted into an accelerating force of antagonism which, in conjunction with the antagonism of the white colonists, operates against the coloured British subject. Justification for the conduct of the Imperial Government, in not interfering with the Natal Government when it imposed the poll-tax, and for surrendering its right of intervention in regard to the twelve natives who were condemned to be shot, is offered upon the ground that the Natal colony enjoys representative government. However, this justification appears to me to suggest two questions. First, seeing that the natives of Natal are wholly unrepresented in the local legislature, has the Imperial Government been responsible for their just treatment, or has it not been responsible?

Second, does "responsible government" confer upon the Natal colonists the right to enact discriminating and oppressive laws against the natives? If the Imperial Government has been responsible for the just government of the native of Natal, if the responsible government of that colony does not give it



the right to discriminate in its laws against the native, and if the Imperial Government be justified—as I believe it is, in other conditions—in intervening on behalf of the Congolese, then assuredly it was justified, despite the adverse criticisms at home and in the colonies, in intervening in regard to the execution of the twelve condemned natives. I make this affirmation on the ground of right, for, as is proved by the present danger in Natal (1906), a danger that is the outcome of the policy of wrong, what is right is in the long run the sound policy.

If the British Government—notwithstanding the high and important relations which it bears to Natal, in common with the other self-governing states—as the hegemonical state of the Empire, as the source whence Natal derived its power of self-government, as guardian of the rights of the natives, and as possessing the power of veto upon unjust legislations that may be passed by colonial legislatures, if the British Government in spite of these relations was not justified in intervening in the circumstances of the Natal crisis, that is to say, that if it was not justified in interfering in the affairs of one of its own colonies in order to prevent the committal of an atrocity, then upon what ground is it justified in the attempt to intervene in the affairs of the *Independent* State of the Congo in order to put down its atrocity?

And now with regard to the futility of coercion. We have seen that when Sir Henry McCallum suggested to the Natal ministry that the charge of murder should be withdrawn in regard to the twelve natives who were being tried by court-martial at Richmond, and that their case should be sent for trial before a civil tribunal, they replied that:—

“Several tribes who had openly defied the magistrates had still to be dealt with, and a military force was at present proceeding against them.”

The Governor stated further that the

“ministers were convinced that for dealing promptly with natives who had taken up arms, the same urgency for trial by court martial then existed as at first, and that any interference would probably conduce to outbreak in the near future, as a sign of weakness or indecision on the part of the Government would immediately be observed by the natives, who, for the most part, are adopting a waiting attitude.”

Thus it will be observed that the great fact which this extract reveals is that the Natal ministry was not so much concerned about securing a fair trial to the natives who had been in custody for the murder of the two police officers, as that all the natives of the colony should be overawed and terrorized by a great display of force and power. And so after that the summary trial of the court-martial had condemned to death twelve natives for the murder of two white men, the Government of Natal commanded that "the disaffected chiefs and indunas" should be present to witness the execution of the prisoners.

With regard to the result of this command, we read on the 3rd of April, 1906 :—

"Some of the natives who witnessed yesterdays' executions at Richmond were greatly unnerved by the proceedings. Several headmen deliberately arrived late, and did not appear until the executions were half over. They were severely reprimanded by Colonel Weighton. The chief, Guolombane, said that he was afraid to watch his people being killed, and he had to be ordered to stand forward at the head of his indunas. Mskofeli nervously kept his head turned away the whole time. The proceedings have made a most profound impression upon the natives."

"The proceedings," we are here told, "have made a most profound impression upon the natives." Yet what do I read in the dispatch from Natal on the very next day after the execution? This :—

"More trouble in Natal. Police force fired on."

Again :—

"According to the latest information available, Magwababa's wife reported that Bambata, with an armed force went to the kraal and secured Magwababa. He then tied his wrists tightly with goat's hide and commenced to flog him, saying, 'Where are your small white men now, who have appointed you chief?'"

Then :—

"Bambata, the deposed chief, is gone into the thorn country with a large following of natives. The Umvoti Mounted Rifles have been ordered to Greytown, and a large force of

police left here to-night under command of Colonel Mansell. I am officially informed that fifty shots were fired at the party which was after Bambata this afternoon. The matter is of grave importance to the peace of Natal, as Greytown lies close to the Zulu border."

As I said a moment ago, this dispatch concerning the flight of Bambata was transmitted on the 3rd of April, or the day after the execution of the twelve natives. But we have noticed, too, already that the dispatch from N'Kandhla Forest, dated the 13th of April, stated that :—

"Bambata and his followers have taken refuge in the caves near Cetewayo's grave. . . . The rebels were undeniably assisted in their flight by the surrounding tribes under the three chiefs, Signada, N. Dubi, and Gayele, who have large following, and whose attitude is not satisfactory. . . ." The Natal Government offers a reward of £500 for the capture of Bambata, and £20 for each of his followers secured, dead or alive."

All this, then, is that "most profound impression" which we are told that those barbarous executions at Richmond produced upon the natives. Like the brave Nigerians, whom injustice had forced to reprisals, at frequent intervals since their country was wrested from them, Bambata, whom a tyrannical Government had forced to reprisals, is called a rebel. But to every public movement, good or bad, a catchword or watchword, as the symbol, is of the utmost use, for it covers a multitude of sins, be those sins in the form of ecclesiastical bigotry, municipal jobbery, political dishonesty, or otherwise. This being the case, it is not singular that in the present farrago in Natal (1906) the colonists should have emblazoned their shield with a catchword. That catchword is the term "loyalty." Judging from the acts, as well as from the speech of these casuists, "loyalty" of the native is abject and servile submission to the whites, it is gratitude to the whites for having deprived him of all rights—social, civil, and political—and it is satisfaction in being a subject of discriminative laws, unequal and unjust fiscal burdens. These aberrant manifestations have their root in the belief of the absurd figment that the white man is morally, mentally, and physically the superior of the black. But if Bambata were a rebel, then so were Kossuth,

Garibaldi, Mazzini, and all members of the illustrious company, who in every age of the world's history, have resisted tyranny and flouted oppression. Nay! Bambata was not a "rebel," but a patriot, a hero, and a martyr; so were the brave band that attended him in his flight, as well as the chiefs who in their flight ministered to their necessities. These, viz. Bambata, his companions in flight, the chiefs who have aided them in their flight, and the Nigerians, whose only effective means of expressing disapproval of their cruel lot is by forcible resistance, are not the persons who are "disloyal," for the disloyal ones are they rather who having, on the one hand, withheld from these native peoples all means of representation, have, on the other hand, by discriminating, oppressive, and exasperating laws, goaded them into active or passive resistance. Opposition to systematic and determined injustice, cannot be rightly called disloyalty, for government presupposes justice, and loyalty fidelity to justice.

Now, then, in the face of the action of Bambata, who undoubtedly must have known of all that had happened and of all that was happening at Richmond and at Pietermaritzburg, in the face of his defiant action in deposing his successor, despite his knowledge of those terrible events, in the face of his successful escape from his pursuers, of the active as well as the moral support which he received from other chiefs, of the feeling of terror that was caused throughout the colony by his movements, and of the fact that although the large reward of five hundred pounds had been offered by the local Government for his capture, and a reward of twenty pounds had also been offered for the capture of each of his followers, not one of them was taken; in the face of all these facts, can the elaborate and imposing display of force which was set in motion by the Government in order to overawe and terrorize the natives, and of which a feature was the compelling of the chiefs and indunas to witness the execution of their fellow-tribesmen, I ask, can these machinations, when judged by their results, be truly said to have been successful? Assuredly not. They have failed, and have failed miserably. They have failed as they ought to have failed. Here, then, is a striking example of the failure of coercion. But the facts which we have just discussed refer to the past year (1906); those of the following extract, which refer to the present year (1907), and which appeared in a London daily paper,

demonstrate, as regards South Africa, even more completely the absolute failure of this system of coercion. We read :—

“ Pietermaritzburg, 5 January, 1907.—Mr. Latham, the Native Commissioner for Zululand, has returned from his visit to that territory. He declares that the thanks of Natal are due to Dinizulu for the fact that the rebellion did not spread generally. One word from Dinizulu, he says, would have set the whole country ablaze, the chief's power being greater than that of the Government. Mr. Latham states that the prestige of the whites has diminished among the Zulus, who have lost confidence in Europeans. If the existing mis-government continued, he added, a struggle between the two races will be inevitable.”

Little wonder it is that the Zulus have lost confidence in Europeans. And let those Englishmen who are always boasting that “ we are *feared*, and not loved,” lay well to heart the facts of this extract.

Similarly, after the Indian Government, against the vehement and unanimous protest of the people of Bengal, had determined to dismember that presidency (1903), it was predicted that the agitation which the proposal and its accomplishment created would speedily die out. But we have observed that as late as the 15th of April, 1906, one of the summary measures which the authorities had enacted in order to circumvent the effects of this agitation was applied to Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee, “ the most powerful Indian popular leader.” Still, even that harsh procedure which panic had called in in order to reduce to impotence India's most popular leader failed in its purpose. And the subjoined spirited protest which the Bombay Presidency Association telegraphed to the Secretary of State for India concerning Mr. Banerjee's arrest and punishment is an attestation of the failure :—

“ The Council of the Bombay Presidency Association feel painfully constrained to bring earnestly to your notice the unprecedented state of intense alarm, indignation, and excitement in which Bombay Presidency, in common with the rest of the country, is thrown by recent events in Barisal.

“ The people are seriously concerned and alarmed that extensive powers given to sections of the Criminal Procedure Code, requiring to be exercised with the greatest discretion, judgment, and coolness, have been issued for preventing or dispersing such

gatherings of loyal, peaceful, respectable, and educated Indians as composed for years such well-established constitutional bodies as the Provincial Conferences which are held every year in most presidencies.

“The minds of the people are seriously exercised that for the purpose such violent, excited, impolitic, unconstitutional methods shall have been resorted to by responsible authorities. Apart from the question of legal technicalities such policy is fraught with disastrous and mischievous consequences for the peace and contentment of the people of this country and repugnant to the best traditions of British rule. This Council gravely and earnestly implore you to take measures to allay the feeling of alarm and indignation into which the whole country is thrown. Barisal was selected for this year’s Bengal Provincial Conference at last year’s Conference, which met at Mymensinghi.”

Here also, then, is coercion succeeding? Not at all.

But since the forwarding of this protest to the Secretary of State for India, things in the great dependency have gone from bad to worse. Thus in reply to a question in the House of Commons on the 6th of May, 1907, Mr. Morley, the Secretary of State for India, said :—

“I have received a telegram which was sent from Simla on 5 May . . . from the Viceroy, which states that, ‘on 21 April a meeting was held at Rawal Pindi, said to have been attended by 8000 or 10,000 men. A well-known pleader presided, and another spoke on the subject of increased land revenue and the prosecution of the Punjabi newspaper.’ Perhaps I was wrong in saying that there was no connection between these disturbances and the prosecution, but it is the opinion of the Government of India that there is no connection. One speaker said the people of Punjab must be prepared to sacrifice their lives for the Motherland. Those who were afraid of bloodshed had better go home. Petitions to the British King were useless. The Punjabis had helped to put down the Mutiny; they were now ill-treated, and were suffering for their treachery to their own countrymen. Now was the time to resist and not to be afraid of Martinis and Howitzers. The people would withhold payment of the increased land revenue. Another speaker protested against increased land revenue, water rates, and forced labour. In consequence of this, the Deputy Commissioner sent notice to the three speakers who took part in the meeting to attend his court, for the purpose of a public

inquiry into the question whether they should be prosecuted for sedition, and have their licences for practice withdrawn.

“A crowd of students, traders, and shopkeepers assembled at the court to express sympathy with the pleaders, and were apparently disappointed when informed that the inquiry would not be held. Then followed disturbances. The three pleaders have since been arrested, presumably for abetting the recent disturbances, and have applied to the chief court for bail. The telegram adds that the General Officer Commanding has telegraphed that all is now quiet, but that he anticipates further rioting if the Chief Court grant bail. I understand that bail has not been granted.”

In connection with the events to which these facts relate, one very noteworthy feature is, that the Indian authorities have been unable to prefer any charge against the chairman of the meeting—who was probably the most influential of the three pleaders that were arrested—although they have deported him since the time of his arrest. Hence, referring to him in the House of Commons on the 14th of May, 1907, Mr. Morley said :—

“Lala Lajpat Rai has not been arrested for any legitimate agitation against any reasonable grievance, but only for the active promotion of open sedition.”

Thus, although this Indian gentleman, whom Mr. Morley describes as a “respected popular leader,” has been freely, if not fiercely accused of sedition, his accusers have been unable to substantiate their accusations by bringing home to him any specific act of sedition. The inference therefore is obvious that this leader’s only offence was that of heading a constitutional agitation—a constitutional agitation, however, which is found by the Indian Government to be inconvenient to its policy of absolutism ; but a constitutional agitation such as has brought about the great political reforms of England, such too as the suffragettes are being allowed to pursue here and now in England, such as all the colourless states of the Empire have employed with impunity at different times, but an agitation which, when it is employed by a coloured community of the Empire, is called sedition.

In connection with these same events, another noteworthy fact is, that in the British Empire, where the flowers of freedom are said to bloom with especial luxuriance, “a respected,

popular leader," without having been charged, and without being chargeable, with any offence, has been deported to indefinite imprisonment in a fort ; that in these same conditions his two friends have also been imprisoned, and that at the present time, in the British dependency of India, there are thirty-two persons who are deprived of their liberty without trial by any court of law, and without any limit to the time of their detention. How enormous, how persistent, and how protracted have been the struggles by which the liberty of the English people have been secured ! Starting with the Magna Charta, which it wrung from the tyrant grip of a despotic ruler, and cleaving its way through the encumbrances and obstructions of the rest of the Plantagenet line, through the Lancastrian, York, and Tudor lines, through the Stuart line, the Commonwealth period, and again the Stuart line, the English people obtained parliamentary liberty from the House of Orange. And still pursuing that fuller liberty which is a nation's equilibrium, after similar struggles, now forward, now backward, now successful, then unsuccessful, now with hope aglow, then with hope eclipsed, it finally secured from the House of Brunswick, in 1832, by the bill of the "Great Reform," national liberty. Thus in the struggle to secure this pearl of great price, 633 years were consumed. Now, how is it possible that a people which has toiled so long and fought so hard for liberty could so far forget its own sufferings, its own longings, its own hopes, its own disappointments, and its own fears, as ever to desire, much less to attempt, to thrust others into the pit where these sufferings were endured. But alas ! such is the selfishness of human nature, that this same people, having denied the most elementary rights of liberty to 344,000,000 of peoples that are associated with them are punishing with fines, imprisonment, and exile, that section of the oppressed which is endeavouring to secure liberty by the use of those very legitimate means which they themselves employed aforesaid. Lala Lajpat Rai, Surendra Nath Banerjee, the native editors, barristers, students, and others, whom Englishmen have fined or imprisoned, or banished, and whom also they denounce, are doing nothing more for their country and for their kindred than Englishmen have done for their country and their kindred. Had these choice spirits of India maintained their silence while despotism and tyranny continued to spoil the land, they had



been traitors to their country and nation. Therefore, let them be assured, that for the stand which they have taken on behalf of the right, they have the sympathy, the admiration, and the esteem, of the lovers of truth and of fair-play, throughout the world; moreover, let them remember, that whereas those shall be forgotten, or remembered with execration—be they princes or plebeians—who, in indifference to the claims of the motherland, side with injustice and oppression, their names, by a grateful posterity, shall be held in everlasting remembrance. The meeting over which Mr. Lajpat Rai presided, which the two other barristers addressed, and which led to the summoning of the three barristers to appear before the Deputy Commissioner—an act that precipitated the disturbance—was convened, we are told, in order to protest against the increased taxation of land, water rates, etc. But in the present volume we have already had Indian taxation under review. And from the effects, the horrible, the terrible, the awful effects which this system of taxation has produced among the Indian people, had I been informed that the addition which it is now proposed to make,<sup>1</sup> to its already staggering weight, had caused an outbreak instead of a meeting for protest, although I should have been sorry, I should not have been surprised.

Now what was the treatment of the disturbance, which seems to have been caused by the summoning of the barristers before the Deputy Commissioner? In addition to the deportation of one of the leaders, and the local imprisonment of the other two, the confinement of all three being indefinite, editors of native newspapers have been imprisoned, newspapers suppressed, districts proclaimed, freedom of speech restricted, and professors and teachers of schools, colleges, and universities, together with their students and pupils, have been threatened with disciplinary measures. Besides these there is also the use of the military and police forces. Of the first we read:—

“ . . . the military authorities of the Punjab have at their disposal ample forces, both British and native, with which to deal with any serious outbreak, if unfortunately this should occur. In the Punjab, the Northern command comprises fourteen battalions of British infantry.”

<sup>1</sup> Since this chapter was written the proposed increase of taxes has been abandoned, I understand, as a result of the agitation.

Further, on the 10th of May, 1907, we read again :—

“ Troops of all arms are marching into Lahore from Mianmir, in preparation for grave eventualities. Police, mounted and dismounted, are also being drafted into Lahore from all parts of the province.”

Now, I wish to inquire whether there be in the British Empire to-day, any community other than coloured, in which for a constitutional agitation—an agitation to protest against the further increase of a merciless system of taxation—the leaders would be deported and imprisoned indefinitely, without trial by any court of law, and indeed without even any specific charges having been made against them; further, where editors of newspapers would be imprisoned, newspapers would be suppressed, districts would be proclaimed, free speech restricted, the withdrawal of government grants to schools, colleges, and universities threatened, and the inhabitants overawed by police and military forces?

I venture to say that there are no communities in the Empire, other than coloured, where the inhabitants would be subjected to such outrages; and that in a colourless community the treatment for such an agitation would have been a Royal Commission. But because the Punjab is a coloured instead of a colourless community, the fiat having gone forth that another turn should be given to the thumb-screw of taxation, resistance thereto, in the form of a constitutional agitation, is opposed by these tyrannous measures. And so had there been a real outbreak in India, the fault had not been that of the Indian, but of the English; who, after decades of misrule there, during which they have been impervious to all petitions and entreaties for reform, now, instead of attempting to remedy the grievances, have aggravated them by imposing fresh burdens. In Eastern Bengal, this same policy of setting at defiance the will of the governed by ruthlessly dismembering their province, is also seen in acutely active operation. England is possessed by the idea that in her dealings with the coloured races, whenever a course of action is resolved upon, however unjust and however oppressive, it must be carried out, for its abandonment would be a sign of weakness. And the dogged persistence with which she cleaves to the palpably fatuous undertaking of breaking up the Presidency of Bengal,

in the teeth of the fierce opposition of the people, is an illustration of this idea. But coloured men are as richly endowed with the sense of right as are colourless men; hence, when England unjustly forces upon them unjust measures, under the mistaken notion of impressing them with the greatness of her strength, she succeeds only in impressing them with the greatness of her lack of strength.

In the course of his answers to questions in the House of Commons on the 13th of May, 1907, Mr. Morley declared: "My Parliamentary record will show that no one dislikes 'repressive measures' more than I." No doubt this is correct, as far as white communities are concerned. But even the man who may have shown a strong dislike to the use of "repressive measures" when they apply to a colourless community, may have little or no real dislike when those measures apply to a coloured community. Nor does Mr. Morley's unfair criticism of the American Negro (p. 303), his sanction of the Natal atrocities, and now his "repressive measures" in India, furnish a basis for the belief that he is opposed to the employment of such measures on behalf of the coloured races. Besides, even if Mr. Morley were opposed to the creed of conciliation for the whites and coercion for the non-whites, as long as he remained a member of the British Government—Liberal or Conservative—he would be compelled to practise repressive measures toward the coloured subject; for as I have observed before, exploitation of the coloured communities of the Empire is the present policy of British rule, and "repressive measures" are the methods of its fulfilment. But I wonder how it is that whereas Englishmen are actively concerned about the irregularities of Russia, such irregularities as those of prohibiting free speech, of arresting and deporting persons without legal trial, or without even being accused of crime, the placing of professors and students of colleges and universities under ban, and the terrorizing of the people by military demonstrations, and that whereas by means of an aggressive association—an association whose work I have justly praised in an earlier chapter—they are striving to bring to an end the atrocities of the Independent State of the Congo, they altogether overlook and entirely ignore the irregularities and the atrocities of the British Empire? Of these British atrocities I need mention only the never-ending punitive expeditions. Does

not charity begin at home? And is the following reproof inapplicable here? “. . . why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother’s eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother’s eye.” The principle by which Mr. Morley, in his policy in India, has succeeded in harmonizing his radicalism with the methods of Russian reaction, is, I believe, thus tersely given by a liberal organ. “. . . India is *sui generis*. Between Ireland and India there are, in fact, a hundred essential differences.” And this principle of “differences” between the two divisions of the Empire, demanding that one should be ruled with justice, and the other with injustice, is the moral support of exploitation. Thus, as it is said here that there are “a hundred essential differences”—mind, it is the estimate of a Liberal—between the coloured community of India and the white community of Ireland, so it is said elsewhere that there are unalterable “differences”—in morals, in intellect, in capacity for government, etc.—between the coloured and colourless races of all the Empire. And of course these “differences,” according to the white man—their discoverer—are all in his favour, and are the title-deed of his ownership of the world and of the coloured races. Of this thesis of “differences,” however, the conclusion is wrong, because the premises are wrong. Actually and potentially, except in self-praise and in self-advertisement, the coloured races are the equals of the colourless race. As such, the forms of government that are best for the one, are, immediately in some cases and more remotely in others, suited to the other. And so, as in the case of the colourless race, coercion in the case of the coloured races will fail.

In the incessant native “unrest,” or outbreaks, in the newer British possessions in West Africa, and in the older British possessions in South Africa, in the West Indies as well as in India, is there the witness of the success or of the failure of coercion? Of the failure, undoubtedly. And as the efforts of the Natal Government have failed to coerce the natives into submission to its oppressive rule, as the endeavour of the India Government has failed to coerce the Bengalese

into acquiescence with the partition of their state, and as the native "unrest" in other parts of India, in the West Indies, in Egypt, similarly testifies to the failure of coercion in the British Empire with respect to the present, so they all prophesy to the failure of coercion in the British Empire with respect to the future. Thus in this policy of the coercion of coloured British subjects, in which England has now openly joined her white colonies, she and they are engaged in the enterprise of sowing the wind.

But this method of coercion that is being employed by England and the white colonists in regard to the coloured races of the British Empire is not new. In modern times, Spain has been its boldest and most energetic patron, and in ancient times, the Romans. But with what result did these two great Empires employ this instrument? With the result of absolute and unqualified failure. Except, then, upon the theory, that whom the gods will to destroy they first make mad, I am utterly unable to understand how a people like the English, who are so eminently practical, can allow themselves to indulge the belief that amid the present changed and rapidly changing conditions—national, imperial, and international—they, a people of forty-one millions, will always be able to hold in absolute subjection peoples who in number are over three hundred and fifty millions.

But before leaving this part of the subject, I must here affirm my belief, that more coloured peoples have been slain by British soldiers than have been saved by British missionaries. And so, against the ceaseless menacing and harrying of these peoples by armed force, in order to seize their lands, and then from their meagre subsistence to squeeze excessive taxes, after their lands have been merged into the Empire, I lodge here an emphatic protest; a protest against what has now become a national vice. And I protest against this national vice, as being altogether unworthy of a people that professes to be guided by the teaching:—"Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." So, then, we have seen that the policy of conciliation at all cost toward the colourless section of the Empire, the policy which the British Government formally accepted on the occasion of the Natal "crisis," is positively dangerous. That it is dangerous because it encourages the

white colonists, through the aid of Imperial support, to pass from one degree of injustice to another degree of injustice in their dealings with their coloured fellow-subjects, and that it is dangerous because that retaliation by the oppressed is now the almost unavoidable result of these injustices. And by the results which have followed the efforts of the Natal ministry to overawe the natives into submission to its tyrannous rule, by the results which have attended and followed the dismemberment of the Presidency of Bengal by the Indian Government in defiance of native opinion, by the results which history has furnished, relative to the same endeavour to secure the abject submission of governed peoples—coloured and colourless—we have likewise seen that the policy of coercion, at all cost, towards the coloured section of the Empire, which the British Government also formally accepted on the occasion of the Natal "crisis," is doomed to absolute and ignominious failure. And yet another lesson that is taught us by the betrayal of the cause of the native by the British Government is that the considerations by which coloured British subjects are governed are not moral, but political.

