

THE
INDIAN QUESTION
IN
EAST AFRICA

BY

C. F. ANDREWS.

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION ONLY.)

THE SWIFT PRESS, NAIROBI, KENYA COLONY.

THE
INDIAN QUESTION
IN
EAST AFRICA

BY

C. F. ANDREWS.

(FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION ONLY.)

THE SWIFT PRESS, NAIROBI, KENYA COLONY.

A PRELIMINARY NOTE.

This book was left in a half finished state, when I went away from Africa in March, 1920. My time in India was so occupied, that I was not able to get the concluding chapters finished. I therefore abandoned the book altogether. But on returning to the Colony and reading over again the pages that were already printed, it has seemed to me that certain principles, which I emphasised, are living interests, to-day. Lord Delamere and Mr. C. Archer in the Memorandum, on behalf of the unofficial members of the Legislative Council and the Convention of European Associations have challenged these principles once more, at the time that this is going to the Press. As their Memorandum has been made public property in the East African Newspapers, and therefore now a public document, I am venturing to re-publish it, at the end of this book, for reference, as an Appendix. I would call attention only to one sentence, which appears to me to strike at the root of all religious and racial neutrality on the part of Government within the British Commonwealth. The writers sum up with three questions, one of which reads as follows :—

“Is the young growth of Christianity and Western Civilisation to be supplanted by Eastern creeds and superstitions?”

I am printing this book for private circulation only, and not for sale, because it is entirely incomplete as an argument and also partly out of date. The world has gone very rapidly forward in the East during the last two years. I hope to be able on some future occasion to publish something on the whole subject in a more permanent form. If I am able to do so, I shall use some of the material which I have gathered here.

The last chapter, called the "Economic Argument," contains the Report which I presented in India, on the East African Question, on my return to India at the end of March, 1920.

Visram Villa
Nairobi.

C. F. ANDREWS.

P. S.—I have to thank the Swift Press, Nairobi, for their long-suffering patience in dealing with my long delays. I would also add, that if any one in the Colony cares to have a copy of this book, in its present incompleteness, it can be obtained by sending the postage payment and written request for it to the Swift Press, Nairobi.

October, 25th 1921.

PREFACE.

THE following chapters are published as a preliminary statement, giving immediate impressions, at the end of my first visit to East Africa and also to Uganda. I hope to be able to stay for some time in the Conquered Territories on my way back from South Africa, and to spend a further period in British East Africa. After the whole journey is over, it is my intention to publish a book on the general subject of Indian Immigration.

As this present paper is purely tentative and open to correction, I shall be most grateful if any mistakes, which I may have fallen into unawares, are pointed out. Letters addressed c/o. The Indian Association, Nairobi, will always find me, and I shall deem it an act of kindness, if any of my readers can spare the necessary time to write about any point which strikes them either as ill-considered or unfair. I shall also welcome frank and open discussion of the principles expressed and the conclusions provisionally formed.

In India, it has been my good fortune never to belong to any political party. My work has been almost entirely educational. The study of Indian History, in a living way, has been a passion with me. If asked the question, what led me to take up this peculiar subject of Indian immigration, I can only say that I have had an instinctive sympathy with things Indian and a certain understanding of them, since the time when I landed in India, now sixteen years ago. Along with this,—which seems to me to be the prerequisite in a foreigner of any fruitful study,—the question of India's destiny abroad has always had its great attraction for me as an historical student. Furthermore, it has so happened, without any planning or designing, that invitations

have come, at different times, to go out to the Colonies and make personal investigations on the spot about Indian colonisation; and when these invitations have come, I have not felt it possible to refuse them.

Wherever and whenever I have gone, complete unfettered freedom has always been given me to form and to express my own individual judgments. I could never have worked for a single moment under any other conditions. It has also been possible to offer my services without any remuneration, and this has increased my sense of independence. More than once I have come to conclusions, which were directly opposed to the views of those who invited me to go out. But I have never been asked to refrain from publishing those conclusions on that account.