Thus, taking the arguments to which I have alluded already as those that moved the Governor of Natal to importune the Imperial Government no longer to withhold its sanction to the execution of the twelve natives, taking these arguments as those upon which the resolution of the Natal ministry for the execution of the twelve natives was based, taking them as those which influenced public opinion in Great Britain in favour of the execution of the twelve natives, and as those which probably led His Majesty's Government to sanction the execution, and we have the Governor saying in his request to Lord Elgin, "I trust that with the additional facts contained in this telegram, your lordship will see your way to withdraw the objection." Then we have him giving as the cause of the request, that "very intense feeling will be excited in the colony by my having suspended the execution." So that the guilt of the natives was not the cause of the request, but rather the apprehension of intense feeling by the people. Similarly, in the case of the Natal ministry, the arguments upon which the demand for the execution rests are not those of the guilt of the natives, but

rather, "that any interference with the court martial now sitting would have a disastrous effect on natives generally. Further, that such interference would probably conduce to outbreak in the near future, as any sign of weakness or indecision on the part of the Government would immediately be observed by the natives. . . ."

In like manner the sanction which British public opinion gave to the execution of the twelve condemned natives was founded not upon the guilt of the prisoners, but rather upon the consideration of "the stability of the Empire," and of "the safety of the white population" in Natal. It is in this sense that the following view of the British Parliament upon the subject, is given.

"The grave news from Natal created serious apprehension among thoughtful members of both sides of the House of Commons. The action of the colonial ministry, it was pointed out, was a protest against the interference of the Home Government in a matter of purely local jurisdiction. Such interference was regarded as a new development in our relations with the self-governing colonies, which might easily affect the stability of the Empire."

However, the question of immediate concern was deemed to be the safety of the white population.

"Members familiar with the conditions prevailing in South Africa affirmed that the blacks had lately manifested an insolence and defiance of authority which might at any moment take a dangerous turn, if it became known that the Imperial Government was assuming an attitude of apparent toleration and encouragement."

Lastly, in the case of the British Government, the motive by which it was probably led to agree to the execution of the twelve natives was not that of their guilt, but simply the force of the combined opinions to which individual allusions have just been made. Thus, in the case of Governor McCallum the consideration which led him to request that Lord Elgin would withdraw his opposition to the execution of the twelve natives was not moral, but political. That is to say, it was not that it was right to execute the natives, but that if the natives were not executed, public feeling "will be excited in the colony against my having suspended the execution." Like-

wise, in the case of the Natal ministry, the cause which determined it to secure the execution of the natives was not moral, but political. It was not that they were convinced that the natives should be put to death, but rather "that any interference would have a disastrous effect upon the court-martial now sitting," "that such interference would probably conduce to outbreak in the near future," etc. Also, in the case of British public opinion, the cause of concern was not a moral one, but a political one, for the question was not whether it was right that the twelve natives should be executed for the murder of the two police officers, but rather that the stability of the Empire would be effected if the will of the colonists be opposed, and that the safety of the white people would be threatened if the twelve natives were not executed. Finally, in the case of the Home Government, the consideration that led to its ultimate decision was not moral, but political. That is to say, the twelve natives were not executed because their sentences were just, but because colonial and British opinions would be satisfied.

Political expediency is the antithesis of political morality. Like the barometer, which varies with the pressure of the atmosphere, political expediency varies with the pressure of public opinion. And by means of this variable quality it is able to invest the grossest injustice with the attributes of propriety. Thus it came to pass that with the acquiescence of the British Government, and with the approval of the white colonists throughout the Empire, the Natal Government, in opposition to the extenuating circumstances which we have noticed on page 367, was able with an easy conscience to take fourteen lives for two lives. Thus it is that notwithstanding its profession to do unto others as it would be done by (p. 184), the British Government, with battalions and fleets ready to devour them up, keeps nearly four hundred millions of the human race in a state of chronic "unrest." And it is this political expediency, with its graduated scale of reciprocal obligations between the two great divisions of the Empire, which constitutes the essence of that danger whereof I have recently spoken.<sup>1</sup>

These, then, are the lessons which are suggested by the betrayal of the cause of the coloured subject by the British Government.

<sup>1</sup> Page 397.



(1) That whereas the colourless section of the Empire is governed by the policy of conciliation at all cost, the coloured section is governed by the policy of coercion at all cost.

(2) That in consequence of these two policies each of the two great sections of the Empire is subject to different standards of equity, and that to the Empire such an anomaly is fraught with the gravest peril.

(3) That unqualified conciliation is inimical to the peace of the Empire, involving the constant encroachment upon the rights of the coloured section of the Empire, by the colourless section. And that coercion, by which it is sought to reduce this coloured section of the Empire to absolute and servile submission to the colourless section, although capable of inflicting upon the coloured section severe hardships, is destined to irredeemable failure.

(4) That the three preceding lessons are measures of the standard of expediency rather than of right. And that it is by this expediency that British coloured subjects are governed.

In considering the subject of the effects of exploitation, we saw that one of these effects is separation between the governed and governing classes of the Empire; that another effect will be rebellion. These two effects were referred to as representing the political and economic side of the question. From this we proceeded further to consider the moral side of the subject. Concerning this moral side I asserted that it is characterized by the features of misrepresentation, and a dual standard of justice; and I have proved the first of these two features. It will be remembered that I introduced the subject of Natal in order to prove the second feature. And now, concerning Natal, we have seen that whereas the population consists of 700,000 whites and 900,000 blacks, whereas the whites, on the ground that taxation without representation is unjust, are granted representative government, the blacks, who in education and property qualification are the equals of the whites, and who also belong to the class that contribute the largest share to the public revenue, are peremptorily refused any part in the representation. In regard to taxation, we have noticed that although the native already contributes the larger portion of the revenue, yet, in addition to that larger portion, in order that he may be driven to work in the mines,

and that his lands may be available to the colonists, he has been condemned to pay a poll-tax.

Further, we have observed that notwithstanding the provocative nature and the injustice of this tax, after its enforcement, its premature enforcement, had led to the committal of two murders by the natives—two murders, however, with which there were interwoven strong extenuating circumstances—fourteen natives were directly shot for these two murders. And that indirectly, besides the burning of their dwellings, the burning of their churches, the seizure of their cattle, the seizure of their sheep, the seizure of their land, by which women and children, and the sick and the infirm, were reduced to the direst straits, 3500 men, according to the conservative estimate of official computation, were killed. And of the systems of taxation with representation for the whites of Natal, but of taxation without representation for the blacks of Natal, the first also obtains in the white communities of Canada, of Australia, and South Africa, and the second also obtains in the non-white communities of India, the West Indies, Malta, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, etc., East, West, and South Africa, Cape Colony in the last example being excluded.

Further, as taxation with representation is one of the great principles by which British rule is alleged to be animated, and as the greatest good to the greatest number—which is attainable only through taxation with representation—is another of the great principles by which British rule is also alleged to be animated, therefore, in the recognition and the endeavour to practise these two principles in the case of the colourless section of the Empire, and in the disavowal and avoidance of them in the case of the coloured section of the Empire, we have the widest possible difference between the modes by which the two sections are governed. And with regard to the killing of fourteen blacks for the murder of two whites, leading up to the killing of 3500 more blacks besides, the slaying of prisoners who were wounded, the abuse of the body of the dead chieftain Bambata, and the starvation of women and children, we know that had it been fourteen white men who had been implicated in the murder of two black police officers, whilst the latter were engaged in the lawful discharge of their duty, and the penalty of death were passed at all upon the murderers, that under no circumstances whatever would those fourteen white murderers

have been executed for the murder of the two black officials. Here is a case in point. On the 12th of November, 1906, we read :—

“ A daring raid has been made into the north-western district of Cape Colony by a Boer named Ferreira, who with a small party, believed to number four, of his countrymen has crossed the Orange River from German South-West Africa, with the intention, it is stated, of trying to organize a revolt. Ferreira and his gang surprised the police camp at Abiam and Witkop, wounded two or three troopers and seized some arms and ammunition. Apparently the raiders secured some recruits from the local Dutch population, and his force is now stated to be about thirty strong.”

Upon the 13th day of the month we read further :—

“ One of the troopers wounded by Ferreira and his men at Abiam post is dead, so that if captured the gang will have to stand trial for murder.”

Now, what is the difference between these raiders and the twelve natives that were hanged in Natal for the murder of two white policemen ? It is the absence of provocation in the crimes of the raiders, and the presence of provocation in the crime of the natives. In the case of the twelve natives the provocation that led to their crime was that of being goaded by an irritating tax, in addition to the great load of unredressed grievances which they had already been bearing. It was that also of collecting this tax before the time that it was due.

But besides the great provocation of many decades of unredressed grievances, the addition of a galling poll-tax, and the collecting of that tax before the expiration of the time fixed by the law, besides these things that constitute the great provocation by which the crime of the twelve natives was preceded, there were also, as we have seen, other strong extenuating circumstances that attended and succeeded the committal of that crime. And yet, notwithstanding it all, these twelve unfortunate men were made to pay the extreme penalty of the law. But in the case of the raiders there was an absence of decades of unredressed grievances, of the goad of an irritating tax, of the illegal collection of that tax, and so there was the absence of provocation. Still, these men invaded Cape Colony with the set purpose, it is said, of kindling the conflagration of a

revolt. To this crime they added the further crime of surprising and overpowering the Government post, of seizing arms and ammunition, and of wounding two or three men of the post, of whom one died soon after from the effects of his wound.

Now, putting the crimes of these raiders and the crime of the twelve natives side by side, we have for the natives murder, attended by strong extenuating circumstances, and we have for the raiders murder and an attempt to incite to rebellion against lawful authority, but with the absence of all extenuating circumstances. Thus, I conclude that the crimes of the raiders are greater than the crime of the twelve natives. But we have seen that the twelve natives have all been shot. What, therefore, has been the fate of the raiders? Listen!

“Cape Town, 13 March, 1907: The death sentences passed upon Retief and Potieter for participation in Ferreira's raid have been commuted to fifteen years' hard labour, and in the case of the other raiders—namely, Piet Ferreira, John Ferreira, and Joosti—to imprisonment for life, with hard labour.”

But is it necessary to say that the reason why clemency has been shown to the raiders, and a cruel injustice to the twelve natives, has been that the former were whites and the latter were blacks? From these facts, then, the facts that, both in its principles and in the application of those principles, the government of the coloured and of the colourless sections of the Empire is entirely distinct and contradictory, and that the application of these distinct and contradictory principles by which the two sections are governed extends even to the extreme penalty of the law, I draw the inference that in the British Empire one of the moral aspects of exploitation is a dual standard of justice.

## XIV

### Present Policy Supported by a False Delicacy

SO that the policy of governing the coloured races of the British Empire mainly for the purpose of exploiting them has, as its effects, on the one hand, separation between the governed and governing races, leading up to the rebellion of the former against the latter, and, it has, as its effects, on the other hand, misrepresentation, defamation, etc., and a dual standard of justice.

Separation, I repeat, is an essential concomitant of exploitation, for approximation or union between the governed and governing sections of the Empire would mean equality and mutual sympathy, of which a result would be the granting of equal rights and of equal opportunities to the governed section by the governing section, and these concessions would be inimical to the policy of exploitation; whereas the governing caste is able by means of separation to declare itself to be superior to the governed, and having made this declaration it finds the next step which it proceeds to take, unhindered. That step is the employment of means—such as those of unequal educational facilities, unequal and excessive taxation, the withholding of the suffrage, and the exclusion and restriction of the governed from and in certain pursuits—in order to impoverish, to weaken them, and to impede their progress. Being thus weakened, impoverished, and impeded, this class is the less capable of effective resistance, and thereby such of its resources that remain become the more easily available for the rapacity of the governing class. And the stagnation which we have observed to exist in the British possessions of the West Indies and of West Africa, as well as the retrogression of British India, are an effect of the undue and unrequited absorption of the resources of those communities by the governing class. But we also observed that as a consequence, partly from dispo-

sition and partly from the necessity which commercial rivalries will impose, the governing state will so continue to increase its demands upon the resources of the governed states that ultimately these governed states, driven beyond the bound of endurance, shall seek release from their intolerable burdens by a monster rebellion.

Alienation, then, between the governing and governed races of the Empire, with the increased oppression and impoverishment of the latter, and its desperate attempt to regain its freedom by means of rebellion, are the actual and possible political and economic results of spoliation. Passing to the moral side of this policy, we are confronted with conditions that are even more grave than the economic and political conditions to which reference has just been made. For these moral conditions do not relate to the products of the national life, but to the national life itself. The moral conditions of exploitation with which we are confronted are misrepresentation and a dual standard of justice. Misrepresentation, that is to say, to make false representation, to give wrong impression, or in more terse phraseology, hard lying, if it be a habit, is one of the most dangerous affections from which any state can suffer. Imagine that a patient is stricken with the disease of consumption, and that if the disease had been rightly diagnosed and properly treated at the very early stage when the patient first consulted her physician it could have been cured, but that the physician, having diagnosed and treated the disease as something other than it is, it developed a rapid and determined course, and now threatens the patient's life; further, imagine the physician to say, after the patient's friends had accused him of professional ignorance, that he knew from the first that the patient was suffering from phthisis, but that having been overcome by his delicacy of feeling towards the fair sufferer, and by his utter unwillingness to cause her pain, or to give her a shock, he was betrayed into *misrepresenting* the complaint. Is it conceivable that either the patient or her friends would have regarded such a statement with pleasure? Would they not have probably replied, and would their reply not have met with universal approval, that as a professional man his obvious duty was to give a true diagnosis of the case, and that as a friend such a diagnosis only could be construed as a sign of friendship?

The British Empire is not unlike such a patient. It, too, is

the victim of a serious affection, its medical attendants have given a wrong diagnosis of its case, and they have done so through a false delicacy or false pride, with the result that the disease, which might otherwise have been cured, is developing with alarming speed. The great and terrible disease with which the British Empire is smitten is misgovernment. Of late—say, from the year 1905 to April of the present time, 1907—certain well-marked symptoms of this disease have been apparent in several organs of the Imperial body. Thus, in the organ called British Guiana, in that called India, in a third called Nigeria, in a fourth called Natal, in a fifth called Egypt, and a sixth called St. Lucia, they have been observed. It may be mentioned at this point that the method of treatment that is followed in the case of this Imperial patient, the British Empire, varies in one respect from that which is usually followed in ordinary cases. For example, the two physicians who attend the British Empire do not each one of them examine, and then singly or jointly prescribe for the patient ; but instead of such a course, one of these physicians diagnoses the complaint, and the other, in accordance with the diagnosis of his colleague, prescribes. With this preliminary remark I pass on to say further that the name of one of the medical attendants of the British Empire is the press, and that the other medical attendant is the politician.

Well, I have said that the disease of the Imperial patient is misgovernment ; but Dr. Press has diagnosed it as “ native unrest.” This, however, is the general name that he has given to the disease, as we have noticed before, the local symptoms, that have appeared in the organ Nigeria, for example, he has called “ Mahdism,” those that have appeared in the organ Natal he has called “ Ethiopianism,” those in the organ Egypt he has called “ Pan-Islamism,” and those in the organ India he has called sedition. The phases of misgovernment of British Guiana and St. Lucia have not been named, but judging from precedents, I do not doubt that they would be called Negro incapacity. Now, it cannot be denied that to call misgovernment “ native unrest,” to call its symptoms in Nigeria “ Mahdism,” its symptoms in Natal “ Ethiopianism,” its symptoms in Egypt “ Pan-Islamism,” and its symptoms in India “ sedition,” is misrepresentation. I have said that the cause of this misrepresentation is a delicacy of feeling. British rule, as

it is exercised among the coloured races of the British Empire, as well as among the colourless race, is generally believed by the latter to be perfect ; and the following extract which appeared in a London daily, in the course of a critique upon a book about Jamaica, and in which the critic contrasts the condition of the Jamaica Negro with that of the American Negro, is an example of this prevailing belief :—

“ It is commonly admitted by philanthropists, scientists, and others that under British rule the problem of how to deal with a backward race is in progress of satisfactory solution.”

This admission of philanthropists, scientists, and others, of which the extract speaks, is at variance with facts, and so, intentionally or unintentionally, it is misrepresentation.

For in its present retrograde and reactionary course, British rule is doing anything but solving satisfactorily “ the problem of how to deal with a backward race.” Besides, the “ solution of the problem of how to deal with a backward race ” requires no unique device nor exceptional skill, for it follows the same course as that of the “ solution of the problem of how to deal with a ” forward “ race,” that course being to do justly. In the earlier days, in the fifties and the sixties, for example, England’s policy toward the coloured races, as we observed before, followed the path of doing justly. And this past policy, in its relation to the present, has had two results : one result in regard to the native races of the Empire, and the other result in regard to Englishmen. With regard to the great bulk of the native this past policy established among them a very strong belief in the sense of justice and love of fair play of the British people. And that belief having become a tradition, has been handed down to the present generation. Hence, being ignorant of the fact that England, having terribly backslidden, is now pursuing a course the opposite of that which she pursued in the past in relation to themselves, this great body of coloured peoples, like one under an anæsthetic whose limb is being severed from his body, pass their time amid their disabilities, their oppression, and their humiliations, in tranquil unconsciousness. But signs are not wanting to show that even these narcotized sleepers are awaking to a sense of their abject state. And England which created this confidence is herself destroying it. This great confidence, then, in England’s sense of justice and of fair play, which her past policy created in the native,



and which, amid the changed and unfavourable conditions of his lot, has kept him until now trustful and tranquil, is one of the two results of this past policy. The other result of the past policy, as I have said, relates to Englishmen. Among one class of Englishmen, probably the largest class, this past policy of dealing justly with the native races has passed, as in the case of the native, into a tradition. And the result is that notwithstanding the fact that the traditional policy is now no more—as is evidenced by such atrocities as the butcheries of Natal and of the Sierra Leone Protectorate—this class of Englishmen still believes that, as in the past, England is dealing justly with the coloured British subject. The writer of the excerpt that I have quoted above may belong to this class of Englishmen. Of course the said class of Englishmen is wrong, but that wrong is of ignorance. However, there is another class of Englishmen, and it, if it be a small class, is yet a powerful and influential class, it knows and it approves the change of England's former policy concerning the native races; yet it utilizes this traditional policy of England toward the native races as if it were still that by which British rule is governed. And this it does not entirely, but partly, because of the delicacy which it feels against shocking the sensibility of the British people by speaking the truth. But to whichever of these two classes of Englishmen the extract which is quoted above belongs, the fact remains that it is wrong. That such contentment as there is among coloured British subjects exists, not because British rule is solving "the problem of how to deal with a backward race," but because the backward races, that is to say the bulk, subsisting on their past confidence in England, are not yet aware that towards them England's course is no longer that of justice, but of injustice.

Thus, in the case of Drs. Press and Politician, the imperial physicians, it being the general belief of the British Empire (that is to say the fifty-four million whites, for they, it is said, constitute the British Empire) that British rule is perfect, they, from a delicacy of feeling lest that they should cause pain to the patient, decline to inform herself or her friends that misgovernment is the malady from which she suffers; and instead they misrepresent the disease by the generic title of "native unrest," and by the specific terms, "Ethiopianism," "Mahdism," "sedition," "Pan-Islamism," etc. But can the chronic and

abject poverty in which the millions of India live, to be swept away by horrid tidal waves of famine ; can the chronic poverty and ignorance in which the mass of the British West Indian peasantry live, poverty which so sharply contrasts with the natural luxuriance and brilliance of those lovely isles ; can the stagnation and inertia of the British West African colonies and the oppression of the South African native communities ; can these conditions, as symptoms of misgovernment, really strengthen the Empire ? And if they cannot, if such conditions must tend to weaken rather than to strengthen the whole, is not the full and frank disclosure of their existence the indispensable preliminary to their discussion and correction ?

Can the misrepresentation then, of these conditions, be real service that is rendered to the Empire ? It is a notorious fact that under a mistaken notion of what is called patriotism, the great bulk of the British press, as well as of British politicians, habitually misrepresent the real condition of the greater part of the Empire. And this is safely done, because that this greater part of the Empire consists, not of colourless, but of coloured peoples. But in my judgment the habitual misrepresentation of facts, as I have observed before, is one of the most serious dangers with which the Empire is threatened. Like the dual standard of justice that exists in the British Empire, misrepresentation is an element of exploitation ; and since exploitation is incompatible with true statement of facts, then, as long as exploitation remains the policy of the British Empire, British statesmen who direct that policy, and the British press which supports that policy, must continue the method of misrepresentation, particularly in regard to the coloured section of the Empire.

Hence the examples of misrepresentation which have been adduced, such examples as that concerning the West Indies, where the backwardness of the peasantry, which is due to deficient supply of land, to deficient educational facilities, and to excessive taxation, is misrepresented as being the result of the natural incapacity of the Negro race. Such examples as that of India, where famine, the result of poverty, and poverty, the result of excessive taxation, are misrepresented as having been caused by deficient rainfall and over-population.

Such examples as that of South Africa, where the discontent of the natives—whom decades of oppressive rule have exasperated almost beyond the bound of endurance, and whom, in the case of Natal, an additional fiscal burden has driven beyond that bound—is misrepresented as the result of Ethiopianism. Again, such examples as that of Nigeria, where native outbreaks, due to the same system of oppression that prevails among the other coloured communities of the Empire, are misrepresented as the result of Mahdism. And lastly, such examples as that of the Transvaal, where the native having been excluded from the franchise, and every device having been resorted to in order that he may be for ever disqualified to vote, yet it is avowed that he is so excluded from the franchise, only because he is unqualified. But side by side with misrepresentation is the dual standard of justice. This standard derives its dual character from the fact that its action is alternative instead of unitive. That is to say, concerning the two great political divisions into which the British Empire is artificially constituted, the operation of this form of justice is not similar, but dissimilar.

Thus while the mode of justice that is applied to one of these two divisions is taxation with representation, that which is applied to the other division is taxation without representation. Again, to one of these two divisions the principle that is aimed at is the greatest good to the greatest number, but to the other division it is the smallest good to the greatest number. Further, to one division it is equal opportunity for all, but to the other division it is equal opportunity to none. Once more, the standard which is applied to the one division is an impartial dispensation of the law, but the standard which is applied to the other division is a partial dispensation of the law. Now, since the exploitation of the coloured races of the Empire is an imperial policy, since the habitual misrepresentation of facts relating to these races, and the dual standard of justice in relation to them and the colourless race, are essential principles of exploitation, it follows that however honourable and however well-intentioned they may be, British statesmen who direct this policy and the British press which supports the policy can neither of them represent these facts as they are, nor deal justly with these coloured races. Therefore the merit of blame rests not

so much upon the fact that they misrepresent or that they countenance the misrepresentation of the coloured races, as that they allow themselves to be the instruments of such a policy. But upon the race of the Empire which employs these principles of exploitation—namely, habitual misrepresentation and a dual standard of justice—against the other races of the Empire what must be the effect of their employment?

That these two principles must have produced some effect upon the national character cannot be doubted. And it is my belief, that England's change towards her coloured partners,—to which I have referred in a previous chapter, and which I have illustrated there by contrasting her former with her present sentiments in regard to those partners, the former sentiment being "We know no man by his colour," the present sentiment being "It is hard in any circumstances for the white man to regard the black without a touch of contempt"—is to some extent due to the effect which these principles have had upon the national character. And that effect, as it seems to me, is hardness, or a diminished power of sympathy, these qualities manifesting themselves among others in the habit of depreciating whatever concerns the coloured races, and of exaggerating whatever concerns the colourless race. Thus also it has come to pass that in England to-day, in the streets or in places of public resort, a black man, however respectable he may be, is not infrequently laughed at on account of his colour. That for the same reason he may find difficulty in being attended to at a restaurant, and in securing accommodation at a boarding-house or hotel. That on this same ground of colour a man will be refused employment, or would be in danger of being boycotted should he embark upon an independent business enterprise. In this changed condition of the national character, I could hardly conceive it probable that the recurrence of atrocities, equalling in magnitude and in wantonness the "Bulgarian atrocities," would awaken in England, at the present time, that splendid outburst of indignation which in the seventies soothed the agony of a people struggling for freedom against the might of a tyrant empire. For since then we have had the shambles of Omdurman (1898), with its 11,000 carcasses—human carcasses, however, and not carcasses of cattle—which

in place of national humiliation evoked feelings akin to national jubilation.

We have had the ceaseless worrying and the mowing down of natives by British troops, either because they do not joyfully relinquish their countries to Britain, or that having relinquished them, they do not joyfully contribute the onerous taxes that are imposed for the maintenance of the costly governments that are established. And now—May, 1906—we have Natal Ethiopian goaded to crime by the injustice as well as by the weight of an iniquitous tax. The crime is the murder of two police officers, and those charged with the murder are twelve native subjects of His Majesty the King. Their case, however, is invested with strong extenuating circumstances. The Governor, who represents the Crown, pleads for sanction to execute the twelve men, in order that the public thirst for their blood might be slaked. But Natal Caucasian, whose bibulous craving the Crown's representative would thus satiate, is the victim of a rabid attack of monomania, an attack of monomania which its latent hatred of the native and its ungovernable fear of his revolt had induced. Of this class of Natalians, few seemed to have been immune from the prevailing disease. Therefore the Governor's action, in pleading for consent to take twelve lives (which would make fourteen) as a punishment for two lives that had been taken, and his action in founding this extraordinary request only upon the desire to appease popular frenzy, might be dealt with with some sign of leniency. But in the United Kingdom, men's minds upon this subject were cool and collected. Therefore one would have expected that inasmuch as the case involved the existence of twelve human beings, their approach to it would be from the high and sacred ground of justice. But was this the ground from which it was approached? No. Even in the United Kingdom it was approached not from this high ground of justice, but rather from the low ground of imperial unity. It was from this low ground that it was generally approached by the press. It was thus that it was approached by the majority of Parliament. However, in pleasant contrast to these two great representative bodies, there stands His Majesty's Government. It approaches the subject from the sacred ground of justice. But most unfortunately for all concerned, including the ministry itself,

the splendid and only legitimate position that was thus taken up by the Government was soon abandoned. For at the sound of popular criticism—at home and in the colonies, the Government hurries from the high ground of justice, to join the majority on the low ground of expediency. Hence, in the case of the King's representative in Natal, the King's ministers in Great Britain, and the bulk of the British people as represented by Parliament and the press, the chief consideration was not that the lives of twelve human beings, of twelve fellow-subjects were at stake, that therefore their decision must be based upon scrupulous justice, but it was rather that the unity of the Empire should be preserved. Thus the twelve lives, making up fourteen in all, were taken. And now Natal Caucasian, gloating over the enormity of its cruel vengeance, is being abetted by these bodies in its further task of hunting down other natives by fire and sword.

For in speaking as the representative of the British nation, and as a member of one of these two bodies, on the night of the 25th of April, 1906, at the Colonial Institute, Lord Elgin is reported to have said :—

“ He would like to express his entire sympathy with the Government of that colony (Natal) in the difficult position in which it found itself, and his cordial wish for a successful and honourable exit from their difficulties. He also wished to express his high appreciation of the tact and discretion displayed by the Government of Natal during this crisis, and the satisfaction with which he had learned that the people of the neighbouring colony of the Transvaal had announced that they were prepared to join with their neighbours to assist them, if need be.”

And speaking as the representative of the British people, and of the other of these two bodies, a great London journal in April, 1906, said :—

“ Lord Elgin, in excusing his telegram, said that the execution of the twelve natives under a judgment of a court martial was a serious matter. No doubt it was. But did Lord Elgin realize that the murder of white officials by natives vastly outnumbering the white population they surrounded was infinitely more serious ? ”

These two utterances are the expressions of expediency,

but not of truth. The endeavour of the colourless race to prevent individuals or communities of the coloured races of the Empire from performing meritorious deeds, by restricting their means and opportunities, and then to depreciate such meritorious deeds that they may have accomplished in spite of their enormous disadvantages, whilst at the same time they load with exaggerated praise, meritorious deeds of their own members, meritorious deeds that are only equal to or that are even less than those of the coloured individuals', or communities', which they depreciate is also like the diminished power of sympathy, an effect of misrepresentation and a dual standard of justice.

The men or the communities that are really developed, that are really free, that are really independent, and whose minds are really healthy, are not they that must habitually lie to their consciences that a thing is done ill because it has been done by black hands, or that it is done well because it has been done by white hands, but rather, they are those who recognize merit because it is merit, and who give it its due, whether it be the product of the hand of the black, or whether it be the product of the hand of the white. But the diminished power of sympathy, or hardness, of the exaggeration or depreciation of merit, according as it is the work of one or other of two classes, also habitual misrepresentation and a dual standard of justice, are they nobler characteristics than those which they have displaced? England is richer, her trade more voluminous, her flag covers greater territorial zones, but is she stronger, is she more self-reliant, and is she more independent now that she is less careful and less willing to deal justly with the coloured millions with whom she is associated, than when the opposite was her course, her purpose, and her ideal,?

Even our great teachers, the men who from the infallible books of science and of history should have imparted to us lessons of instruction, of warning, of reproof, and of counsel, swayed by the principles of exploitation, have misrepresented the declarations of truth, and upheld a dual standard of justice. Alas! that among us the light of prophecy is gone out. Strenuous and unrelaxing efforts are being made to render impregnable the national defence. Millions and yet millions more of treasure pass annually down into the stomach of this insati-

able demand. But amid the excitement of this endeavour a discovery is made ; a discovery which, like a thunder-clap, stuns for a moment the national energy. It is the discovery that the physique of the nation is threatened with degeneration. To avert or to remedy this calamitous omen, various remedies are proposed. But as regards the earnestness with which it is recommended, and the unique position of its authors, as well, no doubt, as the consequences that its adoption might involve, none of these remedies excite more attention—if indeed any excite as much attention—as that which a very eminent soldier and a very eminent surgeon are pressing (1905) upon the attention of the nation for its acceptance. But I venture to say that more than the danger of the insecurity of these realms, and that more even than the decline of the national physique, is the decline of the nation's moral health. For the ultimate basis of physical endurance and physical strength, is moral endurance and moral health. Yet, for the removal of this, the gravest national peril—moral degeneration—who in emulation of the two eminent crusaders of physical culture will preach the gospel of moral reform? The answers to the question, then, that heads the previous chapters to this, viz. the effects of Britain's present native policy, are, that, economically, these effects are actually an imperfect development of the resources of the Empire—moral, mental, and material—arising from the imposition of hindrances in the way of the majority by the minority. That politically, the actual and the probable effects are, the separation and alienation of the two great units of the Empire, leading up to (unless there be a radical reform) a great rebellion of the governed unit against tyranny and oppression of the governing unit. And that morally they are the degeneration of the national character, of the governing part of the Empire, the result of a systematic practice of misrepresentation and a dual standard of justice. Or to put the matter in another form, I have said that the fundamental law which regulates the aliment of the State is like that which regulates the aliment of the body. Hence, as every member of the organism—from the brain down to the meanest strand of hair—has appropriated to it, by an inexorable and inflexible law, its own share of nourishment, and as none of these members could be deprived of its own share of nutriment, or could inherit the share of nutriment



of another member, without the former becoming atrophied or devitalized, and the latter becoming hypertrophied or demoralized, so, in the State or Empire, from the ruler down to the meanest subject, the aliment of each one, by an inflexible and an irrevocable law, is fixed; that therefore, no one of these members of the State or Empire can be deprived of his own aliment, or can inherit the aliment of another member without the former becoming morally, mentally, and materially atrophied or devitalized, and without the latter becoming morally, mentally, and materially hypertrophied or demoralized.

Of the members of the body the aliment is the blood, and of the members of the State the aliment is the equality of opportunity. In the British Empire, the ruling class has violated the law of proportionate distribution that regulates to the members of the State the supply of the aliment, equality of opportunity. The ruling caste of the British Empire has violated the law of proportionate distribution that regulates the supply of this aliment, equality of opportunity, by diminishing the supply that belongs to the coloured section, and by adding the surplus to its own supply. As the result of this act of violation, three conditions have been produced, viz. stagnation in the development of the resources of the Empire, devitalization of the governed section of the Empire, and demoralization of the governing section of the Empire. Concerning the first of these three conditions, the truth of its existence is sustained by the destruction of Indian industries and Indian trade, by the exclusion of the great body of eligible native Indians from holding responsible offices in the Dependency, and by excessive taxation, of which the great weight falls upon the poorest section of the people who constitute the bulk of the Dependency. Further, in the same regard, the truth that stagnation is the condition of the resources of the Empire is sustained by British statesmen and publicists who have spoken and who have written upon the subject, and by the evidence of the Rev. T. S. Sunderland, who, as an American missionary, laboured in India for many years.

As regards the British West Indies, the truth of the existence of stagnation is sustained by the poverty of the mass of the people, by the method of government—a method of govern-

ment by which the class that is least able to bear taxation is burdened with taxes, while the classes that are most able to bear taxation are all but released from taxes. A method of government, furthermore, by which this poorest class, being excluded from the best lands, and restricted in its educational facilities, is deprived of the best equipment for bearing the abnormal load. Still further, the truth that this stagnation exists in the British West Indies, is sustained by the evidence of Mr. Allan (p. 159), who was sent by the Board of Trade of Toronto to investigate the trade conditions of the West Indies. And as regards the British possessions in Africa, West and South, the truth of the existence of stagnation is sustained by deficient educational facilities, excessive taxation, exclusion of natives from practically all the avenues of progress, and the pestilential scourge of punitive expeditions. Also with respect to West Africa, it is sustained by the evidence of Lord Mountmorres (p. 86). And so, taking the conditions of these three great centres as representing those of the coloured states throughout the Empire, I conclude that the chief characteristic of these states is stagnation. Secondly, the coloured section of the Empire being deprived of the equality of opportunity—a circumstance from which the conditions of stagnation have arisen—they have become devitalized. And in addition to its own, the colourless section of the Empire, appropriating to itself the opportunities of which it has deprived the coloured section, has become demoralized; its demoralization appearing in its arrogating to itself the term "superior race," and in its application of the term "inferior races" to the coloured races, and appearing likewise in the reckless traffic in falsehood, by which it belittles and befouls the character of the coloured races. Lastly, the demoralization of the colourless section of the Empire appears in the wholesale plunder and murder of the coloured races that it systematically pursues. Thus the effects of Britain's change of policy in regard to the coloured races of the British Empire are, stagnation in the resources of the Empire, devitalization of the coloured section of the Empire, and demoralization of the colourless section of the Empire. And of these, the probable further effect will be a huge rebellion within the Empire itself.

## XV

### Working the Empire from Without; or, Judging the Future by the Present

WE have seen that Britain's original intention concerning the coloured states of the Empire was that their inhabitants, like those of the colourless colonial states, should be trained for self-government. That originally in feeling and conduct toward these coloured states Britain's regard for them was that of a partner; but that subsequently this policy was reversed, that as a result of the reversal, in place of regarding herself as the partner of these coloured states, Britain regards herself as their owner. That this substitution of ownership for partnership has been derived mainly from the desire on the part of Britain to exploit these coloured states. And tracing out the probable effects of this change of policy, that is to say, the probable effects of exploitation, we have seen that upon the Empire itself they are an imperfect development of its resources, or stagnation, devitalization of the governed section of the Empire, and demoralization of the governing section. That these are achievable by misrepresentation and the practice of a dual standard of justice. Now, then, if these be the probable and the actual effects of the change of Britain's original policy, we may also inquire, what might have been the probable effects of her original policy? The being able to exploit the coloured races of the Empire with impunity is the chief cause of Britain's change of policy concerning these races. And we have observed before that for the carrying out of this policy of exploitation Britain is relying upon her own resources, upon the resources of her ally, upon the moral support of the white colonists, and also the moral support of international friendships.

In a previous chapter I have had occasion to make some remarks about two of these links, of which the chain of exploitation is composed, but now, in pursuance of the present inquiry, I wish to test them more particularly. Accordingly we begin with British resources. The very mention of British resources suggests to the mind her physical, material, and mental powers. The second of these powers again embraces the sub-divisions of naval, military, and industrial powers. The naval and military powers are the products of the industrial power. And the first power, of course, including that of the mind, relates to the bodily strength of the nation. Now, with respect to the material and physical powers of the British nation, by which the policy of exploitation is, in part, maintained, and which constitute the basic national resources, it may be observed that, in a general way, the material resource of the nation is the concomitant of its physical resource. That like the mercury of the thermometer which rises and falls with the rise and fall of the temperature, the material national resources rise and fall with the rise and fall of the physical resources. Hence, the potential national capacity is to be gauged rather by its physical resources than by its material resources.

Upon this head, therefore, our remarks will be concerned with the physical power of the nation, as being the index of its potential material power. And with respect to the physical powers of the British nation it may be said at once, that at least it is at the summit of its development. The report of the Imperial census has shown that, instead of the actual increase of the population of the British Empire being maintained—which was 11·8 per cent between 1861 and 1871, and rose to 14·5 per cent between 1871 and 1881—it really fell in the next two decennials to 11·6 and 8·6 per cent respectively. In the case of the Indian Dependency, the decline is chiefly due to famine and plague, consequently the Indian Dependency is excluded from the following reference. Upon the subject of the decline, the report mentions that—

“a large factor connected with this fall in the increase of the population is the continual depression of the birth-rate, which has now become general in nearly all countries. In Australasia, and especially in South Australia, in Victoria, and in New South Wales (where the matter has recently been reported

upon by a Royal Commission) the fall in the birth-rate is remarkable."

Thus it appears that a decline in the increase of the population of the Empire applies to both the coloured and colourless sections. But since England's present policy is to rule the coloured section of 344,000,000 with a rod of iron, it seems to me that success in the enterprise demands not only that the increase of these coloured partners should decline, but that the increase of England's increase should remain. And why? Because the rigour of government of which force is the chief principle, tends, from its very nature, to increase rather than diminish.

And political and economic causes, to which I have alluded before, also tend to increase this rigour; with the results that the coloured partners of the Empire will make use of the means that are within their power, such as the native press and the more permanent forms of literature, steam, and telegraphic communications, in order to combine themselves into a bulwark of resistance against the common oppression. And that to cope effectively with such a resistance it will require not an increase merely, but an increasing increase of the nation's physical power. This is one reason why it is that, if England's present policy is to be continuous, she should increase, and the coloured subjects should decrease. But there is another reason also, and it is this, namely, the contingency of foreign complication. Our statesmen are sweeping the sea of international politics in order to gather into the nets of alliance and friendship the largest and the most important national fishes. Nor are their excursions only confined to this class of fishes. But concerning three of these great monsters of the political deep, upon whose capture British political fishermen have been bent, I doubt that their capture will be accomplished. One of these leviathans is reported to be actually in the net of friendship, but I shall believe the tidings only after the fish has been beached. Another, at this moment (May, 1906), is reported to be moving in the direction of the alliance net, but my relation to this report is the same as it is to the previous one. Believing that the three monsters that have just been alluded to will not be taken by either net, and that if the two which

are reported as having been caught are really in that happy plight, they will eventually escape, I ask what place in the political sea will these fishes strive to reach ?

As far as the present is concerned, we need consider only two of these marine animals. And with respect to them, my answer to the question that I have propounded is, that each of these fishes will strive to gain the gulf, not of a "World-Power" (for they are already there), but of *the* "World-Power." But this would involve the displacement of England. And so, if England is to maintain her present supremacy in this gulf, against the two fishes that threaten to dislodge her, she will require not a diminishing increase, but an increasing increase of population. And if this be the demand with regard to these two threatening invaders, what must it be when the permanent repression of the coloured races of the Empire is also added ? If these statements be mere cobwebs of the fancy, then as such let them be brushed aside, but if they be sober probabilities, whose forecasts are sanctioned by present conditions, then let Englishmen ponder them. This, therefore, is the situation with which, by her present policy, England is destined to be confronted. But has it not been noticed that in order to meet this very situation England has formed an alliance, and has cultivated friendships—the latter intra-Imperial and international ?

Concerning these friendships and alliance, I have already made some remarks. In regard to intra-Imperial friendships, I have hinted that the aid which the colourless colonists of the Empire—and I speak with particular reference to South Africa—would be able to render Great Britain in the double task of maintaining among the coloured races of the Empire the policy of exploitation, and of prosecuting an armed conflict against one or more of the great powers, would be small. And that because these colonists would find that their own exposure to external attack, or to the danger of reprisals from the coloured peoples among whom they dwell and by whom they are hopelessly outnumbered, of reprisals which their own insolence, their own systematic injustice, and their own shameless tyranny towards these peoples had provoked, requires, at least, all their own available resources. And it is the possibility, nay the probability of

the latter of these two dangers occurring, that makes the present provocative policy of the white colonists towards the coloured British subject—a policy which the British Government has now itself openly endorsed—appear to me as being so very extraordinary.

With respect to alliances, I need only repeat here what I have had occasion to state before, that national interest is the pivot around which international alliances move, and that this form of interest, owing to wars, or industrial development, or geographical position, or the entrance of new states into the rivalries of industrial and political life—owing to these conditions, single or combined—national interest is of very unstable equilibrium. Thus, since the governing principle of international alliances is national self-interest, and since national self-interest is so variable—in the present conditions of international life, and in the future conditions of that life as it is adumbrated by the present—it seems unlikely that twenty years hence, I will say, the present British alliance will be still serviceable as an effective instrument for accomplishing the purposes for which it was designed and executed by the contracting parties.

And coming now to the subject of extra-Imperial friendships, as distinguished from intra-Imperial friendships, to which I have recently made additional reference, I again take the United States as our example, as I did earlier, in the same connection. I stated in that earlier reference that the friendship of the United States is one of the supports—the moral supports—upon which England relies in the pursuit of her changed policy towards the coloured section of the Empire, as well as in case of international complication. Companionship in wrong-doing is more valued by the wrong-doer than is companionship in right-doing by the right-doer. Therefore it is not surprising that England's approximation to Euro-American sentiment with respect to the coloured races should have had the effect—that is to say, the apparent effect—of tightening the cords of amity between the two peoples. And so I am unable to believe that this abandonment of a great principle by England, as part of the price that is paid by her for Euro-American friendship, is a real gain. For the reason that although in the atrociously abominable treatment of Afro-Americans by Euro-Americans, the universal silence

of the latter would make it appear that that treatment is approved by them all, yet in reality it is not the case. That although through lack of courage—but not that they are the less blamable on that account—Euro-Americans of the better sort who are the salt of the American nation, fail to give expression to their conviction; nevertheless, they are strongly opposed to the treatment that is accorded by their colourless brethren to the coloured American.

Now, is it conceivable that this class of Euro-Americans will admire England for having abandoned her former and juster attitude towards the coloured races as part payment for the friendship of their country? And also because Euro-Americans of the baser sort—whether they sit in the senate or saloon—who delight in, and strive to intensify the existing enmity against the Afro-American in the United States, know in their consciences that they are acting ignobly and wrongly; that England's former attitude towards the coloured races was right, and that England has forsaken that attitude in order to secure their friendship. So that although from that comradeship in wrong, which wrong-doing delights to have, this class of Euro-Americans appears to hail England's change of conduct towards the coloured races, yet beyond that sordid regard it must consider England in the matter to have fallen rather than to have risen. Hence, as far as the promotion of Anglo-American friendship is concerned, England's change towards the coloured races cannot have brought her any real gain.

The great blunder—I had almost said the great crime—that our leaders of thought and of action commit, in regard to public affairs is that of judging the future by the present, rather than of judging the present by the future. I am speaking now, not from the point of view of right, but from the low plane of expediency, the plane where these affairs have their conception, their birth, their growth, and their maturity. And no circumstance shows more clearly the subversive tendency of this procedure of judgment than the present differential form of treatment which the parent state employs between the coloured and colourless colonies, dependencies, and protectorates of the Empire. Thus, looking at the matter from the economic side, I would ask this, namely, from which of the two sections of the Empire—the coloured or the colour-



less sections—does the parent state derive the larger part of that material support upon which its existence largely depends? Unquestionably, it is from the coloured section. Well then, since it is from the coloured section, would not mere prudence have directed that every effort should be put forth to develop the resources of these coloured states? But is this the course that is pursued? Have we not seen already that instead of encouraging and husbanding the material, the intellectual, and the moral growth of these states, the parent State, on the one hand, hinders such a growth, and on the other hand, dissipates such resources as are possessed by these states? This is the economic side of the matter. And what is revealed by the political side? However, before proceeding to remark upon the political side, I must observe here, that as a proof of the absolute indifference with which the great majority of the Empire—i.e. the coloured section, the section whose contribution to the maintenance of the Empire is hardly less materially than that of the British section, and is much more than that of the colonial section—is regarded by the other two smaller sections, nothing is more convincing than the recent Colonial Conference.

Beginning in London on the 15th of April, 1907, and ending on the 14th of May, 1907, this conference (a carnival of feastings and flatteries) has had under consideration during its serious moments subjects of such weight and imperial interests as those of military and naval affairs, emigration, finance, trade, commerce, and preference. But although the coloured division of the Empire probably contributes directly and indirectly towards its support as much, or nearly as much, as the British division, and much more than the colonial division, although the welfare of the coloured division is as closely related to these questions with which the conference has been concerned as is the welfare of either the British or the colonial division, and although it forms the enormous majority, yet not a single representative of these 344,000,000 of coloured British subjects has been invited to the conference. That the coloured imperial division possesses representatives, who in their general knowledge of the questions that were discussed by the conference, in their loyalty and patriotism as British subjects, are as competent as are the representatives of the other divisions, cannot be truthfully denied. And

I cite the following from the speeches of three Indian statesmen in support of my contention.

The occasion was a special meeting of the Viceroy's Legislative Council, of March, 1907, and the subject was the immediate reform which had been promised to the Indian people by the Indian Government. In connection with this theme, the Maharajah of Durbhunga commented upon the "deep settled feeling" that was abroad in India, "a consciousness that solemn pledges given by our rulers remain, to use the words of one of our most brilliant Viceroys, 'inadequately redeemed,' the present discontent he regarded as the embodiment of a general conviction that the opportunities open to the people are not proportionate to their present capacities." Dr. Rash Behary Ghose declared "that delay in embarking upon a policy of liberal concessions was spelling the gravest danger." And Mr. Gokhale, in the following striking passage, after dealing with the various questions which arose out of the financial statement that had been presented to the Council, concluded by drawing the attention of the Viceroy to the real obstacle to Indian reform.