I am anxious to disarm beforehand a certain form of opposition on the part of practical men, who dislike theorists above all things and rightly suspect their opinions. I would simply state in this connexion that, a few months ago, the Planters' Association of the Federated Malay States unanimously requested me (through a resolution proposed by their Vice-President and supported by their Chairman and Secretary) to go over to Malaya, at their own expense and as their guest, in order to help them in solving the problem of Indian Colonisation in that country. Indeed, just before I started on my present voyage, a cable reached me from the Chairman again pressing upon me this original invitation. Furthermore, I have quite recently visited Ceylon and have been welcomed cordially by the Estates' Agents Association at Colombo, one of the most important financial bodies in the Island. I had also opportunities of addressing in the up-country districts the different branches of the Planters' Association. From the letters which I have subsequently received, it is quite evident that they have regarded me as an expert who has been able to give them expert advice. I mention these facts for one reason only, namely, to show in the briefest possible manner that my work has been practical in character.

In order, however, not to omit other things which may appear, to some of my readers, to tell against me, I should state that the Planters' Associations in Fiji have formed an adverse opinion and condemned me for the action, which I recently took, in helping to bring to an end the Indian indentured labour immigration to their sugar plantations. In that matter, I am entirely impenitent; for I visited the islands twice over, spending many months in the midst of the Indian labourers themselves and also among the Planters. I have thus witnessed with my own eyes the actual conditions. After all the things that I have seen, I cannot be otherwise than profoundly thankful that Indian indentured labour was not introduced into British East Africa between the years 1908-1912, during a period when serious efforts were being made in that direction and both the Colonial and the India Offices were ready to countenance such a possible development. I am under no illusion, to-day, as to the evil effects of Indian immigration under conditions such as those in Fiji. Personally, I should be the very last man to desire to encourage any system of that kind being again introduced into any part of the world.

My experience of Indian immigration for plantation work has not been confined to the Fiji Islands. I have traced out, on the spot, the same evil effects in South Africa; and I am fully convinced that the trouble there at the present moment is very largely due to the ill-advised efforts in the past of the large estate owners in Natal to import that kind of labour.

Though, therefore, I have by no means been always welcomed by my own fellow-countrymen, on account of the opinions I have formed, and though at times I have had to face serious Indian opposition I feel that I may fairly claim that these things have never been allowed to affect my independence. I have kept that intact throughout. Furthermore, my present position has been reached, not so much by reliance on books, as on personal intercourse with men and women.

I regret that I have been obliged to bring the personal note into this preface. It has been distasteful to me and I would have much rather done without it. But as a stranger, I could only explain my request for a patient hearing in the frankest possible manner and then set forward my views.

I must ask indulgence beforehand for the extreme haste with which the following pages have been actually written and for their lack of adequate revision. As I have stated, they are purely tentative and provisional, I felt it better to invite criticism by publishing them before my second visit, than to omit writing altogether and thus fail to get mistakes corrected and imperfect opinions set right. I am afraid that my boat will sail without my having time to go through the final proofs.

C. F. ANDREWS.

Nairobi, January, 1920.

CHAPTER I.

THE ECONOMIC COMMISSION REPORT.

WHEN I reached Mombasa at the end of November, 1919, a copy of the "Final Report, Part I, of the Economic Commission of the East Africa Protectorate" was put into my hands. It was printed with the royal arms on its title page and on its outside cover. In its opening paragraphs it contained two warrants issued by His Majesty's Ministers, the Heads of the East African Government, in March, 1917, and May, 1917, respectively.

On reading through this Report, I found that the Commission had held its sessions during a period of twenty-two months, and that the evidence had been regarded as of such a serious character that it had been decided to take it on oath, giving a judicial aspect to the proceedings.

The Chairman was a leading member of the Executive Government.

This East Africa Economic Commission was instituted in direct relation to the Conference of the Allied Nations at Paris. It followed throughout the three main headings of the War Conference, dealing with :—

- (1) Measures for the War period.
- (2) Transitory measures of reconstruction.
- (3) Permanent measures.