"The main difficulty," he observes, "arises from the fact that the Government of this country is really in the hands of the Civil Service, which is practically a caste, with all the exclusiveness and love of monopoly that characterizes castes. No reform which they do not approve has, as a rule, any chance of being adopted. He trusted that the proposed reforms when announced would be found to be substantial, and conceded in a generous spirit. The public mind was in a state of great tension, and unless the concessions were promptly announced, and steps taken to give immediate effect to them, they would, he feared, lose half their efficiency and all their grace; the situation is an anxious and almost critical one, and unless the highest statesmanship inspire the council of the Government, difficulties threaten to arise of which no man can foresee the end."

Thus in these extracts there is revealed the grasp of a complex situation, and courage, precision, and moderation in its description.

Who then would say that the coloured races of the Empire are without representatives by whom they could have been

worthily represented at the recent Colonial Conference? If on the one hand, after more than two centuries of British rule, the coloured division of the Empire were not competent to take part in the Colonial Conference, then, than that fact, there is no more conclusive evidence of the failure of British rule. But on the other hand, as this coloured division of the Empire was competent to take part in the conference, and it yet was not allowed to do so, then, than this fact, there is no more conclusive evidence of the injustice of British rule. The Right Honourable John Morley, the Secretary of State for India, has been the representative of the great Indian Dependency at the Colonial Conference, but he is a member of a Government, which although it is called a Liberal Government, has shown itself by its native policy, for example, in South Africa—Natal and the Transvaal—to be no less reactionary than the Conservative Government which it displaced. And as a member of such a Government, he himself, in opposition to the vehement and universal protest of the people, has endorsed the partition of Bengal, his latest triumph in the cause of reaction being the arrest and imprisonment of three reputable Indian leaders in the Punjab, three reputable leaders who have been guilty of no breach of the law, refusing them bail, denying them trial, and deporting one of them to confinement in a fortress; and also in addition to these there has been the imprisonment of native editors of newspapers, intimidation of scholastic India by threatening their seats of learning with financial embarrassment, and the overawing the populace with military force—these acts being the punishment of a constitutional agitation, against the scandalous increase of an outrageous and vicious system of taxation.

The fact that Mr. Morley bears such a record stirs up within me grave doubts that in him purely native Indian interests would have had at the conference, a zealous and sympathetic representative. But if even his acts since his advent to the high office of Secretary of State for India, had been such as to inspire the friends of the Dependency with the liveliest confidence in his representative capacity, it would still have been true that as the largest section of the Empire, a section that subscribes to the maintenance of the Empire almost as much, if not as much as the British section, that subscribes to it much more than the colonial section, and

which in loyalty, patriotism, and ability, is the equal of either of the other two sections, the coloured races of the Empire should of right have had their own representatives at the Colonial Conference. Nor is this contention invalidated, even by the euphemistic designation of "self-governing colonies," for we are dealing not with names, but with principles.

We were about to remark upon the subversive tendency of the procedure of judging the future by the present, rather than of judging the present by the future, as it is shown politically, in the differentiation between the coloured and the colourless races of the British Empire by the latter of these two sections. Well, then, how is the procedure of this subversive tendency revealed politically? The air is full of sounds, but whereas the rest of these sounds are for the most part inarticulate, two of them which are also more vehement than the rest are very distinct. They are the sounds of war and of peace. Of these two sounds, that of peace is hollow and artificial, while that of war is full and natural. In the fourth volume I purpose to give the reasons, why the peace which is being so noisily proclaimed abroad, is regarded by me as a grotesque sham and a perilous delusion. But I will be content to assert here that a probable crisis of the present political fever will be—sooner or later—a great war. Now, in view of this great maelstrom that looms athwart the course of the British Imperial barque, what tack should she pursue? In order to answer this question, we shall renew our reference to the two great ethnic elements of which the British Empire consists. But we shall consider them as three great elements, viz. the parent state, the white colonists, and the native peoples.

Now, in confining ourselves for the moment to the colonists and native peoples, one striking fact to be observed is, that with the exception of the North American colonies and Australasia, where the whites are in the majority, the coloured peoples in all the colonies, dependencies, and protectorates of the Empire are in the overwhelming majority. Taking Natal—with which my previous remarks may have made us somewhat familiar—as a representative of these centres where the coloured element preponderates over the colourless element, we find there a population of 100,000 whites and of 900,000 blacks. Another striking fact with respect

to these two unequal elements is that in the case of the smaller, viz. the whites, the chief source of supply is greatly diminished. The chief source of supply of the white population of the colonies, dependencies, and protectorates of the Empire, South Africa being excepted, has been unquestionably the United Kingdom. But that there has been a great decrease in emigration from the United Kingdom to the British colonies of late years is evident from the facts that whereas during the years 1881-90 emigrants numbering 355,566 left the United Kingdom for other parts of the Empire, during the years 1891-1900 the number had shrunk to 266,183. A third striking fact that is to be noticed between these two numerically unequal elements of coloured and colourless peoples in the colonies, dependencies, and protectorates of the Empire is that the rate of increase of the coloured is greater than the rate of increase of the colourless. Now, putting these three facts together, we see that the permanence of the numerical strength of the coloured element over the colourless element is unchangeable.

Natal has shown us that what these colourless colonists, who are overwhelmingly outnumbered by the coloured peoples, depend upon in order to live with their coloured fellow-subjects are the British fleet and the British army. But as I have hinted already, the time is approaching when the British nation will have to fight for her supremacy. And when that time arrives, what will the colonists do? As to the tack which they should pursue—one would have thought that these coming events, of which the shadows are everywhere visible, to those who have eyes and who wish to see, would have led the colourless colonists, on the ground of self-preservation, at least, to seek the goodwill, if not the friendship, of their coloured fellow-subjects. But instead of such a course, it is the diabolical drama that was lately, and that is still being unfolded in Natal, which, in varying degree and under varying circumstances, is being performed throughout the Empire.

That is to say, that the great majority of the colourless colonists of the British Empire, instead of dealing justly with the native, provoke him to discontent, by means of oppressive and unjust measures, then they make his discontent the pretext for throwing him into prison, for seizing his goods,

for seizing his land, or for shooting him. Still, even when the colonists have shown such a lack of the power of intuition and of prudence, even when they have shown so complete an absence of self-control, one would have expected that the parent state by precept and example would have given them instruction and guidance. Generally children are without either the experience, the foresight, or the insight, that is possessed by their parents, hence, more than their parents, they are apt, in their action, to be inconsiderate and precipitate. In comparison with older states, the same is more or less true of younger communities. For these reasons, therefore, one would have thought that the parent State would not have countenanced, much less have abetted, the practices of the colourless colonists towards their coloured fellow-subjects; but that she would rather have discouraged those practices. However, that the parent State has not taken this course is also evident from the following part of a speech that was delivered by the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the 25th of April, 1906, and that has been referred to in another connection.

In the course of his speech the chief of the Colonial Office said :—

“ At the Colonial Office they had to deal not only with the facts of area and population of the colonies, but with facts and difficulties of administration. What they had to seek was co-operation in the work of administration carried on by those at home and those abroad. They must look more than anything else to giving sympathy and support to the man on the spot. There was lately a rising in one of our Protectorates which had a formidable appearance, but which was promptly suppressed by the energetic action of the Commissioner and his officers. In that case the Home Government co-operated with the man on the spot by leaving the matter entirely in the capable hands of Sir Frederick Lugard.”

Speaking of Natal, Lord Elgin continued :—

“ He would like to express his entire sympathy with the Government of that colony in the difficult position in which it found itself, and his cordial wish for a successful and honourable exit from those difficulties. He also wished to express his high appreciation of the tact and discretion displayed by the Government of Natal during this crisis, and the satisfaction with which he had learned that the people of the neighbouring

colony of the Transvaal had announced that they were prepared to join with their neighbours to assist them, if need be."

We are also informed by Reuter, on the 18th of May, 1906, that :—

"The Transvaal Volunteer infantry force for Natal entrained here this evening" (17th of May). "Prior to their departure they were paraded, and Lord Selborne wished them God-speed. His excellency expressed his own and his fellow-countrymen's pride in the Volunteers, who had volunteered simply from a sense of duty. It was an absolute necessity for all the whites in South Africa to stand together, in order to maintain social order among the blacks, who must be largely regarded as children. They carried the white man's burden, and their first duty was to show that the white man never turned his face, and though stern when necessary, was merciful in victory."

The natives of Natal, in the first instance, had been improperly and unjustly taxed; then before the time had expired which the law had fixed, the payment of the tax was improperly and unjustly enforced; the injustice and impropriety of the tax, in the second instance, leads to a collision between some two score of those natives and the police; in the collision two of the police, after they had killed a native, are killed. Thereupon the colonists, stricken with terror, proclaim martial law, dispatch troops to the scene of the disturbance, and embark upon other warlike expedients to quell an imaginary native revolt. Kraals are shelled, churches are burnt, crops are destroyed, cattle and lands are seized, and two of the natives are shot.

For the same murder of the two police officers twelve other natives, in addition to the two that are shot, are, at the instance of the Natal Government, put upon their trial. The trial is by court martial under militia officers, and, notwithstanding the presence of strong extenuating circumstances in the case, these twelve natives are condemned to be shot. Outraged by the impropriety and injustice of the imposition and collection of the poll-tax, and their outrage being further aggravated by the spoiling of their crops, the seizure of their herds, the burning of their churches, the destruction of their kraals, and the shooting of two of their number, the natives, upon

being now bidden by the peremptory command of the Natal Government to be present at the execution of these their twelve condemned tribesmen, not unnaturally, burst into open hostility. For the purpose of extinguishing this flame, which at so much pains its own hands had kindled, the Natal Government begins to mobilize its militia forces and to organize its volunteers. Of course, the Transvaal Colony, in the interest of whose industry of gold-mining, as I observed before, the infamous poll-tax was partly enacted against the native by the Natal legislature, offers a contingent for this man-hunt; a man-hunt in which 3500 natives are slain, and women and children are cast adrift to exposure, to famine, and to death. And it is the quelling of this open native resentment, which the triple outrages of the Natal Government had produced, that drew from the Secretary of State for the Colonies the benediction, and from the High Commissioner of South Africa the pyrotechnic that I have quoted above.

The progress which the Secretary of State for the Colonies has made from the 30th of March to the 25th of April, 1906, is very striking, and very astonishing. It is striking in that it afresh illustrates the fact that in the present temper of British rule political considerations completely supersede all moral considerations. And it is astonishing for the reason that it was on the first of these dates that the Secretary of State for the Colonies dispatched his famous telegram to South Africa, directing that the execution of the twelve natives should be delayed, because the execution of twelve men was "a serious matter." And that since then he has not only sanctioned the execution of these twelve men, and endorsed the subsequent acts of the colonists in the same direction, but in regard to the whole affair he has become so enthusiastic, that on the second of these dates he announced that the Home Government henceforth will cooperate with "the man on the spot," by leaving matters affecting the coloured British subject entirely in his hands. Further, the progress of Lord Elgin, as it is shown by his statements, from the 30th of March to the 25th of April is astonishing, on account of what "the man on the spot" generally is with respect to the interest of the coloured British subject, and that, notwithstanding this, the British Government has abandoned the interest of the coloured British subject to "the man on the spot." As examples of what "the man on the spot" generally is,



Lord Elgin has given Sir Frederick Lugard and the Natal Ministry.

Well, what have we noticed concerning the administration of Sir Frederick Lugard in Northern Nigeria? We noticed that after the Imperial Government had entered into a solemn compact with the Sultan of Sokoto (p. 39) that he should be paid an annual subsidy of fifteen hundred pounds, for the privileges and rights of trade and of government which it should enjoy and exercise in his dominions, and that while it was enjoying those privileges and was exercising those rights, it discontinued the payment of the subsidy without warning or explanation. That after it was supposed that the Sultan of Sokoto was displeased with the British authorities—as he ought to have been—although the supposition was founded only upon native rumour, which Sir Frederick Lugard characterized as utterly worthless—Sir Frederick Lugard, as High Commissioner of the Protectorate, induced the British Government to send a military force against Sokoto, which, after slaying a number of the Sultan's subjects and putting to flight the Sultan himself, incorporated Sokoto and its environs with the British Empire.

Lastly, we have seen that since this grossly immoral deed has been enacted, Sokoto and its vicinity, being still under the consulship of Sir F. Lugard, have been a seething pot of discontent, bubbling over at frequent and irregular intervals, in the form of native outbreaks. And the following is one of the latest reports that is to hand regarding the struggles of this brave people beneath the yoke of wanton oppression. It appears in the daily press of the 29th of May, 1906, and is to this effect:—

“The Emir of Gaudo—an important centre to the south of Sokoto—who was proved to have promised assistance to the rebels in the recent Sokoto rising, and whose attitude was altogether unsatisfactory, has, we are informed, been deposed by the High Commissioner, and deported, with certain members of his household, to Lokoja. A new Emir has been appointed in his stead. It is under contemplation to remove the ex-Emirs of Kano and Zaria to Burutu. There are rumours of unrest in the province of Bauchi, and also of a Senussi gathering to the north of Lake Chad. A fort is being built at Burmi, near which place, if the Senussi movement comes to anything, trouble may be expected to arise.”

And what have we seen about the Natal ministry? Why—the triple outrages, of the unjust poll-tax, of the shooting of fourteen natives for the two murders that had been caused by the unjust enforcement of the unjust poll-tax, followed by the declaration of war against the natives because of their resentment at having been commanded to witness the shooting of their twelve tribesmen condemned, and by the killing of 3500 of these natives. Such, then, is “the man on the spot,” to whom the British Government has delegated its responsibility to secure for the native fair treatment. As for Lord Selborne’s speech that is given in the excerpt above, the native appears in it, rather as a horde of savages which has never been in contact with civilization, and which periodically raids British territory from its barbarous haunts, than as subjects of the King of England, who contribute substantial sums to the revenues of all the South African colonies, and who are steadily rising in the scale of civilization. And the tone of the speech reveals the speaker as a local pettifogging politician of narrow mental range, fevered with the miasma of colonial prejudice against the native, and endeavouring to draw public attention to himself, rather than as an enlightened statesman, the representative of the monarch, and thereby the friend and protector of all subjects of the King that are within the limits of his rule.

Between Lord Selborne’s speech to the Volunteers on the eve of their departure for Natal and the nature of the errand of the Volunteers there is certainly a resemblance; that resemblance is an absolute lack of dignity. In Natal, who are the Volunteers going to fight? Subjects of the King; subjects of the King, whom a ruthless tyranny had driven to desperation; and subjects of the King which are unarmed. Indeed, if the natives had been well armed and well drilled, these brave Transvaalers, deeming discretion to be the better part of valour, would no doubt have remained at home. But in participating in such an encounter as this, is there dignity? And then, in the speech of the High Commissioner, the representative of the Crown, we have in the utterance, “It was absolutely necessary for all the whites in South Africa to stand together, in order to maintain social order among the blacks, who must be largely regarded as children,” and that “They carried the white man’s burden,” the baldest appeal to race vanity and race prejudice that even a demagogue might envy. But in this claptrap

what dignity is there? In the jargon of the literature of the day—high and low, rich and poor—the noble lord has declared that the blacks “ must be largely regarded as children.” Well, suppose that for the sake of argument we admit that the “ blacks ” are children. Would Lord Selborne deny that even children possess rights, and that by virtue of those rights they are entitled to just treatment?

The blacks are children, thereby it must be inferred that the whites are men. Hence that the hysterical seizure of which Natal Caucasian was the victim upon the rumour that fifty Zulus were armed with assegais, must be regarded as a sign of manhood. That the endeavour to defame the character of the coloured section of the Empire, in order that the character of the colourless section may appear to greater advantage, is a further sign of manhood. That to bend every fibre of energy, in order to hinder the progress of the coloured British subject, whilst at the same time calling heaven and earth to witness that this progress is the only aim of the white British subject, is likewise a proof of manhood. If I were asked what is the difference between manhood and childhood, I should reply that the difference is as between restraint and lack of restraint. I should say that restraint, that is self-restraint, is the domination of the lower self by the higher self, and that lack of restraint is the domination of the higher self by the lower self. Now, as to the glaring and crying abuses of the British Empire, abuses of which some of them have been engaging our attention in the preceding chapters, abuses such as those that permit one system of education to the colourless race and another system to the coloured races, that permit one system of taxation to the one and another system to the other, that also applies one system of legal justice to the one and another system to the other; in a word, the system of abuses by which one part of the Empire is governed by conciliation and the other part is governed by coercion. What is the significance of such a system of abuses? It is lack of restraint. But this, as I have said already, is the child's, or the “ children's ” characteristic. Thus Lord Selborne, as is not unusual when such descriptions are unfavourable, has applied to the blacks the description that more properly belongs to the whites.

Persuading itself into the belief that the coloured subjects are

children, the colourless section of the Empire, upon the ground of that persuasion, next proceeds against this coloured section, with those deeds of injustice of which the examples that I have given are among the evidence. And so epithets such as this one of "children" act as a salve upon the consciences of the colourless section of the Empire. Thus, in his speech to the Volunteers on the eve of their departure to the front, Lord Selborne, in a manner similar to that in which the fetish doctor applies his medicine to the bodies of the native, on the eve of their departure to the battle, was applying this salve of "children" to their consciences. And this is a strong mixture that his Lordship applies, for it contains not only the salve "children," but also that of the "white man's burden." The great disadvantage from which fetish medicines suffer, whether they be applied by the white witch doctor or by the black witch doctor, is that they cannot survive analysis. Thus when we analyze this unguent of "the white man's burden," we are met by three facts, of which two are patently contradictory.

Of the two contradictory facts, one is the white man's innate dislike of work, the other is the white man's intense love for this "burden"; whilst the third fact is the white man's inordinate love of gain. His love for the "burden" appears in this, that he has travelled many thousand miles to possess it, and that on reaching his destination, he has used every kind of craft and stratagem, and even force, to induce the owners of the "burden" to entrust it to his care. Now how can these two contradictory facts of his hatred of work and of his love of this burden be harmonized? By this, that the burden is borne not by himself who governs, but by those who are governed, whilst he, the white man, impelled by his inordinate love of gain, pockets all the profits. Therefore the white man's "burden" is but a nostrum, an impudent fraud. In an empire, then, that consists of the parent state with a population of 41,000,000, of colourless colonists that number 13,000,000, and of coloured subjects that number 344,000,000, we have seen the colourless colonists pursuing a course of antagonism toward the coloured subjects; and we have observed that this is done in order that the latter may be available for furthering the ends of the former. For the pursuit of this policy, the colonists rely upon the resources of the parent State. But we have also observed that, like the colonists, the parent

State pursues a policy of antagonism towards the coloured subjects of the Empire.

The reason, which is identical with that of the colonists', is that these coloured subjects may subserve the ends of the parent State. The prosecution of this policy likewise rests upon the use of force. But, as has been observed, the future of the parent state is dimmed by the shadow of a great conflict. Thus the defensive forces of the parent state will be required for the purpose of holding the majority of 344,000,000 of coloured subjects, within the Empire, in subjection to the minority, or the 54,000,000 of colourless subjects; and for meeting the threatened hurricane of arms without the Empire. The forces being insufficient for the dual requirements, are supplemented by intra-Imperial friendships, or the friendship of the colourless colonists, and by extra-Imperial friendships, or international and allied friendships. But it has been shown that inasmuch as the attitude of the colonists toward the coloured subjects is that of enmity rather than of amity, that numbers of colonists throughout the Empire are surrounded by overwhelming numbers of coloured subjects, and that all the colonists depend upon the parent state for their protection, the friendship of the colonists, as an efficient auxiliary for coping with the two-fold demands of the repression of the 344,000,000 of the coloured subjects and the defence against a great armed foe, is nil. That Anglo-American friendship—which is regarded as the most important of the extra-Imperial friendships—resting upon nothing more substantial than a series of concessions that has been made to it by the parent state of the British Empire, including that of a great principle, will be unlikely to render any appreciable help to the double operations of the parent state. And that the unstable circumstances upon which the continuance of alliances depend make the forecast of the service which any one alliance may render at a future time more or less doubtful. Thus, deducting the auxiliary combination of intra-Imperial and extra-Imperial aid, upon which the parent state relies in its work of repression of the 344,000,000 of coloured subjects of the Empire, and upon which it depends for the defence of the Empire against foreign attack, deducting this auxiliary combination from the original inadequacy of the forces of the parent state, we have that inadequacy as the net result, also, as the outcome of the practice of judging the

future by the present, rather than of judging the present by the future.

But this inadequacy of the forces of the parent state of the British Empire to fulfil the double task of repressing 344,000,000 of coloured British subjects and of defending the Empire against external attack represents the political side of the subject. With respect to the economic side, it has been shown to proceed upon the plan of impoverishing the majority, that is the coloured section of the Empire, in order to enrich the minority, that is the colourless section of the Empire ; or, in other words, the present Imperial policy proceeds economically upon the lines of a very partial development of the Empire or stagnation in regard to the natural resources of the Empire ; upon the lines of devitalization in regard to the coloured races of the Empire, and of demoralization in regard to the colourless race of the Empire. Now, taking these three conditions as the alternative of England's past Imperial policy, or the policy of amelioration, let us pass on, in order to notice in some detail that policy of amelioration of which the present policy of deterioration is the alternative.

## XVI

### Working the Empire from Within ; or, Probable Effects of Britain's Original Policy

THE original policy of Great Britain, as it is represented by the declarations of 1858 and 1865, concerning coloured British subjects, was, as I have observed already, that they should enjoy equal opportunities, like the colourless subjects ; and that, like the colourless subjects, they should also be trained for autonomous government. But what is the essential feature of such a policy ? It is equality of treatment. The proclamation of 1858 declared that selections for the public service would be based, not upon the grounds of race or religion, but upon those of ability and character. Thus every youth who possesses the qualifications of ability and character might have grown up with the consciousness that he is a free subject of a free Empire, that as such the most laudable endeavour to cultivate his character and his intellect will be suitably rewarded in the sphere of service which he might elect to fill ; for equality of treatment is the birthright of the British subject. As a result, then, of this equality of treatment, instead of there being 54,000,000 of subjects as the available source, whence supplies for the services of the Empire might be drawn, there would be 398,000,000. Hence the quality of service for the Empire would probably be higher than it now is. Thus, by the practice of equality of treatment there would have been no exclusion of native Indians from the higher public offices of their own country. There would have been no exclusion of coloured subjects from the services of the Army and Navy ; there would have been no exclusion from the West African Medical Service.

Again, there would have been no such distinction as we have seen to exist in Cape Colony between the grants that are al-

lotted for the education of the whites and those that are allowed for the education of the blacks. Nor would there have been the spectacle which Jamaica presents of having half the children of the island growing up in ignorance, ostensibly from lack of funds, whilst at the same time the taxes which their parents pay into the public treasury is devoted to the sugar industry, that industry contributing little or nothing to the general revenue. Nor would the prevailing defectiveness of the primary system of education in India, Ceylon, East and West Africa, and other coloured communities of the Empire, have existed. Further, had the original policy of equality of treatment prevailed in the Empire, there had not been in the British West Indies tens of thousands of acres of arable land lying untilled whilst the peasant who supplies the great bulk of the revenue by means of agriculture is excluded from those arable lands of the plains, and is forced to till the arid land of the hills. Nor would there have still remained the primitive system of agriculture that is followed by the coloured inhabitants of these tropical and sub-tropical zones, but instead there would have been well-equipped institutions for the teaching of agriculture on the methods of science. The industries of India had not been destroyed. Punitive expeditions had been the exception rather than the rule. And the equality of treatment which would secure to every member of the 398,000,000 subjects of the King the opportunity to prepare himself for the pursuit to which he decided to devote his talents would have prevented that torpid stagnation by which the tropical and sub-tropical states of the Empire are for the most part paralysed. Cloyed by a superabundant fertility, there is hidden in the soils of these sunny lands stores of exhaustless wealth. But side by side with that fact there is also this other, that they to whom alone it is permitted to dig out these hidden treasures are the native inhabitants. Thus, by putting facilities within the reach of the native that he may successfully develop the enormous wealth of these regions, there would at least be sufficient support for the inhabitants, and so the sight of thousands of civilized men and women, depending for their daily bread—as we have noticed concerning Sierra Leone—almost entirely upon a country that has been described as “wholly savage and untrodden” would have been unknown. Equality of treatment,



which supplies to all equality of opportunity, being inimical to the discrimination and the humiliation that prevail in the Empire against the coloured subject, would have afforded prosperity and contentment to all their inhabitants.

Again, equality of treatment, or the supplying to all equal opportunity, being the Imperial policy, one section of the Empire, as is now unhappily the case, could not look upon, and could not treat the other section with habitual contempt and studied incivility ; but regarding each other rather as equals, both sections would be joined together in friendly rivalry toward the common goal of the unity and prosperity of the Empire. There would, therefore, be an absence of that enmity—and its concomitants, injustice and suspicion—now so sedulously cultivated by the colourless toward the coloured section. And there would be in the coloured section toward the colourless, an absence of that feeling of resentment and injury, which enmity, injustice, and suspicion have produced. And between the two great sections of the Empire, there being on the one hand mutual respect and confidence, and on the other hand prosperity and contentment, the necessity for such a spectacle as that of the increase of the naval and military forces in old colonies, like the British West Indies, and that of keeping up in British India—even now that the Russian power is completely disabled—a huge and highly expensive military establishment, would be non-existent.

And so, like Canada and the other colourless states of the Empire, the coloured states also—except for defensive purposes—would have been free from these signs of failure in British rule. Once more, under equality of treatment, the two great sections of the Empire, living together in mutual respect, and in prosperity and contentment, would rise, like one man, in case of danger to defend the Empire that they both have been made to feel their own.

This, then, is the alternative of England's present régime, or the policy of exploitation. Under the present régime, or deterioration, there is on the one hand, an inequality of treatment within the Empire leading to oppression, degradation, misrepresentation, and wilful impoverishment of the coloured section, or majority, by the colourless section, or minority, and resulting in the stagnation of the Empire's resources,

in the devitalization of its majority, and demoralization of its minority;—these outrages by the colourless section of the Empire upon the coloured are committed in the presence of drawn sword and cocked rifle, of battleships and cruisers cleared for action—and under this present régime the need of such forces to subjugate one part of the Empire to the other part renders the defence of the Empire inadequate, and weakens its safety against external attack. But under the past régime, or the original policy of amelioration, there had been, on the other hand, equality of treatment within the Empire leading to a more equal distribution of its burdens between the two great sections; to their mutual respect and sympathy, to confidence and co-operation, to the prosperity of the whole Empire, and to the sufficiency and ability of the Imperial forces, sustained by the interest of all the peoples, to defend the Empire against external attack.

And these indications of the former régime are the probable effects of Britain's original native policy. Now then, which of the two is the better—the present Imperial policy, which, like a great whirlpool, endangers the future progress of the British Empire, or the past Imperial policy from which this great obstructive danger is absent? The course of enmity between the two sections of the Empire, with the separation of the two, and the degradation, defamation, oppression and impoverishment of the governed section by the governing section, and the demoralization of the governing section itself—or the course of amity between the two sections, their approximation to each other, the observance of candour and truthfulness in their references to each other, their practice of mutual justice, and the abiding aim to promote each other's welfare? I ask again, which of these two policies is the better? Can there be a doubt which of them is the safe policy, and which is the unsafe policy?

Assuredly, all sane men, all honest men, all intelligent men will say that the latter is the course of Imperial life, and that the former is the course of Imperial death. Yet, although this must be the verdict of sanity, of intelligence, of candour, and of honesty, regarding these two courses, it is also a fact that throughout the Empire, the great preponderance of white opinion, and of white practice, is zealously defending the present course, as being that which is proper and safe. One

of the immediate causes of this most extraordinary attitude is due, I believe, to the pernicious habit of judging the future by the present, rather than of judging the present by the future. Between these two methods of judgment, what is the difference? Judgment of the future by the present regards what might be called the external strength of the Empire as of primary importance, whereas judgment of the present by the future regards what might be called the internal strength of the Empire as of primary importance. Thus the declaration of the first of these methods is, continue to increase the navy; reorganize the army; form alliances with the powerful states, and where alliances are impracticable with such states, cultivate their friendships.

And by every device of malice and craft within the Empire, it artificially separates the two component ethnic parts, restricts the mental, material, and political possibilities of the majority, and at the same time it affords to the minority the fullest scope for the exercise of these means. But the declaration of the second of these methods is: Promote harmony between the two great ethnic parts of the Empire, by the faithful observance of the ordinary obligations and courtesies of life, for the strength of a state depends not upon its external relations, but upon its internal cohesion. Give the fullest means and opportunity for mental, moral, material, and political development, not to one part only, but to all the parts of the Empire; and so, all the parts being well developed, and working together in harmonious relations, the whole will thereby attain its full consummation. An Empire thus equipped may, if circumstances demand it, make alliances and cultivate special external friendships; and should these succumb to the vicissitudes of time, it will derive satisfaction from the knowledge that by having secured internal solidarity it had first set its house in order. These are the two ideals of the two methods of judgment, and I have no hesitation in characterizing the first of them, which is the one that is in vogue, as being immoral, as being at variance with sound economics, and as being inimical to sane politics.

But to all this Englishmen, in effect, thus respond: Well, you see, we are in the minority, as you say. Hence, if we had given equality of opportunity and equality of treatment to the coloured races of the Empire, in accordance with our

original intention and declaration, and if we were also preparing them for autonomous government, they would probably have become too powerful for us, and as a result they would, or at least there would have been the possibility, that they would turn us out of the countries in which they are in the majority, but which we now rule. Prudence, therefore, has directed that we should obviate such a possibility by limiting the opportunities of these races, by withholding from them political rights, by seeking the moral support of the white colonies and of outside friendships, and by seeking also the active support of an alliance.

The truth that underlies this response is, that of right, the coloured states of the British Empire and their peoples belong absolutely to England, that accordingly she is in duty bound to take such measures as will render inviolable her ownership of those states. Well, if those coloured states and their inhabitants are the absolute possessions of England, then ancient Britain and its inhabitants were the absolute possessions, first of the Republic, and subsequently of Imperial Rome. Further, if those coloured states and their inhabitants be absolute possessions of England, then so must Canada and the Canadians, Australia and the white Australians, Natal and the white Natalians, etc., also be. But if the relation between ancient Britain and ancient Rome, and between England and her white colonies, was not and has not been that of owner and owned, but rather of preceptor and pupil, or guardian and ward, then neither is the relation of England and her coloured colonies that of owner and owned, but rather of preceptor and pupil, or guardian and ward.

And so with respect to the coloured states of the Empire, the substitution of ownership for guardianship, by Englishmen, is a most audacious and preposterous assumption. And even as Spain and the empires of antiquity, in regard to a similar assumption, failed, so, in the result hoped for, will this assumption, as will be its just reward, also fail. I have already given some reasons why I believe that neither her own inherent strength, the strength of the white colonists, of an ally, and of the friendships of other nations combined, will be sufficient to enable England to keep her heels in perpetuity upon the necks of a fifth of the human race. But there is another reason, which, even if these others had not existed,

had been sufficient to bring to naught this monstrous endeavour. That reason is the fact that the coloured races of the Empire are England's partners, and not England's slaves. So then, for the sole purpose of being always able to have the absolute control of their possessions, England, by excessive taxation, defective education, the denial of political and social rights, has dared to attempt the circumvention of the destinies of 344,000,000 of the human race. Did ever selfishness and avarice assume more heinous and hideous proportions? This colossal attempt, the offspring of selfishness and avarice, has certainly been paralleled by Rome, but then Rome was heathen, whereas England is Christian. And this presumptuous endeavour to cut off the progress of 344,000,000 of peoples is nothing less than the endeavour to contravene natural laws, for the destinies of peoples, no less than the destinies of sun, moon, and stars, are fixed. But who having contravened physical laws, has gone unpunished? Therefore does England, in the contravention of ethnic laws, expect exemption from Nature, the inexorable Shylock?

The stem holds the fruit to itself with a firm and jealous grip. In fact, it regards the fruit as its own property, for did it not give it birth? And from the birth of the fruit, until now, has not the stem uniformly furnished its support? Again, is it not under the protection of the stem that the fruit has grown? By how many fierce winds, how many drenching showers, has the fruit, from infancy to maturity, been assailed? And were it not for the firm and unyielding hold of the stem, how could the fruit have survived these assaults? Hence the stem regards the fruit as its own possession. And so, now that the fruit is flushed with the radiance of ripeness, the stem still desires to preserve its adhesion. It cherishes this desire from its inherent love of property, it cherishes it from the months of association and of companionship that it and the fruit have passed together.

Above all, the stem cherishes the desire that the fruit should remain with it, from a sense of parental affection. But alas! the fruit has a destiny of its own to fulfil; thus its life with the parent stem is transient, not permanent. That life has been but a preparation of the fruit for a larger service, and so, at the arriving of the time, and at the magic touch of gravitation, stem and fruit, as if with mutual grief, part to meet no

more. Such is the connection between England and her coloured subjects: it is transient, not permanent; it is guardianship, not ownership. It is that the latter may be prepared for a larger and an independent existence. To recognize the transient nature of her parental domination in the case of her coloured subjects, as she has recognized it in the case of her white colonists, may not be to England's immediate interest, as that interest is at present understood. Such a recognition by her might entail material loss (although she would be compensated by moral gain). Yet, whether she recognizes or not the transient nature of this relation, the fact remains that even as the stem must give up the fruit when the time arrives, so must England give up the coloured races.

Whether these races pass to their independent existence inside the Empire or outside the Empire shall remain entirely with England. There is no reason why they should not, indeed there could be only mutual benefit if, like the colourless colonies, they should pass to the fulfilment of their destinies as autonomous communities, within the Empire. But this could be done only if England should return to her former policy, and not if she should persevere in the present policy, for the present policy is that of explosion and not of cohesion. The policy, which may be also described as that of the conjunction of the Empire, and which has been referred to as England's original policy, is now so thoroughly in disfavour that it is contemptuously called the "Little England" policy; its adherents being labelled or libelled as "Little Englanders." And so, the converse of this original policy, namely the present policy, must be called, I suppose, the Big England policy, and its adherents, Big Englanders. Of this Big England policy, there is one very important idea that has been omitted in the preceding discussion, hence I must crave permission to allude to it here. It will be best introduced by the following quotation that occurred in a critique of an earlier work of the author.

"Most reasonable men would agree, and have agreed at any time within the last hundred years, that the British Empire is an ample domain, and that expansion, for the sake of expansion, was to be deprecated. (By a curious irony, the sentiment is found in the dispatch of Sir Stamford Raffles, one of

the greatest of the builders of the Empire.) But the difficulty soon begins when the particular and concrete case has to be considered. To nations no less than to individuals it would seem that there can be no standing still; they must be moving forward or else backward."

"To nations no less than to individuals it would seem that there can be no standing still; they must be moving forward or else backward." Territorial accretion, then, is progress, or "moving forward." Here, therefore, is the solution of the enigma of "punitive expeditions" in the British Empire. This noxious system, the scourge of Africa and of India, continues its predatory raids upon unoffending peoples in those lands, in order to demonstrate that the British Empire is "moving forward." Thus, externally, the present ideal of the British Empire is the ceaseless increase of territory, and internally, it is to maintain a wall of separation between the governed and governing sections of the Empire, to treat the governed section with habitual and gross injustice, an injustice that includes material impoverishment and defamation of character.

The combination of both ideals is completed by the continued increase of the army and navy, supplemented by an alliance, by the cultivation of international friendships, and by the friendships of the white colonists, in order to preserve the Empire from external attack, and to maintain the governed races in their position of degradation. In other words, after a householder has built himself a great establishment, and has furnished it with every requisite, including a very large staff of servants, he relies partly upon his neighbours to secure order in his household.

The analogy that is suggested by this policy of the Big Englander, i.e. the policy that regards the continuation of areal expansion as a proof that the Empire is "moving forward," is that of a man whose friends and well-wishers estimate the vigour of his health and range of his physical capacity by the amount of food that he takes. This man, these admirers argue, must not only be healthy, but very strong, for his appetite is voracious. Of course, in their estimate these judges have not suffered themselves to be influenced by questions so trivial as whether the man is properly able to digest and to assimilate his food. Like such a man with his food,

the British Empire, annexing enormous tracts of territory, is pronounced on that ground alone by the Big Englanders—who claim to be its only friends—to be very healthy and very strong, or in other words to be “moving forward.”

Thus the fallacy which, ignoring this man's digestive and assimilative powers, concludes that because he partakes of large quantities of food he is therefore healthy and strong, is identical with that which concludes that because the British Empire is constantly receiving accessions of territory, it is therefore “going forward,” or is healthy and strong. And the facts by which this latter fallacy is exposed are these, that if the Empire were healthy and strong, that is to say, if it had digested and assimilated the territories which it had been appropriating, now that the Russians are completely crippled, there would have been a considerable decrease in the military strength of India; but instead of that there is, if anything, an increase of that strength. If the British Empire were healthy and strong, the recent increase of the naval and military forces in the West Indies had been unnecessary, and the present “unrest” (June, 1906) in other parts of the Empire had not existed. Let the Big Englander, then, know that territorial increase is not by any means a proof that the Empire is “going forward,” and let him also know that it is to these instances of the increase of naval and military forces, of native “unrest,” division, discontent, suspicion, and oppression, that his Big England policy leads.



## XVII

### Imperialism and its Nestor

**B**UT in speaking of the Big England policy, or Imperialism—for this latter term is also one of the aliases of exploitation—stress must be laid upon the fact that its present brutally aggressive form—a description which the exacerbated slaughters of African and Indian natives since 1895 has sanctioned—is pre-eminently due to one statesman. That statesman is the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, M.P. I regret the illness of Mr. Chamberlain, and would rather have aimed my shafts—which, however, were prepared before his illness—at a eupeptic than at a valetudinarian. But truth is invariable. I have already referred to the British Empire as a barque. Returning to that metaphor, I observe further that the population of 398,000,000 of the British Empire may be considered as the crew of this great ship, and that the statesmen of the Empire may be regarded as its officers. Of these statesmen Mr. Chamberlain, as the one who more than any other is responsible for the extraordinary progress that the Imperial vessel has made in its present course, will be regarded as its captain. It will not be questioned, I think, that the chief consideration that will guide the conduct of a trustworthy and competent captain will be the safety of the ship, and that with regard to the safety of any ship, the primary requisite is discipline.

Thus, in all that relates to theoretical and practical seamanship, the captain may be proficient; he may also be a very humane man, very generous, very courteous, and thereby he may be very popular with his men; yet, if the use of his knowledge of navigation and the fulfilment of his official relations to his crew, in combination with discipline, be not subordinated to the safety of his ship, then in all probability, as a master-mariner he will fail to achieve distinction. Thus,

we have the safety of the vessel as the end of seamanship, and we have knowledge and discipline as the means of attaining that end. Similarly, in politics the safety of the ship of state may be said to be the end of statesmanship, and knowledge and discipline may be called the means of attaining that end.

Now, taking these two factors, namely, knowledge and discipline, and their result, namely, the safety of the ship of state, as the essentials of good statesmanship, I desire, by means of them, to make some remarks on the captaincy of Mr. Chamberlain. To that end, I begin with the statement which Dr. Blyden quotes in the *Journal of the African Society* for January, 1905, as having been made by Mr. Chamberlain concerning the British Empire, that "the gates of the temple of Janus are never closed." Relative to the terrible indictment that is made against this Christian Empire, in this statement of Mr. Chamberlain—an indictment that is the more terrible because it is literally true—I honestly believe that it may be said that the wars which have thus been waged against native tribes of Africa during Mr. Chamberlain's tenure of office as Secretary of State for the Colonies, wars which for the most part are designated as punitive expeditions, and wars of which some (not all be it noticed) form the sombre catalogue that is tabulated on page 32, exceed in proportion those of any other Colonial Secretary. Nor would this be surprising if the following statement that was made by Mr. Chamberlain in the course of a speech on the 11th of May, 1905, be taken into account:—

"We approached a new country. We established a new protectorate, or a sphere of influence. . . . We thought they could stop, but in practice we found it was not possible. Where the British flag was, there must be British peace. We were unable therefore to stay where we began. We must go on till something like rough justice and order had been introduced into territories for which we were responsible. Hence many little wars, much to be regretted, but withal not to be taken into account with their results. No doubt sometimes we had been guilty of crime. But when we looked at the whole history of this wonderful movement it was obvious that, whether wrong might have been done, enormous benefit has been conferred upon the peoples concerned."

The doctrine which this extract inculcates is that the end

justifies the means ; or it enjoins the doing of evil in order that good may come. It is thus that Mr. Chamberlain says : " No doubt sometimes we had been guilty of crime. But when we looked at the wonderful movement it was obvious that whether wrong might have been done, enormous benefit has been conferred upon the peoples concerned." The argument that supports the doctrine that is thus enunciated by Mr. Chamberlain is roughly this : that uncivilized native communities are frequently in conflict with one another, therefore the British Government, as representing a civilized state, is justified in entering such communities by force, is justified in slaughtering those of their members who resist its entrance, is justified in annexing their territories, in order to establish among them peaceful government. An extension of the same argument would be certainly this, that, in the interest of peace, the British Government would be justified in seizing and administering the estates of private individuals, subjects of the Empire, who are in frequent disputation about their properties. But in the logical extension of Mr. Chamberlain's argument, if the British Government would be exceeding its legitimate bounds by seizing and administering the estates of British subjects on the plea of peace, because the heirs were constantly at feuds with one another, then can the British Government, on the ground of peace, because the people are constantly at feuds with one another, be within its legitimate bounds in seizing and administering the countries of these peoples, who, though they be called savages, are not British subjects ?

If, then, Mr. Chamberlain's argument be fallacious in the first instance, it must be likewise fallacious in the second ; and hence his doctrine of doing evil that good may come, which is the application of his argument, must in like manner be fallacious. But I can conceive a condition in which the British Government might justifiably force its rule upon native communities that are outside the bounds of its jurisdiction. And that condition may be illustrated by one whom we will suppose to be suffering from a gangrenous limb, but who, notwithstanding the consequent peril to his life, refuses to have the diseased limb removed. Knowing that if forcible interference were not resorted to death would be the man's only alternative, his friends and the surgeon who

may have been consulted about the case would be justified in accepting the responsibility—which the ignoring of the patient's objection would incur—the former by consenting to the operation, the latter by operating.

Similarly, I can conceive that the social and moral conditions of savage communities, in respect both to the deadly effects of some of the conditions upon such communities, and in respect to the unwillingness of the communities to adopt remedial measures in regard to the conditions, might be such as to justify the entrance of a civilized state into those communities, and to justify its forcible removal of their social and moral members, gangrened. But such an interference, it will be perceived, is undertaken, not under ordinary circumstances, but under extraordinary circumstances; and furthermore, it is undertaken mainly for the well-being of the savage communities themselves. Of course Mr. Chamberlain's claim, according to the extract, is that British annexations of uncivilized states is done mainly for the well-being of their inhabitants. Therefore there are these three questions. First, have the extraordinary circumstances that I have just alluded to as those which might justify the forcible annexations of uncivilized states by civilized states arisen in the cases of British annexations of savage native states? Second, are there no other means for the cure of social and moral disorders of savage communities, which are equally effective as forcible annexation, but which are unattended by the violence that attends forcible annexations? And third, has British annexation of uncivilized states been done mainly for the welfare of their inhabitants?

Concerning the first of these three questions, I observe that if it be true that the inhabitants of the native states that have been annexed to the British Empire during what might be called the earlier period of Imperial expansion were socially and morally gangrenous, this constituted the extraordinary circumstances that are mentioned before, and forcible annexations in order to amputate the social and moral gangrenous members possibly became a necessity. But if all this be true concerning the earlier period of Imperial expansion it is certainly not true concerning what might be called the later period of Imperial expansion, from 1895 to the present time, 1906. For respecting the region of Northern Nigeria, for example, which has been annexed during the latter

of these two periods, we have seen, vol. i., p. 248, that the states within that region had attained to a high degree of civilization under their native governments, yet that they have been annexed.

Therefore, gross and bestial savagery, as constituting the extraordinary circumstances that have been alluded to cannot at least have been the cause, as Mr. Chamberlain's remarks imply, of the later annexations to the British Empire. In answer to the next question, whether there be not a remedy for the social and moral misgovernment of savage communities, which is as efficacious as that of forcible annexation, but which is free from the horrors that attend the remedy of forcible annexation—such horrors as the burning of crops, the laying waste of villages and towns, and the killing of natives—horrors that result in indescribable misery, not only to the able-bodied, but also to women and children, and to the infirm? I reply that there is such a remedy. In the first volume of this work (p. 189) I have shown that the barbarism of heathen Europe was more intense than the barbarism that prevails at present among the lowest of African tribes. And it was this remedy, to which I now allude, which released heathen Europe from her barbaric spell. The remedy is the Christian faith. With regard to this Christian faith two facts might be observed. One is that among all the great Christian states of the world Britain is the chief propagator of this faith. The other fact is that forcible annexation, with its attendant horrors, as a remedy for the social and moral disorders of uncivilized communities is entirely forbidden by the Christian faith.

This brings us to our third question, viz. whether British annexations are mainly undertaken, as Mr. Chamberlain avers, for the benefit of the native inhabitants of the annexed territories? If these annexations are for the benefit of the natives, then the lot of the natives will be ameliorated, and, as a result of their ameliorated lot, they will be contented. But we have seen that the lot of the native, as is evident from the examples of India, Nigeria, the Sierra Leone Protectorate, and Natal, is actually harder under British rule than it was under native rule, that in consequence the native is discontented, a discontent which in the case of India has resulted in increased expenditure on the military and police forces, and in Nigeria and Natal, in native risings and punitive expeditions.

So, then, Mr. Chamberlain having stated that " We approached a new country. We established a new protectorate or sphere of influence . . . that the limitation of this procedure has been found impossible, because where the British flag was there must be British peace," or, in other words, that British annexation of native states is mainly for the purpose of securing peace to those states. We inquired in the first place whether it be true that anarchy prevailed in all the native states that have been annexed to the British Empire; and we found that however the question might be answered regarding earlier annexations, it cannot be answered affirmatively regarding later annexations. That under their native rulers the greater number, if not the whole of these native states, as, for example, those that are within the protectorate of Northern Nigeria, had been comparatively peaceful. That in very few of them, if in any, had there existed practices which were gross and revolting. So that as far as these later annexations are concerned, the motive that has been assigned by Mr. Chamberlain as being their cause is devoid of facts. In the second place we have observed that if even the state of mis-rule which is alleged to have existed in these native states, and which is also alleged to have been the primary cause of their annexations, had really existed, the rough and septic instrument of forcible annexation, with misery as its concomitant, is not the best means for securing peace. That England herself, as the leading missionary nation, is the chief agent of the most effective instrument for securing peace; and that besides this, the law that guides this great instrument of peace, of which England is the chief agent, peremptorily forbids the use of forcible annexation. That therefore, if the real motive of England's forcible intrusion into the affairs of these native states was that she might establish peace among them, she would have chosen the smooth and efficacious means, rather than the harsh and less efficacious means.

Thirdly, we have observed that among the natives under British rule there exists at least as great discontent as there had existed among them under their native rulers. These three facts, therefore—the fact that in the later annexed states peace had already existed, that the instrument which England has employed for establishing peace in these native states, viz.

the instrument of force, is calculated to produce, and has produced misery instead of peace, and that discontent rather than peace has been produced among the natives of her annexed territories—completely disprove Mr. Chamberlain's assertion that the chief reason of Britain's annexation of native states is to secure peace to those states.