It is under the third heading "Permanent Measures" that the conclusions on the "Indian Question" are given. If one may judge from a very careful reading, not once, but many times over, of the whole Report, the clear impression is left, that the "Indian Question" was regarded by the Commissioners themselves as by far the most important part of the whole subject, as affecting the welfare of the Native.

The pages dealing with the "Indian Question" read as follows :—

"We have left to the end what is perhaps the factor which more directly than any other affects the welfare of the Native—that is, the influence of the Asiatic.

It is hoped that the frank discussion of this subject will not cause offence, but it is one which calls for plain speaking.

It must be borne in mind that any criticisms of the Indians which it may be necessary to make, refer specifically to those in this Protectorate. These are mostly drawn from the lowest type of artizan coolie and "banya" or small shop-keeping classes, and include few representatives of the more responsible elements of the population of India.

Further, such criticisms, like most generalisations, are subject to exceptions. There are some Indians in the country who have proved themselves reliable members of Society, and of whom we should be sorry to use disparaging terms. Exceptions, however, have little bearing upon the main argument.

Before the advent of the Imperial B.E.A. Company, Indians were established on the Coast, where they seized the opportunity afforded them by the abolition of slavery, to oust by loan and foreclosure the ancient Arab trade and civilisation of which Zanzibar was the centre. But except for occasional incursions by half-caste Baluchis, the interior was untouched by Indian influence till British control was effected. The introduction of the coolies employed on the construction of the Uganda Railway was the first connection of Indians with the interior. The employment of Indian labour for this work was due, it is believed, purely to considerations of convenience, and here it is instructive to note that not only did the capital cost of the Indian-built Railway work out excessively high—more than double the sum for which a reputable firm of British Contractors had offered to execute the task with African labour, but that the working costs per train mile of the Uganda Railway are higher than those of the railways of the South African Union, though the percentage of white men employed on the latter is more than twenty times as great.*

It may be permitted to question whether the authorities of the time realised the immense Imperial significance, for good or evil, of their action in promoting contact between the natives of East Africa and the decadent civilisation of India. The inevitable effect of the intervention of an intermediate race between European and African is

* *Note.*—Particulars taken from :—

1. Report of General Manager, Uganda Railway, year 1916-17, pp. 8, 20.
2. Report of General Manager, South Africa Railways, year 1916, pp. 14, 118.

that that race absorbs most of the occasions of personal contact with the African. Hence such intimate influence as the African of this country is at present receiving, are mainly imparted to him by the Asiatic, and are predominantly Indian rather than British.

East Africa is in a somewhat different position from any other countries of Africa in respect of this problem.

The self-governing states of the Union, together with the Rhodesias, control Indian immigration, with a view to ultimate exclusion. In Natal, Indian labour was at one time introduced, but its introduction was subsequently agreed to have been a mistake, and drastic steps have been taken to limit and localise its effects.

In the African Protectorates under the Colonial Office, Indian immigration is not prohibited, with the result that in East Africa the immigrants have not been confined to the trading class, but have included coolies, clerks, artisans and mechanics. German East Africa was for long protected from this invasion, but latterly, for political reasons, considerable encouragement was given to Indians there.

It is the distinguishing peculiarity of this country that here the Indian plays the parts of clerk, artisan, carpenter, mechanic, etc., functions which the African is capable, with training, of performing, and does elsewhere perform, satisfactorily. The presence of the Indians, organised as they are to keep the African out of every position which an Indian could fill, deprives the African of all incentives to ambition and opportunities of advancement.

It may be admitted that the Indian has played and still plays a useful part in opening up trade, stimulating the wants of the natives and inducing them to part with their products for purposes of export. For this service he is entitled to credit, but the essential point is that the same service might, with due encouragement, have been performed by the Native peoples.