But has it not been shown beyond reasonable doubt in an earlier chapter (p. 84) that the primary cause of Britain's annexation of native states is that she may gain increased facilities for her trade? And is it to be thought that in his sweet and childlike innocence Mr. Chamberlain is ignorant of this fact? Here again, then, we encounter another manifestation of that disease whereof I have had occasion to speak several times before, namely, the disease of misrepresentation, disingenuousness, or saying one thing when just the opposite is known to be the fact. Of all the evils that may afflict a State, few, it seems to me, can be as serious, and certainly none can be more ruinous than this evil, when it affects the chief exponents of the various institutions of that State. For it affords shelter and security to abuses that will sooner or later loosen the very foundations of such a State. But strong as is his moral support—for in these "many little wars," or crimes that have stained the national conscience, and that he sanctioned as chief of the Colonial Office, he has had the moral support of Christendom—Mr. Chamberlain has not been content to rest his acts upon this support alone, but has boldly announced that the mandate for these pillaging excursions had been given him by the Almighty. It was thus that as late as the 9th of May, 1906, the occasion being a social function in London, he said, when speaking of the greatness of the Empire:—

"You should remember, too, that it" (the Empire) "brings responsibilities—that it is a trust which is confided to you. I humbly believe we were destined by Providence to be a great governing race."

Still, as will be seen by the subjoined extract, the tone of self-satisfaction and of self-adulation with which the first of these two extracts rings, in its reference to the fact that it is by deeds of violence, bloodshed, and rapine that the Empire is enlarged, and the certitude by which the second extract is poised, the certitude that these sanguinary abominations are Divine

decrees, have not always been the sentiments and expression of the right hon. gentleman.

For upon the subject of the recent wars of Afghanistan and of Zululand in 1880, Mr. Chamberlain, speaking at Birmingham, at the annual meeting of the Liberal Association in that same year, said :—

“ Let them consider the effect of the Government policy in our recent wars in Africa and Asia. He coupled the two together because they would find the same principle had actuated both. The Government had tried to shield themselves for the South African disaster behind Sir B. Frere, but every one knew he developed his policy in full time for the Government to recall him, if they so minded. As they did not do so, he assumed they were quite ready to take credit for his success if he was successful, and to throw the blame upon him if he failed. Be that as it might, we had entered upon these wars on false pretexts, which were only to conceal our real project of aggression. We had made false professions of our desire to secure the friendship and independence of the states we had invaded, and in both cases we had destroyed all that existed of system and order in the politics of these tribes, and had left behind us anarchy and confusion, the seeds of fresh trouble. We, a Christian people, had been the cause of the death of thousands and tens of thousands of brave men defending their homes and liberties. We had wrought havoc and desolation over unnumbered miles of territory, and we had done it because fancied British interest required a scientific frontier in Asia, which we had contrived to do without for many long years before, and because Sir B. Frere, after thirty years of peace and friendship, thought British interests would be endangered unless we brought the King of Zululand under submission to British authority. One of the consequences of this policy had been a distinct degradation of the characteristics of the nation and a distinct lowering of the tone of public morality.”

Whereas, then, in the nineteenth century we have the higher Mr. Chamberlain or Dr. Jekyll saying :—

“ We had entered upon these wars on false pretexts, which were only to conceal our real project of aggression. We had made false professions of our desire to secure the friendship and independence of the states we had invaded, and in both cases we had destroyed all that existed of system and order in



the politics of these tribes, and had left behind anarchy and confusion, the seeds of fresh trouble. We, a Christian people, had been the cause of the death of thousands and tens of thousands of brave men defending their homes and liberties. We had wrought havoc and desolation over unnumbered miles of territory," etc.

"One of the consequences of this policy had been a distinct degradation of the characteristics of the nation and a distinct lowering of the tone of public morality,"

in the twentieth century we have the lower Mr. Chamberlain or Mr. Hyde saying, with regard to similar "projects of aggression that had been concealed," saying with regard to "wars that had been similarly entered upon, on false pretexts," saying with regard to similar "false professions of our desire to secure the friendship and independence of the states we had invaded," saying with regard to the "system and order that our invasion of these states had destroyed," and with regard to the "anarchy and confusion" that it had left behind, saying with regard to "the death of the thousands and tens of thousands of brave men who had been defending their homes and liberties," saying with regard to the "havoc and desolation we had wrought over unnumbered miles of territory," and saying with regard to the distinct "degradation of the national characteristics, and of the lowering of the tone of public morality," of which these acts have been the cause:—

"We approached a new country. We established a new protectorate or sphere of influence. . . . We thought they could stop, but in practice we found it was not possible. Where the British flag was there must be British peace. We were unable, therefore, to stay where we began. We must go on till something like rough justice or order had been introduced into territories for which we were responsible. Hence many little wars, much to be regretted, but withal not to be taken into account with their results. No doubt sometimes we had been guilty of crime. But when we looked at the whole history of this wonderful movement, it was obvious that whether wrong had been done, enormous benefits had been conferred upon the peoples concerned."

"How are the mighty fallen, and the weapons of war perished" !

The distance from the defence of evils which were once

denounced, to the condemnation of those by whom the evils are now denounced, is not great. Therefore, that Mr. Chamberlain should have covered that distance—as is shown by the two following accounts, of which one is the copy of a letter which was written by Mr. J. Keir Hardie, M.P., to a native of Zululand, who was said to be a student at Edinburgh, and the other an attack upon Mr. Keir Hardie for his letter to the Zulu by Mr. Chamberlain, in a speech that he made at Birmingham in July, 1906—I say that Mr. Chamberlain should have covered this short distance between the defence of evils which he once denounced and the condemnation of one by whom the evils are now denounced, is not surprising. This is a copy of Mr. Keir Hardie's letter :—

“ HOUSE OF COMMONS,

“ 4 July, 1906.

“ MY DEAR SIR,—I regret to say that I cannot offer you an appointment, as I will not be in Scotland again until the middle of August. I am obliged by your approval of anything I have been able to do to assist your race, and regret that I cannot do more. The terrible event which happened in the Soudan the other day, with the attendant brutalities, reduces the administration of that country under British rule to the level of that of the Congo Free State ; whilst the wholesale massacre of natives which is going on in South Africa, under the pretext of suppressing rebellion which does not exist, fills one with shame and horror ; I hope the day will come speedily when your race will be able to defend itself against the barbarities being perpetrated against it by hypocritical whites, who regard the black man as having been created in order that they might exploit him for their own advantage. The press and the politician for the most part keep the country in ignorance of the real treatment meted out to natives, and not until they (the natives) are in a position to hold their own can they expect to be treated as human beings.

“ Yours truly,

“ (Signed) J. KEIR HARDIE.”

And referring to the execution of the twelve natives by the Natal Government, Mr. Chamberlain, reproving the British Government, in the speech which he delivered at Birmingham in July, 1906, for “ occupying themselves with the details of a trial of which they have not read the evidence, for occupying themselves, without any knowledge of the circum-

stances, with criticizing the kindness and general feeling of justice which animate those people as much as they do ourselves," proceeds thus to attack Mr. Keir Hardie for his letter to the Zulu student :—

"One of them, as a climax to the meanness of the whole thing, actually writes a letter to a chief in this country and wishes him success—in what? Success in a contest between his people and our children (shame). I will dwell no longer on incidents which fill me with disgust and indignation (cheers). The effect is deplorable. How can you expect the people outside the country, who do not understand that these men are seeking petty notoriety—(hear, hear)—to understand that a member of the British Parliament can speak language of that kind without supreme cause, which allows him to take the part of every country but his own? (hear, hear). One thing I will say, and I say it in your name. These men at any rate do not represent the working classes of England (loud cheers). Never yet in our history, or in the history of the British race, has a great democracy been unpatriotic (hear, hear). Ladies and gentlemen, the unity of the Empire must be proceeded with and accomplished."

Is there not a likeness between Mr. Chamberlain's opinions of 1880, which are contained in the quotation upon page 456, and Mr. Hardie's opinions of 1906, which are contained in his letter to the South African student at Edinburgh? Referring to the wars in Asia and Africa, Mr. Chamberlain said in 1880 :—

"... we had entered upon these wars on false pretexts, which were only to conceal our real project of aggression. We had made false professions of our desires to secure the friendships and independence of the states we had invaded, and in both cases we had destroyed all that existed of system and order in the politics of these tribes, and had left behind us anarchy and confusion. . . . We, a Christian people, had been the cause of the death of thousands and tens of thousands of brave men defending their homes and liberties. We had wrought havoc and desolation over unnumbered miles of territories, and we had done it because fancied British interests required a scientific frontier in Asia, which we had contrived to do without for many long years before, and because Sir Bartle Frere, after thirty years of peace and friendship, thought British interests would be endangered unless we brought the King of Zululand under submission to British authority. One

of the consequences of this policy had been a distinct degeneration of the characteristics of the nation, and a distinct lowering of the tone of public morality."

Now, in these statements Mr. Chamberlain made at least three charges against the British people. He charges them of being guilty of aggression, in that he says, "we entered upon these wars on false pretexts which were only to conceal our real project of aggression." Further, he charges the English people with deception, in that he says, "we had made false profession of our desire to secure the friendship and independence of the states we had invaded." Thirdly, the British people are charged by Mr. Chamberlain with having caused desolation in these states against which they waged wars, for he says, "in both cases we had destroyed all that existed of system and order in the politics of these tribes, and had left behind us anarchy and confusion. . . . We, a Christian people, had been the cause of the death of thousands and tens of thousands of brave men . . ." Then, in regard to the reason that was assigned for these crimes, Mr. Chamberlain tells us that its only basis was a misconception. For he says, "we had done it because fancied British interests required a scientific frontier in Asia, which we had contrived to do without for many long years before, and because Sir Bartle Frere, after thirty years of peace and friendship, thought British interests would be endangered unless we brought the King of Zululand under submission to British authority." Finally, upon the national character, the reflex action of these crimes of aggression, deception, and desolation, according to Mr. Chamberlain, has been moral degeneration, for he says, "One of the consequences of this policy has been a distinct degeneration of the characteristics of the nation and a distinct lowering of the tone of public morality." Now these three charges of aggression, deception, and desolation which Mr. Chamberlain in 1880 made against the British people are also found in Mr. Keir Hardie's letter of 1906.

Thus with respect to the charge of aggression he says :—

"I hope the day will come speedily when your race will be able to defend itself against the barbarities being perpetrated against it by hypocritical whites, who regard the black man as having been created in order that they might *exploit them* for their own advantage."

With regard to deception he says :—

“The terrible events which happened in the Soudan . . . with the attendant brutalities, reduces the administration of the country under British rule to the level of that of the Congo Free State ; while the wholesale massacre of natives . . . in South Africa under the *pretext* of suppressing rebellion, fills one with shame and horror ; I hope the day will come . . . when your race will be able to defend itself against *hypocritical* whites. . . . The press and the politician, for the most part, *keep the country in ignorance* of the real treatment meted out to the natives.”

And with regard to the crime of desolation, Mr. Hardie's charge is thus expressed :—

“The terrible events which happened in the Soudan the other day, with the attendant barbarities, reduce the administration of the country under British rule to the level of that of the Congo Free State, whilst the massacre of natives which is going on in South Africa . . . fills one with shame and horror.”

Since Mr. Chamberlain's opinions, then, as expressed by him in 1880 upon this phase of the theme of the coloured races, and Mr. Hardie's opinions, as expressed by him in 1906, upon the same phase of the same theme, are identical, it is obvious that what Mr. Hardie wrote in 1906 to the Zulu student was what Mr. Chamberlain spoke in 1880 to the world. So that for the same views which Mr. Chamberlain denounced Mr. Hardie in 1906, he would have applauded him in 1880. Providing, of course, that it is just, and that it is conscientious, there is nothing wrong or even unseemly in a leader changing his opinions ; indeed, to minds that are vigorous, well-balanced, and conscientious, such changes are as inevitable as are those between adolescence and middle life. Therefore, in Mr. Chamberlain's case, the question is not that he has changed the opinions which he formerly held concerning a very important Imperial question, but it is whether that change be wise and just, and, therefore, whether it be advantageous to the Empire. In 1880 two wars which the British people waged against two coloured states were denounced by Mr. Chamberlain ; they were denounced upon the ground that they were wars of aggression, that they involved the practice of deception, that they involved desolation, or the slaughter of “ thousands and

tens of thousands of brave men defending their homes and liberties," and that they involved the moral degradation of the nation. But in 1906 Mr. J. Keir Hardie was attacked by Mr. Chamberlain for having denounced these very same crimes. And in place of Mr. Hardie's denunciation, what does Mr. Chamberlain advocate? He advocates the infallibility of the white section of the Empire, and antagonism between the two sections. Thus, in the first of these two cases he upbraids the Government for "occupying themselves . . . with criticizing the kindness and general feeling of justice which animated those people," i.e. the white people of Natal. And in the second case he denounces Mr. Hardie for writing a letter "to a chief in this country, and wishes him success—in what? Success in a contest between his people and our children." So, according to this second case, questions which, for example, are in dispute between coloured and colourless members of the Empire are to be adjudged, not by their merits, but by the racial affinity of the disputants. In all such cases the colourless section are invariably to decide in favour of the colourless disputant, and the coloured section in favour of the coloured contestant. I am bound to recognize the fact that with the whites this mode of procedure already obtains. Yet will any sane man aver that it conduces to the welfare of the Empire? And what shall be said when such a procedure receives not merely the patronage, but the open advocacy of a leading statesman? To make the whites believe that, however they act towards the non-whites, they can never be wrong, that these acts will always be sustained by the rest of their section, with the view of supporting the common prestige, is such a course wise with respect to the welfare of the Empire? And is such a course just with respect to the mutual obligations of the two sections of the Empire?

But this endeavour of Mr. Chamberlain to encourage in the whites the belief that they are infallible, and to foster in them the feeling of opposition to the non-whites, will be seen to be the very reverse of what was Mr. Chamberlain's endeavour in 1880. For then believing that the whites were fallible, and that their fallibility had led them to wage an unrighteous war, he blamed them and defended the victims of their aggression, of their deception, and of their desolation. And are these not the means by which concord within as well as without the Empire

may be achieved? Therefore, can Mr. Chamberlain's attitude of 1906 be said to reveal a higher or as high a mark of statesmanship than, or as, his attitude of 1880 revealed? And this is the statesman to whose yoke all the white peoples of the Empire in regard to their relations with the coloured peoples of the Empire have bent the neck. Therefore, whatever the Mohammed of British politics preaches concerning these coloured peoples, the white peoples yield an unquestioning obedience. And this is done although Englishmen sing, "Britons never! never! never! shall be slaves!" The slaves of an insensate and invertebrate conventionalism.

But is it not sad? Yea! is it not a national misfortune, that concerning the most vital and the most pressing imperial question of the day there is not a statesman of the first rank in England—with perhaps the single exception of Sir Charles Dilke, whose steadfast adherence to the fundamental principles of liberalism, amid the prevailing political degeneracy, deserves the gratitude of the colourless no less than of the coloured section of the Empire—who is bold enough, who is courageous enough, and who is independent enough to raise his voice on behalf of justice and truth? Thus, it has come to pass that of all things, at the present time, truth is the most unpopular. All honour, then, to Mr. J. Keir Hardie and the other stalwarts of his kind, who, believing that a State which is directed on lines other than those of justice and truth is doomed to disaster, have dared, amid the howl of the mob and the frown of the polite, to defend the right.

Well, as the most formidable of the formidable band of Imperialists, indeed "Empire-builders," Mr. Chamberlain must be given credit for the belief that territorial expansion is the "going forward," or that it is the real progress of the Empire. But after these territorial and ethnic accessions are made, how does Mr. Chamberlain proceed to deal with the situation that their presence creates? The two excerpts which are here subjoined, and which are taken from a speech that was made by Mr. Chamberlain in the House of Commons, on the 21st of July, 1904, furnish the answer to this question. The first excerpt says:—

"We are dealing with undoubtedly the domestic policy of great and powerful colonies—of the whole of South Africa, in fact—and although we have technically a control over their

legislation, I do not believe there is anybody in this House who would contend that we should be wise to exercise that control in its fullest sense, or to interfere in any decision the colonies arrive at unless we could show that some Imperial interest was concerned. In the debate now going to take place I plead, in the first instance, for moderation on both sides, and I beg the House to remember that every word said here is likely to be reported, and perhaps imperfectly reported there, and may do harm which the speakers will be the first to regret. Let us, then, avoid saying anything which can hurt that independent feeling which makes its appearance from the very first beginning of a British colony. Do not let us pretend to superior virtues, to superior knowledge which we cannot possess, but do let us give every kind of generous, reasonable consideration to what we may find to be the views of our kinsfolk and our fellow-subjects abroad."

In the second excerpt we read :—

"White labour in South Africa will not work side by side on equal terms with black or yellow labour, and I think white labour is right. After all, we hold our position of being a dominant race. If we admit equality with these inferior races, we shall lose the power which gives us strength."

Upon the authority, then, of these two extracts, I am able to answer the question as to the manner in which Mr. Chamberlain proceeds to deal with the situation that is created in the Empire by its accessions of coloured peoples, peoples who of late, mainly through his baneful exertions, have been much increased.

The answer is that by inflaming the vanity, and stirring up the prejudices of the colourless section of the Empire against the coloured section, Mr. Chamberlain has striven to keep the two elements in permanent antagonism. Thus, whereas, on the one hand, we have this gentleman's lachrymose and obsequious adjurations that no member of the House of Commons should seem to wish to interfere with the domestic policy "of great and powerful colonies of the whole South Africa," that they should "avoid saying anything which can hurt the independent feeling which makes its appearance from the very first beginning of a British Colony," and "not to pretend to superior knowledge which we cannot possess, but do let us give every kind of generous, reasonable consideration



to what we may find to be the views of our own kinsfolk and our fellow-subjects abroad," on the other hand we find him saying :—

"White labour in South Africa will not work side by side on equal terms with black labour or yellow labour, and I think white labour is right. After all, we hold our position of being a dominant race. If we admit equality with these inferior races, we shall lose the power which gives us strength."

If the colourless man—be he Anglo-Saxon, Teuton, Slav, Celt, or any other—were really superior to the coloured man, he would be less noisy about it. The man who is learned, or physically strong, or virtuous, does not need to go about the streets with a trumpet in his hand in order to inform his fellows of the fact. It is the pretender and trickster who has recourse to such an artifice, for superiority or greatness vaunts not itself, is not puffed up, does not behave itself unseemly.

Speaking in the House of Commons two years earlier than the time when he delivered the speech from which our two last extracts have been taken (July, 1902), Mr. Chamberlain, who was then Secretary of State for the Colonies, made a similar statement about the prejudice which white labour has against working with coloured labour, but then, he was careful to conceal his own opinion on the subject. Now, however, that the official mask has been removed, the right hon. gentleman has felt no further compunction in appearing in his true colours. The coloured races of the Empire, Mr. Chamberlain assures us, are inferior to the colourless race. When savants who are acquainted with history and science, have been so far seduced by the vulgar appeals of politics as to forswear their high calling and to subscribe to this cult of Caucasian superiority, it is not remarkable that Mr. Chamberlain should be found among its votaries. For whereas the knowledge is absent which might have restrained him from its delusion, the temperament is present which would constrain him thereto. Still, even by such historical facts which Mr. Chamberlain, as an intelligent man, must possess, he should have known that no permanent domination of any one of the three great races has ever existed, but that peoples which in accordance with the revolution of time

have been at the bottom, have risen to the top, whilst those that have been at the top have fallen to the bottom; that tribes of the lowest savagery have made this ascent, and that peoples of the highest culture have experienced the descent; that, therefore, it is entirely absurd to describe any tribe, any people, or any one of the races as being permanently superior, or as being permanently inferior. This, then, is Mr. Chamberlain's attitude concerning the two great divisions of the Empire: an attitude which in the one case is that of sycophancy, and in the other case that of arrogance; it is an attitude, moreover, that tends still further to widen the breach of racial animosity that had already existed between the two sections.

Now, I wish to ask two questions. First, What constitutes a successful State? And to this question I reply that, in my judgment, unity, and prosperity constitute a successful State. The second question I ask is, What means are the best for securing to a State unity and prosperity? My reply to this question is that, in my opinion, the best means for securing to a State unity and prosperity are those that grant to all its inhabitants equality of opportunity. Now, if these two answers be correct, then, notwithstanding all that are written to the contrary, the British Empire cannot be pronounced a success. For a permanent cleavage divides its 398,000,000 of peoples into two antagonistic camps, and this is contrary to unity. Three hundred and forty-four millions of its three hundred and ninety-eight millions of inhabitants, or seven-eighths of the whole, is deliberately impeded, in the course of progress, and this is contrary to the equality of opportunity. Lastly, in consequence of the obstruction of its progress, this seven-eighths of the population of the British Empire is in a state of chronic poverty, and this is opposed to prosperity. But we have already observed that according to the most positive forecast which present events have induced, England, sooner or later, will have to defend her supremacy as mistress of the seas and of the world of commerce. Now, it is evident that if the issue of such an adventure is to be favourable to England, there must be the two conditions of a united and a prosperous Empire. There must be a united Empire; otherwise, the need would arise that a large part of the Imperial forces should be quartered among the coloured peoples of

the Empire in order to maintain their present subjection, diminishing the numerical strength of the forces that should be available for encountering the foe. And the continuance of the social degradation, of the political disabilities, and of the economic oppression to which the coloured peoples of the Empire are subjected is practicable only by the unremitting use of force.

Hence on account of the present disunion of the two Imperial sections, the disunion of which the degradation, disabilities, and oppression of the coloured section are the result, only a portion of the Imperial forces could be available to meet the foe; whereas, by a united Empire practically the whole of these forces would be available. Further, if the great bulk of the forces should be available for a critical national emergency; if the resources, the material resources, undisturbed by the strain of the conflict, should flow onward to sustain the fighting lines; then, in the sense that its inhabitants are contented, in the sense that their contentment is the effect of their equality of opportunity, the Empire must be prosperous. Of course, these arguments have reference only to sound policy, not to sound morality, for the politics of to-day, notwithstanding its loud and gusty profession, seldom in acts reaches the moral plane. Therefore, from this standpoint of sound policy, in regard to the Empire, its unity and its prosperity are the two greatest considerations; and in their importance these considerations take precedence even to imperial defence, and its cognate themes. Thus, the universal unity of the Empire, and the universal prosperity of the Empire, are among those fundamental considerations of which I said, that they are ignored in the discussions of Imperial affairs for subjects that are of far less significance.

But in regard to these pre-eminently important considerations of imperial unity and imperial prosperity, what is the attitude of him, whose prominence in the political arena has led to his designation as the captain of the Imperial barque? We have only just recently been observing what Mr. Chamberlain's relations are to these absolutely fundamental questions of the unity and the prosperity of the Empire. With regard to the former of these two questions, I have had occasion to notice earlier that having altogether ignored the presence of 344,000,000 coloured subjects of the Empire, or the presence

of seven-eighths of the population of the Empire, Mr. Chamberlain has spoken of that population as consisting of 54,000,000 whites, or only one-eighth of the population. And I have only recently referred to Mr. Chamberlain's speech, in which, after expressing his approval of the discrimination that white labour makes against coloured labour, he proceeds to allude to the latter as "inferiors." Besides, it was during Mr. Chamberlain's reign at the Colonial Office—a reign which, as far as the coloured subjects of the Empire are concerned, was one of terror—that such reactionary and exasperating measures as the suppression of the Maltese and the Jamaica constitutions were adopted.

Therefore, as no harmony that exists between the parts of either section of the Empire, while discord exists between the two main sections themselves, is worthy of the name, and as Mr. Chamberlain's colonial policy has been notorious in its promotion of this discord between the two main sections, he must be called, as regards the unity of the whole Empire—not as regards the unity of the parts of a section of the Empire—an anti-unionist, or disruptionist. And with regard to the prosperity of the Empire, it might be recalled that it was Mr. Chamberlain, who as Secretary of State for the Colonies advised Parliament against carrying out the unanimous and urgent recommendation of the Royal Sugar Commission (p. 133), which was to the effect that the only means of restoring prosperity to the British West Indies was the settlement of the peasantry upon the land. Further, that it was Mr. Chamberlain who sanctioned the closing of the schools to one half of the children of the Jamaica tax-paying peasantry, on the pretext of an *empty treasury*, whilst at the same time granting from the same *empty treasury* £20,000 to the non-tax-paying sugar planter. It was Mr. Chamberlain, too, that sanctioned the ordinance of the Sierra Leone Protectorate (p. 54), the ordinance which drove the people of the Protectorate into rebellion, and of which the Royal Commissioner who was sent out by the Government to inquire into the cause of the "rising" characterized the provisions as "aggression pure and simple."

It was Mr. Chamberlain who sanctioned and defended the exorbitant and oppressive poll-tax of the Transvaal, who also sanctioned the hut-tax of the Sierra Leone Protectorate ;

the hut-tax which the Royal Commissioner described as unjust and unsuitable to the people, the hut-tax which was levied, and which is still levied from the people of a country that Mr. Chamberlain himself has described as "wild, bare, and almost untrodden." Lastly, it is Mr. Chamberlain who has excluded qualified native practitioners from West African Medical Service.

And so as an Empire cannot be called prosperous in which seven-eighths of the population are drained by excessive taxation, and in which the progress of this seven-eighths of the population is deliberately retarded by the denial to it of equal opportunity, in order that the remaining one-eighth of the population may be enriched, and as Mr. Chamberlain, more than any other statesman, is responsible for the fruition of the policy, I am compelled to say, in regard to the prosperity of the Empire, that his attitude towards it is that of hostility. The exploitation, instead of the amelioration, of the coloured section of the Empire being the present Imperial policy, we have seen that contravening the fundamental law of the progress of states—viz. the law of the equality of opportunity—it has resulted, as regards the resources of the Empire, in stagnation; in regard to the governed section of the Empire, in devitalization; and in regard to the governing section of the Empire, in demoralization. Within the Empire the combined tendency of these three effects is towards the rebellion of the governed section against the governing section. Whereas, from circumstances which are foreign to these internal conditions, the Empire itself is tending externally towards the encounter of a hostile attack. And as far as the internal conditions are concerned, no statesman of modern times has contributed so much to their success as the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain. Now, these fourfold internal conditions—actual and prospective—are they the best preparation for the external condition of a prospective hostile encounter? In other words, do they contribute to the safety of the Empire? They do not contribute to the safety of the Empire. Do they contribute to the good discipline of the Empire? They do not contribute to the good discipline of the Empire. But Mr. Chamberlain, who has wrought so mightily for their development, must have believed that these conditions are both favourable to the safety and to the good

discipline of the Empire. And such beliefs betray a lack of knowledge. Hence, as involving lack of knowledge, and as being inimical to the safety of the Empire, the principles of Mr. Chamberlain's captaincy are radically unsound.

As a ship that is lost, the following allegory represents the British Empire in relation to Mr. Chamberlain's policy. Hailing from Port Albion, the ship, which is called the "British Empire," is on a long voyage through perilous seas, her destination being Port Success. The captain who takes her out dies during the voyage, and is succeeded by the chief mate. The circumstances that led to the loss of the ship are recorded by an apprentice, a consumptive youth, who dies previous to the time that the ship is lost. The record is picked up by a vessel that passes that way some time after the foundering of the "British Empire." And the discussion that now occurs concerning the loss of the ship, and that occurs several years after the event, is due to the opposition of a section of the people of Port Albion to the proposal that a monument should be erected to the memory of the captain who perished with the "British Empire." At a public meeting the leader of those that are opposed to the proposal, supports their views by the following remarks: "As most of us know, the 'British Empire' was the prettiest, the costliest, and the fastest ship of our renowned merchant fleet of this Port of Albion, as well as of the surrounding states. Thus, it is that not only have our most enterprising leaders of commerce been ruined by her loss, but also our fame as belonging to the most important maritime port, of this and of other states, has since been eclipsed. In view, then, of the present movement to erect a monument to the memory of Captain Chamberlain, owing to whose astounding dereliction of duty, in my opinion, the 'British Empire' was lost, I desire to recall to our citizens the following circumstances. These are some of the facts relating to the last voyage of that incomparable barque. The narrative of these facts has been taken from a statement which was drawn up by an apprentice who accompanied the vessel on her ill-fated voyage. The author of the statement, it is supposed, had himself died of consumption ere the vessel reached its tragic end. The 'British Empire' was on a very long voyage to the northern seas. The first part of the voyage was tempestuous, the second part extremely auspicious, whilst the seas

through which the third part lay were strewed with icebergs, frequently swept by storms, spiked with hidden rocks, and obstructed by waterspouts. For this her tremendous voyage, the 'British Empire' was supplied with a full complement of hands. These, apparently, were divided into three watches, which, according to their importance in the working of the vessel, were, first, the Imperial Watch; second, the Black or Coloured Watch; and third, the Colonial Watch. The Imperial Watch and the Colonial Watch were of one race, but the men of the Black Watch were of other races.

"During the first and second stages of the voyage the relations between the Imperial Watch and the Black Watch were cordial, whereas the relations between the Black Watch and the Colonial Watch were fairly correct. However, towards the commencement of the third part of the voyage intercourse between the Black Watch and the Colonial Watch became more and more restricted; in fact, their relations were quite strained. The cause was that the Colonial Watch had been expecting that, in addition to doing its own work, the Black Watch would also perform some of the work of the Colonial Watch. And although its own pay and rations, like the pay and rations of the Imperial Watch, were more than those of the Black Watch, the Colonial Watch was also demanding that a further reduction in the rations of the Black Watch in favour of its own rations should be made. At this juncture the captain, J. R. Prudence-Insight, who had conducted the 'British Empire' so far on her course, died of apoplexy. He had been very apprehensive with regard to the dispute that had arisen between the men of the Black Watch and of the Colonial Watch; and this was the chief reason of his apprehension, that such a dispute would be fatal to discipline, and that the loss of discipline would endanger the safety of the ship, particularly as they were now entering upon the most perilous part of the voyage. Indeed, concerning successful seamanship, Captain Prudence-Insight's philosophy was summed up in the single phrase, 'the unity of the crew.' And he had always contended that unity among the crew could best be secured by fair and impartial dealing towards all. Thereby he was strongly averse to giving the men of the Imperial and of the Colonial Watches higher wages and more rations than the men of the Black Watch, merely on the ground of race. He would have

given them all the same amount of rations, and would have regulated the pay of each man according to his knowledge of his work.

“But in this he was overruled by the most influential shareholders of the vessel, who contended that such matters should be determined strictly on the lines of race. Well, from all this it will be readily understood that Captain Prudence-Insight would be strongly opposed to the absurd wish of the Colonial Watch, for as seamen they were not by any means more competent than the Black Watch, besides, their actual work in the ship was even less than that of the Black Watch, while the only basis for their preposterous desires was that they and the shareholders and the captain were of the same race. But Captain Prudence-Insight being now dead, he was succeeded by the chief mate. And as for the rest of the narrative, I will let the chronicler himself speak. ‘Most unfortunately for us all, the captain under whose command this ship has completed the first and second part of the voyage, died of apoplexy, just at the beginning of the third part of the voyage. And Mr. Chamberlain, who had been chief mate, has taken command as skipper. This gentleman has some good qualities, as, for instance, energy and industry, but unfortunately he is a poor disciplinarian, and I fear that in this the safety of our beloved barque is compromised.

‘The trouble between the Colonial Watch and Black Watch began before the death of the late captain, but he being a just man and a stern disciplinarian, and knowing that the wishes of the Colonial Watch were unjust, that concession to their wishes would put an end to the discipline of the ship, and that we had now reached the sea of icebergs, of storms, of rocks, and of waterspouts, stoutly opposed their claim. And I doubt not that had he lived, harmony would have been restored among our crew. But the present skipper, who as mate upheld the endeavour of the late captain, to deal with each section of the crew fairly, now that he is captain is extremely partisan. Of course, he is of the same race as the Imperial and the Colonial Watches, and having now completely taken the side of the Colonial Watch against the Black Watch, he thinks that if the worse should come, and we should have to put the members of the Black Watch in irons, the ship could be worked by the Imperial and Colonial Watch alone.



He thinks, too, that we should most probably get help from some friendly sail.

'That is all very well, but I should have thought that it would be the first attempt of a wise skipper to make his own crew the first and last line of defence, rather than expect a chance sail to be even its last line of defence. And I should have expected this all the more, since a glaring injustice is the cause of the demoralization of our crew. But how does this modern Solomon of the "British Empire" purpose to reconcile the Imperial and Colonial Watches to the idea of superseding the Black Watch in the working of the vessel? By increasing the amount of their grog and their allowance of cocoa, and by serving them with a few ounces of fancy biscuits, all of which, in the euphemism of nautical phraseology, are known under the generic name of "Preference," or "Tariff Reform." I am very ill, and do not expect to survive this voyage, but I have made an effort to record these impressions, so that should our ship return home safely, the owners may be better able to decide about continuing the services of Mr. Chamberlain as her skipper.' "In this drama the curtain falls before the actual tragedy is reached, nevertheless, by means of its prologue we are enabled to anticipate the issue. Thus we have the presence of a flagrant and nude injustice. Two batches of seamen are equally competent in the knowledge of their calling and in the working of the ship; one already does more work than the other; yet this latter underworked class, which is better paid and better fed than the former overworked class, is dissatisfied, and insists that for its further benefit the work of the former class should be still further increased and its rations diminished. The sole basis upon which this inequality of treatment rests, and upon which the further audacious suggestion is made, is that the parasitic class of seamen are of a different race to the victimized class, and that they are of the same race as the owners of the ship and of the captain.

"Therefore is it surprising that as the consequence of these glaring irregularities, the crew should be torn asunder by bitter feuds and mad jealousies? And these strifes and divisions, would they be conducive either to the quality or quantity of work that was performed in time of safety? In other words, does the demoralization of the crew of a vessel conduce to its efficiency in fair weather? And if it does not conduce to the

efficiency of the ship in fair weather, can it conduce to that efficiency in foul weather? But where is the master of the ship? Surely he will have been throwing the great weight of his influence upon the side of the concord of the crew. He will have been doing so when the sea is calm and the voyage propitious, but how much more will his energies have been increased when the sea is lashed by storms, bayoneted by rocks and icebergs, and barred by columns of waterspouts? Such no doubt would have been the course of the ordinary captain, but Captain Chamberlain was one of the extraordinary type, hence as captain, he strove, not in time of calm, but in time of peril, to promote discord among his crew, that discord to which the foundering of his ship the 'British Empire' must be attributed, and he did this by resting his action in the matter, as did the men before the mast, upon the phantom of race identity. The picture which to-day fascinates men in the gallery, and holds them spellbound, posterity will assign to the garret. I move that the proposal to erect a monument to the memory of Captain Chamberlain, who perished in the 'British Empire,' should be rejected."

## XVIII

### General Summary and Conclusion

THIS, as well as the subsequent volumes, in which the present division (the second division), of "Glimpses of the Ages" is to be completed, deals and will deal with the question whether the white race, as it is alleged, is morally superior to the non-white races, and the non-white races are morally inferior to the white race. In our introduction to this volume, we observed that primarily man sustains a three-fold relation. A relation to his Maker, a relation to his fellows, and a relation to the material world. We observed further that these relations carry with them corresponding obligations. And in the case of man and man, we noticed that these obligations are discharged in conformity to a law, which is expressed in the words, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself"; or "Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you." Or, as I said, these two synonymous laws put into another form, are, make the measure of your action to yourself the measure of your action to others. I asserted that the degree of conformity to this rule of measuring our actions to others by the same measure that they are measured to ourselves, is the degree of goodness, and that to both the doer and the recipient the effect is the diminution of pain and the increase of happiness. It was also observed that the obligation that a man's contact with his fellow should result in the promotion of their mutual happiness, and in the diminution of their mutual pain, extends from the most intimate to the most distant relations of life.

Thus, however wide may be the difference between their worldly stations, however distinct may be their national or racial characteristics, even as no atom in the universe escapes the obligation to the law of gravitation, so no man on this planet escapes the obligation to this law of goodness. And

'twixt man and man, the law of goodness being the highest and the most important law, it has been selected as the standard for determining the question of the superiority of the colourless race and the inferiority of the coloured races. Thereby, the communities or individuals of the races which in the fulfilment of their obligations to their fellows conform more to the law of goodness are the superiors, and the communities or individuals of the races which in the fulfilment of their obligations to their fellows conform less to the law of goodness are the inferiors. Accordingly, as the colourless race has affirmed that it is superior to the coloured races, I shall expect in the present volume, as well as in the next volume—the third volume being the consideration of the manner in which the colourless race conforms to the law of goodness in its dealing with its own members, the fourth volume being the consideration of the attitude of the Christian Church towards the securing of conformity to the law of goodness, and the fifth volume being the result of the conclusions which we may reach in the preceding volumes—that the colourless race in its dealing with the coloured races has more nearly conformed to the law of goodness, or to the doing to others as it would be done by, than do the coloured races in their dealing with the white race. If this should be the case, then I shall concede to the colourless race its claim of moral superiority to the coloured races; but if it be not true that in the dealing of the colourless race with the coloured races there is manifest a greater conformity to the law of goodness than is manifest in the dealing of the coloured races with the colourless race, then I shall deny that the colourless race is morally superior to the coloured races, and that the coloured races are morally inferior to the colourless race.

In relation, then, to the inquiry of the moral superiority of the colourless race and the moral inferiority of the coloured races, the subjects which we have been discussing in the preceding chapters range themselves under two heads. Of these, the first represents the dealing of the chief Caucasian states with the coloured and independent, but weak state of China. In the dealing of these Caucasian states with China, we have seen that China, weakened by defeat, by loss of territory, and by the burden of a great indemnity, the results of an unsuccess-

ful war with Japan, is surrounded by these Caucasian states in their quest for concessions, as if by a pack of hungry wolves. About her humiliated and irritated, they prowled without thought, without feeling, without principle, ready to tear her limb from limb. Enraged at the mean advantage that these European states were taking of her incapacity, shocked at the outrage that they were committing upon the sentiment of her patriotism, the Chinese, in a fit of unbridled anger, wreaked upon the representatives of Europe that resided in China, a summary and savage punishment. For these atrocious crimes of the Chinese upon Caucasian residents in China—crimes of destruction of property, of murder, and of torture—the Caucasian states retaliated upon the Chinese. The Chinese had plundered and had destroyed property, and the Caucasian representatives, following in the footsteps of the Chinese, did the same. Sparing neither age nor sex, the Chinese had tortured and hacked to pieces men, women, and children of the Caucasus. And here again the representatives of the Caucasus, following the Chinese, spared neither age nor sex, but tortured and hacked to pieces men, women, and children of China. At these ghastly infamies, the Chinese halted in their excesses. And did the Caucasians do the same? No!

Thus, whereas the Asiatic and heathen halted at the base, the Caucasian and Christian advanced to the summit. That summit of these revolting misdeeds was the outraging to death and the outraging and then the stabbing of women and children of ages ranging from six to sixty. And after the committal of these horrors, before whose opacity, the horrors of the Chinese pale into transparency, the Caucasian ends his debauch by abstracting from China a stupendous fine. Now, what conformity is there to the law of goodness, or doing to others as ye would be done by, in the action of the men, who, upon seeing another man wounded and lying in the highway, attempt to rob him of his watch, his purse, his cheque-book, and his umbrella, and receiving from him some severe kicks, proceed to his house and violate his wife and daughters, and then refuse to leave until a sum of money should be paid down to them? And what conformity is there to the law of goodness, or the doing unto others as ye would be done by, in the action of the Caucasian nations, in which, upon perceiving China defeated and helpless, they proceed to rob him of his territory, and receiving

from him some severe blows, revenge themselves by ravishing his wife and his daughters—adults and children—their ages varying from six to sixty, and end these deeds of bestiality by a fine of 450,000,000 of Hai-Kuan teals upon China? In the action, then, of these white peoples of the West to this non-white people of the East, instead of there being a greater conformity to the law of goodness, there is from the beginning to the end, as is seen from this series of episodes, a violation of that law, and this to the extent that the non-white people could not have surpassed, and that, as a matter of fact, they did not equal. And taking this as a fair sample of the treatment according to the Cecilian law of the cutting up of “the dying nations,” that the white race would mete out to coloured states that are weak but that are politically independent, I conclude that as far as conformity to the law of goodness relates to coloured and independent states, that it, i.e. the colourless race, is not morally superior to the coloured races.

The second head under which the subjects that we have considered in the preceding chapters of this volume, range themselves, is that of the dealing of the colourless race, as it is represented by the British people, with the coloured races as they are represented by the semi-independent and dependent states of the British Empire. And under this head the facts which we have thus been noticing will be recapitulated and amplified here. They will have relation to the manner in which the coloured British subjects have been brought into the Empire, the manner they have been treated in the Empire, and the reason why they have been so treated. We saw that the manner in which coloured British subjects have been brought into the Empire has been almost exclusively that of force. For example, taking the Sierra Leone Protectorate, we find Britain, on her own initiative, inducing the native kings and chiefs to conclude treaties of friendship with her, the object being to secure the increase and stability of her trade in those territories. In return for these benefits she promises her protection to these people. But as soon as her authority is firmly established, she passes an ordinance, by which she confiscates to herself the entire region; she likewise introduces an unnecessary and an expensive system of government, for the support of which she burdens the natives with a crushing weight of taxation. Besides the seizure of his country and the imposition of a grievous taxation, the native is harassed

with the plague of punitive expeditions in order that he may keep up the volume of trade to the normal limit, even when his doing so is unprofitable to him.

These same tactics of friendship and protection first, followed by annexation and subjection—the latter involving the maintenance of an unsuitable and costly form of government by means of excessive taxation, and the maintenance of trade by punitive expeditions—have been followed in Northern and Southern Nigeria, in Matabeleland, in Mashonaland, in Central and in East Africa. Such is one of the phases of the manner in which coloured British subjects are brought into the Empire. Another phase has been that of wars with European states (France, Spain, and Holland), out of which the Indian Empire, the Dominion of Canada, the colonies of the British West Indies, the Cape of Good Hope, Malta, Ceylon, Mauritius, etc., were created as British possessions. A third phase is represented by conquest, the result of war against coloured states, and Hong Kong in China and Ashanti in West Africa are examples. A fourth phase is that in which a country has been discovered by a British navigator, and taken possession of for the British Crown; of these, West Australia, Queensland, and Victoria are examples. A fifth phase is that in which the native rulers ceded their territories to the British Crown; of this we have as examples, New Zealand and certain islands in the Straits Settlements. A sixth phase is that in which coloured peoples were kidnapped in Africa, were forced across the seas, and were sold into slavery, as in the case of the British possessions in the West Indies.

Now from the historic view that is given us by the junction of these states and peoples with the British Empire, we have the verification of my statement that the chief means of that junction has been force. Thus, the first great fact is that the overwhelming preponderance of the coloured peoples of the Empire did not join it voluntarily, but were forced into it. On the other hand, whether by conquest, by cession, by treaties of friendship, or by discovery, these coloured peoples, upon joining the Empire, brought with them great and valuable possessions, possessions which have greatly increased the wealth and magnitude of the Empire. Then, too, we have noticed before that the machinery of government that has been severally introduced into these states, and that is modelled after that of the

hegemonical state, is largely sustained by the coloured inhabitants in some places where they are in the majority, and is entirely sustained by them in other places where they are in the majority. Thus the accessions of these coloured states to the Empire have been to the chief state only gain, and that upon an enormous and lavish scale.

Well, among other things of striking significance that might be mentioned as having occurred during the accretive evolution of the Empire are the following three: the formal abolition of slavery throughout the British dominions, the granting of free institutions to certain colourless communities, and the Indian Mutiny. With respect to the second of these events, the chief importance, from the present view-point, is that with its reservation to itself of the right to intervene at any time on behalf of the coloured sections, the parent state committed to the care of the new governments the destinies of the coloured peoples that occupied the territories in which representative governments were introduced. With respect to the first and third of these events, the chief considerations of importance, from the present view-point, are the pledges which were voluntarily given by the hegemonical state that coloured British subjects (like the colourless British subjects to whom self-government had been already given), should be trained for self-government; and that to this end, according to their ability and character, they should be eligible to fill offices of trust. It may be added that there was nothing that was remarkable in those pledges, for the coloured peoples are as richly endowed intellectually, and are as capable of being trained for self-government, as are the colourless peoples of the Empire; whereas their contribution towards the formation and towards the maintenance of the Empire is much greater than those of the self-governing colonies. Thus, since these coloured peoples were potentially capable of self-government, it was a duty that was as incumbent upon the guardian state to prepare them for that independent existence as it is a duty that is incumbent upon the individual guardian to prepare his ward for the battle of life. Besides, the title which his right as a partner of the British Empire confers upon him, and the nature and high importance of self-government, demand that in his preparation for self-government he—the coloured British subject—in accordance with the rule of equality of opportunity, which is announced to



him in one of these pledges, should be eligible to fill places of trust in the public service. And so, in the pledges that have been given to the coloured subject by the hegemonical state, there is neither magnanimity nor sacrifice, but simple justice and simple duty. But how have these pledges of preparation for self-government and of equal opportunity as the means of preparation been fulfilled? They have been flagrantly contemned and thrust aside by the hegemonical state.

Thus the door of opportunity has been slammed in the face of the coloured races; and, as a result, we have seen that the services of the army and navy, and practically the Civil Service also, are closed against them; the same being more or less true in professional, commercial, and industrial pursuits. And so the general fact is that from every calling from which it is possible to exclude the coloured subject he is excluded, and where it is impossible to exclude him, custom has so arranged that he may not upon equal terms compete with the colourless subject. As factors of this device, whereby the way of the coloured subject throughout life is greatly handicapped, there are, on the one hand, the supply to him of a defective system of education and his restriction in the ownership of land, and, on the other hand, his subjection to an exhausting mode of taxation. The reasons which Englishmen give for having broken their pledges to coloured subjects of the British Empire are that these races cannot govern themselves, and this that fact is the result of lower mental and moral capacity. But these reasons are unsatisfactory, for it has been shown in the first volume of this work, and the matter has been referred to again in the earlier part of the present volume, that the chief part of their civilization, including that of government, is of Negro or Egyptian origin.

Therefore, it is for Englishmen to prove that the race by which they were first taught, through the Greeks and the Romans, the art of civilized government is itself destitute of the capacity for government. Then as to India, about which so much is being said at the present time (May, 1907), I will ask this question, Whether a people that has given to Europe and America trigonometry, algebra, and what is called Arabic notation; a people that has achieved distinction in philosophy and art, that has built magnificent cities, founded industries of world-wide repute and a commerce celebrated in the West no

less than in the East—whether such a people can be seriously said to be without the capacity for government? Why! these achievements and stable government are synonymous and inseparable. During the present session of Parliament Mr. John Morley has said in one of his speeches that if any one thinks that India, with its diverse peoples, languages, and religions, is fitted for free political institutions, he is a simpleton. But I venture to say that he who thinks that a people which has produced a civilization such as the Indian people has produced (a civilization of which the bone and marrow is law and order) is unfit for the best form of government, is a greater simpleton. However, the setting one class against the other, as is now reported to be the case in India between Moham-medans and Hindoos, and that with the knowledge and even the connivance of the Indian Government is not the way, in my judgment, to discover whether a people possesses the capacity for self-government. The reasons, then, that are given by Englishmen as the cause of the violation of their pledges to the coloured races, viz. that these races cannot govern themselves, and that they are without the capacity for self-government, are not borne out by the facts that it was the Negro that taught the Caucasian the method of civilized government, and that stable government was the heart of the civilization that the Hindoo established. And so, from this standpoint these reasons are unsatisfactory.