In every direction, the sphere of the Indian in this country is not complementary but competitive with those of the European and African. Even in the minor spheres the European, if the Indian would submit to the civic, moral and commercial obligations current in European Society, has nothing to fear from Indian competition, the contrary theory, which formerly found favour in local governing circles, having been completely exploded by the history of the past thirteen years. But with the African, the case is different. He is not strong enough anywhere to stand against the competition of a more crafty race. So long as that race is organised to keep him in servitude, by shouldering him out of all the posts which lie in the path of his advancement, he must be content to remain a mere hewer of wood and drawer of water.

There are, therefore, strong economic reasons against the free admission of certain classes of Indians into the country.

There are unfortunately other reasons of even greater weight against all Indian immigration into this, or indeed any part of Africa.

Physically, the Indian is not a wholesome influence because of his incurable repugnance to sanitation and hygiene. In this respect the African is more civilised than the Indian, being naturally cleanly in his ways; but he is prone to follow the example of those around him. Plague, though said to be "endemic" in the country, has certainly been imported, if not originally, then on later occasions, from Bombay, and Indian quarters are almost invariably the foci of each successive outbreak. The same may be said of all dirt-born diseases. The Indian is everywhere the despair of the sanitarian; here he is a menace not only to himself, but especially to the natives of the country.

The moral depravity of the Indian is equally damaging to the African, who in his natural state is at least innocent of the worst vices of the East. The Indian is the inciter to crime as well as vice, since it is the opportunity afforded by the ever-ready Indian receiver which makes thieving easy. If the Indians were eliminated, the number of offences against property, now high, would be reduced to manageable proportions.

The Empire is faced with a serious dilemma, which cannot be evaded. The choice lies between the vital interest of the African and the ambition of India. The presence of the Indian in this country is quite obviously inimical to the moral and physical welfare and the economic advancement of the native. The matter is one of the highest Imperial importance, and we regard it as imperative that the Empire should definitely decide, and that without delay, whether the welfare of the African is to be subordinated in his own country to political considerations and the pretensions of the more restless elements of India. Upon the decision as to East Africa, the future of the whole continent will largely depend, for if Indians are to be allowed to stream in at any one entrance in unlimited numbers, it will scarcely be possible to localise them indefinitely in any particular territory.

Our own view of this question is that there can be no excuse for meting out to the African treatment to which India herself would never submit.

On purely economic grounds, we submit that the admission of the Indian was a cardinal error of policy. It involved the economic stagnation of the African throughout a large tract of Africa, and the consequent retardation of progress for the sake of what promised to be at best but a temporary convenience. In our view, the error ought gradually, but without unnecessary delay, to be rectified by similar means to those by which the same error is being rectified in Natal.

The Railway and other Government Departments should as quickly as possible replace Indian employees by Europeans in the higher grades and Africans in the lower. Further, Asiatics who are allowed to remain in this country should be obliged to conform to the same sanitary standards as Europeans as a condition of their residence here. It will probably be found that this will result in a great reduction in their numbers.

The Imperial Principle which is to control the migration within the Empire of different peoples has been finally laid down by the Imperial Conference in July last in the following terms:—

'It is an inherent function of the Governments of the several communities of the British Commonwealth, including India, that each should enjoy complete control over the composition of its own population by means of restriction on immigration from any other communities.'

It is therefore essential that a decision of policy in reference to East Africa should be come to without further delay, and that such decision shall be based upon the principle of self-determination, and shall consider only the interests of the indigenous native and Arab population and of the race responsible for their control.

It is our firm conviction that the justification of our occupation of this country lies in our ability to adapt the native to our own civilisation.

If we further complicate this task by continuing to expose the African to the antagonistic influence of Asiatic, as distinct from European philosophy, we shall be guilty of a breach of trust."

A further chapter of the Economic Commission Report, dealing with the "Political Future of Middle Africa" was drafted and discussed at several meetings, and up to the last it had been the intention of the Commission to publish it in the main body of

the Report, under the heading "Chapter XVII." But during the concluding session it was decided to omit it from the main Report,—possibly because it had the appearance of going beyond the terms of reference.

One of the Commissioners, however,—named E. Powys Cobb, Esq., of Molo,—attaching great weight to this question, as one which (to quote his own words) "towers above all others and casts its shadow across the whole economic future," has himself published this chapter in a Note under his own name. He has been allowed by the Chairman and members of the Commission to take this somewhat unusual course, and the Chapter is thus fully quoted, as an Appendix, at the end of the Report itself. It reads as follows :—

" CHAPTER XVII.—POLITICAL FUTURE OF MIDDLE AFRICA.

" The East Africa Protectorate is an artificially defined territory " without natural frontier (except on its seaboard.) It constitutes " one of the group of territories under the British Crown comprising " (in addition to British East Africa) Uganda, the conquered territory " German East Africa, Nyasaland, and the Rhodesias. The territories " of this group, which in this chapter will be referred to as Middle " Africa, are to a very large extent homogenous in character, forming " together one predominantly agricultural domain of boundless rich- " ness and fertility. Middle Africa is, in fact, one of the world's " great unopened storehouses.

" The acquisition of the Conquered Territory, which formerly " split Middle Africa into two sections, has now made practicable the " consolidation of the countries composing it into one federated " Dominion.

" Federation is required as a preliminary to standardising policies " on several of the main questions which confront all the territories of " the group. Hitherto each has gone its own way, with the result " that there has been no community of counsel and purpose. East " Africa and Uganda have in apparently analogous, if not identical " circumstances, arrived at and carried into execution widely " divergent conclusions on such important questions as native tenure " of land, and native policy generally. Had they arrived at identical " conclusions, it could only have been by accident. Such a state of

“ affairs appears to us indefensible. The wastefulness, and where the interests of subject races are concerned the harmfulness of it, hardly call for demonstration.

“The following are among the matters in respect of which federation would lead to greatly increased efficiency of public services in all the territories affected :—Defence : finance : customs : policing : communications : immigration : native policy : education : and scientific and industrial research. This appears to us so obvious that we refrain from enlarging on any of these matters except the first two.

“ A consolidated Middle Africa would constitute in British hands a permanent strategical barrier to any possible scheme for dominating Africa by means of a ‘Mittel Afrika’ scheme of aggression such as Germany had in contemplation. “It would be the bulwark of Africa against militarism. Few will be so optimistic as to imagine that no such bulwark can be required when the present war is ended : but it will not be afforded to the full extent possible by a number of detached Protectorates.

“The strategical advantages attending unification of control and administration of the various territories of Middle Africa would be of inestimable value in the event of Great Britain again being involved in warfare there. The defensive strength of such a combination should be sufficient to render any hostile designs futile.

“ The advantages of federation in the sphere of finance would be of scarcely less importance. A Dominion approximately equal in area to the sister Dominion of South Africa, and certainly not inferior to it in natural resources, would be able to command support for the financing of large scale railway and other projects necessary for development, where a number of minor states, incapable of acting in concert, would be unable to find accommodation.

“ Apart from such material advantages, the union of the British territories of Middle Africa would powerfully promote the spreading of the British ideal, which we are convinced is what the best interests of the people of Africa demand.

“ We therefore recommend that the countries specified should unite in forming the Dominion of Middle Africa, each however retaining intact such local autonomy as it now possesses : and that a Governor General be appointed for the Dominion, who should be assisted and advised by a Federal Council, consisting of the Lieut.-Governors and popular representatives of its component units. We have assumed the readiness of each of the units to attach themselves to this rather than to any other contiguous federation.

“ It will be noted that the conquered territory formerly known as German East Africa is an integral and essential portion of the proposed Dominion. The scheme above outlined therefore conflicts with the scheme recently propounded in the London press for making over the conquered territory to India for colonisation. The later scheme necessitates driving a wedge between the northern and southern parts of the Middle African Dominion, and is therefore strategically objectionable in the last degree. If further argument is necessary, it may be suggested that on military and sanitary grounds alike, the occupation of any part of Africa by Indians without European support and guidance would be a dangerous experiment.

“ Besides, we regard it as highly important that advantage should be taken of the opportunity offered to reunite and consolidate native peoples such as the Coast Arabs and Swahilis, and the Masai tribe, which have hitherto been divided into sections disjoined from each other, much to their mutual disadvantage, by purely artificial frontiers.