Elsewhere (p. 121 of this volume) we have noticed that it has been said that "If there were the least shadow of foundation for the belief that any system of autonomy . . . would give India more content and prosperity than she enjoys at present . . . no time should be lost in initiating it. But nothing is more certain than that if the experiment were tried, India would be plunged into the horrors of internal strife, and that the progress made during the last century would be obliterated within a twelvemonth."

I do not doubt that if complete political independence were given to India her initial act in taking up and carrying on the work of progress to which she had succeeded would be to tear down more or less completely, by means of internal dissensions, the work of the present builder. But would such an act be exceptional, would it be unparalleled? Rather, would it not be but a fresh demonstration of an almost

invariable rule? Thus, when the period of Britain's pupilage under the superior civilization of Rome was terminated by the withdrawal of the Roman legions, previous to the beginning of that structure that is now recognized as being purely British, was not the Roman model, by means of internal dissensions, invasions, and conquests, first of all completely demolished? And coming to later times, when democracy in France, as was its right, and its duty, desired to establish institutions that should represent the whole French nation, did it not first of all—by means of a revolution which, if equalled, is unsurpassed in the madness of its violence—almost completely demolish the models which its aristocratic predecessors had designed and executed? And with variations these two examples of a people, and of a class, first of all destroying the models of their teachers before proceeding to reproduce them from the moulds of their own genius, are visible in the histories of nearly all great peoples. Thus, if India were given complete political independence, and were to enter upon her work by completely demolishing the model that she had inherited from her teacher, there would be in the act nothing either for surprise or for despair. India will have inherited from England the visible institutions of government, but she will have also inherited from England the ideas of government. The first of these inheritances is impressed by the genius of the British people; hence, if the government of India is to be impressed by the genius of the Indian people, her second inheritance must assume concrete form; and it is this transmutation that generally occasions the complete destruction or the complete modification of the original or inherited model. If the real reason why the journal from which the last quotation is taken, demurs to advocate complete political independence for India, be the fear that India would begin by destroying the present system, then the fact that such an act would not be the exception, but, if anything, the rule, the rule to which England herself has conformed, should be sufficient, I think, to allay its fear, and to lead it to reconsider its attitude to the subject. But there is this also, that it is most probable that were England to rule India for a thousand years, and India at the end of that time were to enter upon absolute independence in government, she would begin by first of all destroying her foreign model.

However, according to her accredited leaders, India is not asking for complete political independence, but for that form of government, viz. autonomous government, by which the present model shall remain intact. And so, in this respect the apprehension of the author of the extract is entirely groundless. Another argument that is employed against Indian autonomy, or the granting to India of what are called free institutions, is that her governments under her native rulers and extending to many centuries have been uniformly despotic. But is not the same true of Japan and Persia, which have now adopted the system of free institutions? Is it not likewise true of China, which is remodelling her government upon the new plan? And how is it, that although Englishmen, in the cases of Japan, Persia, and China, have not merely refrained from using the previous modes of despotic government of these countries, as a ground of opposition to the liberal form of government that they have each of them adopted, or are adopting, but have heartily approved their change of government, yet, in the parallel case of India, they use her previous mode of despotic government, as a ground of opposition to granting her a liberal mode of government?

But can it be believed that while Japan, Persia, and China have adopted, or are adopting, a mode of government by which the masses of their peoples may take part in their governments, Englishmen will succeed in reconciling India to her present despotism, or in contenting her with the shadow of representation that the Secretary of State for India recently outlined, the 6th of June, 1907, in his Indian Budget speech in the House of Commons?

Further, from the standpoint that the attitude of British policy has not tended of late years to qualify the coloured British subject for self-government, but rather to disqualify him for self-government, by closing against him the doors of equal opportunity, and by sedulously withholding from him every means of political development, the reasons of the inability of these races to govern themselves, and of their incapacity for self-government are also unsatisfactory. But there is a third set of facts, and it is this which I have said is the reason why England deliberately broke her pledges to the coloured British subject, to the effect that he would be trained for autonomous

government, and that in the meantime he should enjoy equality of opportunity. This third reason is that she may, without let or hindrance, exploit him for her own advantage. Now, as accounting for England's broken pledges in regard to the coloured races, whereas the reasons of the unfitness, and of the incapacity of these races for self-government do not harmonize with the facts that it was a Negro people that taught Europe civilized government, that Hindoo civilization could be possible only with a high form of government, and that British policy has been rather to discourage than to encourage in the coloured races of the Empire capacity for government, they entirely harmonize with and are explained by the theory that the wish to exploit the coloured peoples is the cause of England's broken pledges. But unfitness and incapacity for self-government are not the only forms of malignity with which Englishmen, in order to draw off attention from their broken pledges, or to justify their unfaithfulness have covered these coloured members of the Empire. Indeed, it would be far easier to enumerate the forms of traducement that have been overlooked, than to enumerate those that have been employed in the work of ruining the character of the coloured peoples of the Empire. But let it suffice to say that in this ignoble enterprise no depth of meanness has been too great to which to descend, no weapon of calumny too foul to handle, and no species of mendacity too base to practise. From the armoury of this Satanic creation I present one of the weapons with which the character of the coloured British subject has been assailed by the colourless British subject. It is to the effect that as a result of some morbid condition, the Negro suffers from a disgusting odour; or, in other words, that he stinks. This statement has appeared in works that are designated as scientific. And it has appeared in those works, I suppose, as an item of special knowledge. But it is almost superfluous to say that the conveyance of knowledge is not the only object, or is not the most frequent object with which this allegation is made; for it appears also in ordinary literature, and it appears there as a means of exciting against the Negro race contempt, scorn, and despicability. Now, if it were true that some constitutional defect had produced such an odour in the Negro, that odour to him had been a distinct misfortune. But for his misfortune would it be good breeding, would it be generous, would it be noble, would it be

kind to excite against any one ridicule, scorn, contempt, and despal? If, then, it were true that the Negro is afflicted with this physical misfortune, where is the generosity, the nobility, the good breeding, and the "superiority," in that Englishmen have used this misfortune, for exciting against him scorn, contempt, and ridicule, and for inflicting upon him immeasurable pain? But it is not true that the Negro is afflicted with this reprehensible odour, it is not true that science that is truly so-called has made such an announcement; all that is true about the announcement is, its correctness as a type of the *facts* which sustain the superiority that is claimed by the colourless race over the coloured races.

Thus, in regard to this most disgusting assertion, it is not only that Englishmen, with respect to British Negro subjects, have aided in circulating what is in itself a distinct misfortune, that they have done so voluntarily, that they have done so zealously, that they have done so with the knowledge that it will cause these coloured British subjects to be regarded with scorn, with the knowledge that it will cause them to be held up to contempt, with the knowledge that it will cause them to be held up to ridicule, that it will place them at the greatest disadvantage, and that it will inflict upon them the acutest pain, but it is also true that the assertion which is in itself a distinct misfortune, and which in this manner and with this knowledge Englishmen have aided in circulating with reference to British Negro subjects is a wicked, an atrocious, and a cruel lie. And a companion of this vile instrument, which we have already examined, is that in which the Negro race is described by a reputable English journal as a race of rapists (p. 220). But besides that of justifying their policy of exploitation, and all its concomitants of injustice, the object in employing these methods of the grossest falsehood or of the wildest exaggeration is, on the one hand, to impress the British Negro subject with a sense of his own impotence, and, on the other hand, that he may be impressed with a sense of the Englishman's omnipotence.

Reduced to their final limits, the dealings of the colourless race with the coloured races of the British Empire, give us a series of three wrongs. The first wrong is that of forcing the coloured races into the Empire—as has been the case with the great majority—whether by slavery, by conquest, or by the snare of friendly treaties. The second wrong is that after

these coloured races, or the overwhelming proportion of them, had been dragged into the Empire against their will, after their great territorial possessions had been incorporated with the Empire, after that they had bestowed upon the Empire their enforced and unrequited toil, and while they were contributing the revenues towards the support of their numerous governments, the hegemonical state pledged to them its word that they should be accorded equality of treatment with the colourless race, and should be prepared for autonomous government. But for no other reason than that it wished to continue the practise of exploiting these coloured peoples with impunity, this hegemonical state deliberately violated the pledges that it had made to them. And the third wrong is that having forced these races into the Empire, having given to them certain pledges as a result of their large interests in the Empire, and their active service in its support, having broken those pledges, the hegemonical state, endeavours to justify its unfaithfulness to these races, and at the same time to ensure their submission to its crimes, by means of oppressive taxation, defective educational facilities, and every form of obstruction which is placed in their way, by the systematic aspersion of their character with lies of the most abominable kind, and by degrading, humiliating, and deceiving them.

Now, as to subject of the moral superiority of the colourless race and the moral inferiority of the coloured races, the declaration with which we started was that as the colourless race has affirmed that it is superior to the coloured races, I shall expect to find in the present as well as in the next volume, that in its dealings with the coloured races it has conformed to the law of goodness, or doing to others as ye would be done by, more completely than do the coloured races in their dealings with it. Well then, as far as the facts which we have considered in the present volume are concerned, the facts of which the three wrongs that I have just now mentioned are the summaries, and the summaries of which one is coercion, the other deception, and the third aspersion, can they be honestly said to evince a greater conformity to the law of goodness, or of doing unto others as ye would be done by, than would be evinced by facts that relate to the dealings of the coloured races towards the colourless race? Or, in other words, is it possible that the coloured races could have acted more dishonourably to the

colourless race than the latter (according to these acts of Englishmen, who in this case are its representative) has acted towards the coloured races? They certainly could not. And so with respect to this volume I conclude from the evidence that we have had under review, that morally the colourless race is not superior to the coloured races. Hence, as far as the treatment of the colourless race relates to coloured independent but weak states, the latter being represented by China, and as far as the treatment of the colourless race relates to coloured semi-independent and dependent states, the former being represented by the British people and the latter by the coloured communities of the British Empire, we have seen that morally the colourless race is not superior to the coloured races. As has been already announced, the subject of the manner in which the colourless race treats dependent coloured peoples will be discussed further in the next volume; the colourless race being represented by the Euro-American and the coloured races by the Afro-Americans.



# INDEX

## A

- Abbot, Dr. Lyman, and Missions, 45  
Abeokuta, Alake of, 177  
Africa—  
    Its three peoples, 195  
    *See also* Coloured race  
African race, 182  
Africans—  
    Assimilation of culture of, 196  
    Alleged incapacity of, 194  
Afro-American—  
    Numbers of, 222  
    " *Spectator's* " charges against, 223  
Anglo-American friendship, 299, 311,  
    424, 437  
Anglo-Chinese Treaty of 1858, 185  
Anglo-French Agreement of 1895, 49  
Anglo-Japanese friendship, 236  
Anglo-Saxon, concert of, 277  
Anglo-Russian Literary Society, 178  
Australia and coloured labour, 376

## B

- Backward races, 303  
Bai Bureh, 69  
Bai Forki, 66  
Bai Kompah, 56 *seqq.*  
Balkan States, 198  
Bambata, 386 *seqq.*, 402  
Bandajuma, 58 *seqq.*  
Banerjee, Surendra Nath, 389  
Basuto Scouts and the land, 139  
Beauty, natural and artificial, 186  
Bengal, partition of, 379, 427  
Bible, the, and racial history,  
" *Bible, The, and Spiritual Life,* " 180  
Blake, Sir Henry, 128

- Blyden, Dr. W. E., 224  
Bokary Bamp and his imprisonment,  
    65 *seqq.*  
Bombay shipping, 243  
Bonner, Rev. William, 175 *seqq.*  
Bright, Right Hon. John, on India,  
    121  
British Empire—  
    Alliances of, 423  
    And war, 428  
    Annexations, character of, 452  
    *seqq.*  
    Census of, 313  
    Coloured population of, 222  
    Coloured races of, 314 *seqq.*  
    Misgovernment in, 219, 407  
    Misrepresentation in, 410  
    Policy, alternative of, 442  
    Policy, difference in, 401  
    Policy, effect of, 313 *seqq.*  
    White population of, 318  
" *British Empire, The, and Alli-*  
    *ances,* " 197  
British Guiana, 296  
British patriotism, 148  
British resources, 420  
Bryce, Right Hon. James, 303

## C

- Calcutta, 242, 378  
Canaan, 182  
Cardew, Sir Frederick, 70, 71, 73,  
    77 *seqq.*  
Casement, Consul, 200 *seqq.*  
    *See* Congo  
Caucasian intellect, 226  
Census, Imperial, 420

- Chalmers, Sir David, 53 *seqq.*  
 Chamberlain, Right Hon. Joseph,  
 54, 62, 65, 82, 136, 160, 263, 286,  
 290, 300, 318, 449 *seqq.*  
 China—  
   Boxer movement, the, 16  
   Dillon, Dr. E. J., on the allied  
   forces, 17 *seqq.*  
 Chinese slavery, 336  
 Christian religion, 184  
 Colonial Conference, 425  
 Coloured race—  
   Alienation of, 406  
   Alleged odour of, 485  
   And army and navy, 250  
   And the Empire, 32, 96  
   And the land, 139  
   And the press, 179  
   And man in the street, 237  
   And missionaries, 95  
   Bars to progress of, 157  
   Blathwayt, Mr. Raymond, on,  
   168 *seqq.*, 280, 282  
   British rule of, 274 *seqq.*  
   Changes in Imperial policy in  
   regard to, 268 *seqq.*  
   Insufficient educational facilities  
   for, 254  
   Lack of opportunity of, 232  
   Politically, 321 *seqq.*  
   Probable rebellion of, 418  
   Proclamation of 1858, the, 439  
   See Natal  
   Their treatment, 91 *seqq.*  
   Their treatment in England, 176,  
   177, 412  
   Three groups of, 10, 11  
   Unequal taxation of, 129  
   White race versus, 143  
 Congo Free State—  
   Forced labour in, 201 *seqq.*  
   Treatment of women in, 209  
   Mutilation of natives in, 215  
 Congo Reform Association, 217  
 "Daily Telegraph," 13 *seqq.*  
 Denshawi, 345  
 Digby, Mr. William, "Prosperous  
   British India," 103  
 Dinizulu, 353  
 Douglass, Frederick, 224  
   "Life and Times of," 323  
 Dube, Rev. J. L., and education, 356  
 DuBois, Professor Burghardt, 179  
 Durbhunga, Maharajah of, 426  
 Dying nations, 13 *seqq.*
- E
- East Africa—  
   Education in, 255  
 Egypt and Lord Cromer, 344  
 Elgin, Right Hon. Earl of, 347, 430  
 Emigration, 429  
 English versus coloured medical men,  
   234  
 Equality, social, 232  
 Ethiopianism, 292  
 Ethiopian race—  
   And slavery, 92  
   Alleged incapacity of, 220  
 European civilization, 195
- F
- Fairtlough, Captain, 76  
 Ferreira's raid, 403  
 Franchise and Transvaal natives,  
   270 *seqq.*  
 Freetown, 162  
 Frontier police of Sierra Leone, 51  
   And "Sierra Leone Times," 52  
   And Sir David Chalmers, 53  
 Froude, J. A., 197
- G
- Gaudo, Emir of, 433  
 Ghose, Dr. Rash Behary, 426  
 Goodness, law of, 5, 9  
 Government and misgovernment, 219  
 Grey, Right Hon. Sir Edward, 161,  
   322  
 Guinness, Dr. Harry, 216  
 Guolombane, 386
- H
- Hardie, Mr. J. Keir, M.P., 458 *seqq.*  
 Hay, Sir James, 50 *seqq.*  
 Hayti, 196  
   Alleged misgovernment in, 198

- Hayti, Froude on, 197  
 Heathen progress, 195  
 Hemming, Lady, 171  
 Hindoos—  
   Antiquity of civilization of, 194  
 Hunt, Sub-Inspector—  
   Imperial Government and, 366  
   *seqq.*  
   Murder of, 355 *seqq.*  
 McCullum, Sir Henry, on, 360  
 "Natal Witness" and "Pretoria  
 News" quoted, 366  
 Hut Taxes, 55 *seqq.*  
   And native chiefs, 60 *seqq.*  
   Illegality of imprisonment for  
   refusal to pay, 68  
   Inability to pay, 80 *seqq.*  
   Refusals to pay, 67  
   Sharpe, Captain, on, 65 *seqq.*

## I

- India, 99, 239 *seqq.*  
   Agricultural possibilities of, 114  
   And Lord Kitchener, 119  
   And self-government, 482  
   Character of British rule, 102  
   Civilization in, 239 *seqq.*  
   Famine in, 100 *seqq.*  
   Institutions of, 240  
   Legislative Council of, 426  
   Mechanical and agricultural in-  
   dustries of, 240  
   Originality in, 240 *seqq.*  
   Poverty of the people, 106  
   Shipbuilding in, 242  
   Sunderland, Rev. T. S., on, 103  
   *seqq.*  
   Taxation in, 118  
   Treatment of natives in, 175  
 Indian judges, First Earl of Selborne  
 on, 247  
 Indian merchants, 241  
 Indians in Canada, 141

## J

- Jamaica, 123, 295  
   Coloured race in, 155  
   Mr. Chamberlain on, 264 *seqq.*

- Jamaica, Lack of education in,  
 149 *seqq.*  
   Memorial by the churches, 149 *seqq.*  
   Sugar industry in, 153  
   Taxation in, 126  
 Jews, massacre of, 199  
 Johnston, Sir Harry, 224  
 Justice, dual standard of, 347 *seqq.*  
   And great teachers, 415

## K

- Kaffir labour, 338  
 Kano, capture of, 33  
 Karene, 65  
 Khama, 172  
 Kwaia, 74

## L

- Latin literature, maturity of, 195  
 Leuchars, Colonel, 349  
 Liberia, 196  
 Lloyd's Plantation, 323  
 Lobenguela, 302  
 Loko, Port of, 65  
   Arrest of chiefs of, 67 *seqq.*  
 L'Ouverture Toussant, 224  
 Lugard, Sir F. J. D., 38 *seqq.*

## M

- Macdonald, Sir A. P., 100  
 Mackenzie, Colonel, 349  
 Magwababa, 386  
 Maltese and the Colonial Office, 263  
 Marriage, 301  
 Man, superior and inferior, 6  
   Chief duty of, 184  
 Mill, John Stuart, on Government, 120  
 Miller, Professor Kelly, 223  
 Missionaries, 15, 16  
 Missionary enterprise, 292  
 Mission stations in Africa, 45  
 Moore, Captain, 75  
 Morland, Lieut.-Col., 33 *seqq.*  
 Morley, Right Hon. John, 303, 390,  
 427  
 Mskofeli, 386  
 Mulatto, the, 73, 159  
 Mveli, 355

## N

## Natal—

- "Bloemfontein Friend" quoted, 351  
 Education in, 356  
 Elgin, Lord, and, 414, 430  
 Imperial Government and, 260, 347, 433  
 "Natal Mercury," 369  
 "Natal Witness" quoted, 350  
 Poll Tax in, 293, 355 *seqq.*  
 Rising, 289 *seqq.*, 347, 401, 402  
 Sale of plunder, 352  
 "Times of Natal" quoted, 349, 358  
 National interest, unstable character of, 329

## Natives, British rule of, 273

- And the Church, 291  
 Congress of, in South Africa, 290  
 Grievances of, 297  
 Hardie, Mr. J. Keir, on, 458  
*See Coloured race*

## Negroes—

- American, 220  
 As British subjects, 220  
 Brain of, 225  
 Ill-treatment of, 142  
 Klaatsch, Professor, on, 142  
 Olivier, Sir Sydney, on, 158  
 Slow progress of, 159  
 So-called curse of, 183  
 Supposed failure of, 194, 224  
 Their alleged savagery, 192, 220  
 "New India," Sir Henry Cotton's, 244  
 Niger Company and Emir of Sokoto, 40  
 Nigeria—  
 British progress in, 42  
 Status of native in, 173  
 Northern Nigeria, 433 *seqq.*

## O

- Odessa, massacres in, 199  
 Olivier, Sir Sydney, 158

## P

- Pa Nembana, the case of, 57

## Party politics, 259

- Pease, Mr. Joseph, M.P., 46  
 Poll Tax, 293, 403  
*See Natal*  
 Press and public opinion, 258  
 And Natal, 260  
 And the coloured race, 262  
 Progress and British rule, 161  
 Progressive and non-progressive countries, 307  
 Punitive expeditions, 294 *seqq.*

## Q

- Queensland and native Australians, 141

## R

## Race—

- Origin of, 3  
 Ascendancy of, immoral, 252  
 Racial prejudice, Canon Hensley Henson on, 233  
 Rai, Lala Lajput, 392 *seqq.*  
 "Representative Government," 120  
 Romani, 71  
 Ronietta, 55 *seqq.*  
 Rowe, Sir Samuel, 50  
 Russia, 233

## S

- Salisbury, Marquis, on dying nations, 13  
 Selborne, Right Hon. Earl of, 431 *seqq.*  
 Sharpe, Captain, 65 *seqq.*  
 Sierra Leone Colony, 163 *seqq.*  
 Protectorate, 48 *seqq.*  
 Hut Tax in, 55 *seqq.*  
 Insurrection in, 69  
 Petitions of chiefs in, 60 *seqq.*  
 Slave raiding in, 82  
 Tenure of land in, 58  
 Treatment of chiefs in, 56, 57  
 Tribes and the land, 81  
 Slavery—  
 In Africa, 46  
 Pease, Mr. Joseph, M.P., and, 47  
 Sokoto, fall of, 35  
 Sultan of, and his subsidy, 41

- South African Native Congress,  
154  
South African natives, 252, 285  
"Spectator," 190 *seqq.*  
Students in England, 237  
"Sugar and the West Indies,"  
145  
Sunderland, Rev. T. S., on British  
India, 103 *seqq.*

## T

- Temple, Sir Richard, on India, 275  
*seqq.*  
Thomson, Mr. Joseph, 40  
"Times," 152  
Transvaal and British Indians, 140  
Transvaal natives, 139  
Tugwell, Bishop, on Kano and So-  
koto, 43  
Turkey, 198  
Turner, Bishop, 291

## U

- Unfit, eliminating the, 32 *seqq.*  
United States—  
And England, 300, 423  
Census Bureau of, 304  
Negroes in, 220 *seqq.*

## W

- Washington, Booker T., 224  
West Africa, 160  
British and French rule, 161  
Coloured medical men excluded in,  
166  
Mountmorres, Viscount, on, 85  
West African Medical Service, 251  
West Indian Committee, 123 *seqq.*  
West Indies, British—  
Chronic depression in, 145  
Coolie labour in, 338  
Poverty in, 132  
The peasant and the land, 134  
Whitehead, Rev. J., 217  
White race—  
Alleged superiority of, 1, 169, 237  
Defects of, 189  
Degeneration of, 416  
Dislike of work of, 436  
Exaltation of, 292  
Grey, Sir Edward, and, 322  
Love of gain of, 436  
Russo-Japanese War and, 274  
Treatment of coloured race, 171  
*seqq.*  
Winton, Sir Francis de, 50 *seqq.*

## Y

- Yoko, Madame, 60

PRINTED BY  
WILLIAM BRENDON AND SON, LTD.  
PLYMOUTH