“ But we have already stated in Chapter VII what we submit are final reasons against the betrayal to the Asiatic of any section of the African peoples, the responsibility for whose destinies has fallen into our hands. Short of the retrocession of the territory in question to Germany, we can conceive of no transaction more immoral, or more certain ultimately to recoil in ruin upon our own heads, than to buy off Indian discontent at the expense of the native of Africa. Such generosity at the cost of others, and those our own dependents, would be neither honourable nor politic.

“ If India requires an outlet, there are vast empty spaces in Asia awaiting development to which it might now be practicable for her to apply her energies without the certainty of such evil results as must attend the exploitation of the African by the Asiatic.”

E. POWYS COBB.

Keringet, Molo, E.A.P.,
18th May, 1919.

When we come to examine the evidence on which such drastic conclusions are based, the result is altogether disappointing. No Indian member was invited to sit on the Commission itself, although some of the largest business transactions in the country

have been carried out by Indian merchants, and although for a number of years the opening up of the trade with the interior was almost entirely in Indian hands. What is stranger still to notice is the fact, that not a single Indian Association appears to have been invited to send its representative to give evidence.

I cannot find any hint whatever that the Commission itself took any steps to remedy or alleviate the initial injustice that had been done to the Indian community. I use the word "injustice" here advisedly; for the Supreme Government of the Protectorate must have clearly known that the "Indian Question" would be dealt with in a manner which would jeopardise their whole future; and to refuse the perfectly reasonable request for representation, in those circumstances,—appears to me fundamentally unjust.

The disappointment is scarcely less when we turn to the European evidence which was tendered on oath. The Commission itself in its own Report, states that "the influence of the Asiatic" is "perhaps the factor which more directly than any other affects the welfare of the Native." Again it is stated, "The matter is one of highest Imperial importance. . . . Upon the decision of East Africa the future of the whole Continent will largely depend." Yet, on turning to the index of the very large volume of Evidence, we find only nine references to the subject.*

I will quote at full length the nine passages referring to Indians.

(1.) The first reference is that of H. Ryle Shaw, Esq., Coffee Planter: It reads as follows—"In Natal where the Indian population is larger than the European, and where there is constant intercourse with India, the Port possesses a large quarantine ground for Asiatics. In this Protectorate the necessity for such accommodation is much greater."

* The heading "Kilindini Port" has eighty-one references, some of them many pages long.

(2.) The second reference is by the Hon. C. W. Hobleby, Provincial Commissioner, as follows :—

“The next point upon which I would venture to lay stress is the more intelligent use of the Native population. I would like to abolish the idea that if skilled work has to be done an Asiatic must be engaged. . . . We should as soon as possible commence to train a considerable number of native youths to do the necessary artisan work. The training should be on English lines, not Indian : the pupils should be taught to work standing at a bench, not squatting on the ground. The Indian system of two men to a hand saw and two men to a plane should be consistently discouraged. I have no bias against the skilled Indian foreman or artizan, but it is noticeable that the quality during recent years has deteriorated, although the rate of wages has increased. It has also been asserted that the employment of large quantities of Asiatic labour results in a steady leakage of money from this country to India.”

(3.) The third reference is by the same witness :—

“If the Indian immigrant were a great introducer of new capital into this country it would balance the loss (i.e., on imports) to some extent, but, as far as my information goes, this is not the case. Hardly any land owned by Asiatics in East Africa is being actively developed and worked. In Uganda, I believe, there are a few coffee planters. In East Africa nearly all the Asiatics are engaged in wholesale or retail trade, financed to a great extent by the banks.”

(4.) The next reference is that of A. K. Constantine, Esq., Merchant and Motor Car Hirer :—

“The native trade was in the hands of the Indians. Europeans would not have little “dukas” in the native villages like the Indians. Wherever trade was large enough the European could beat the Indian. Natives might be trained to take the place of Indians, but these “dukas” must deal with the Indian whole-

saler in Mombasa. The Indian wholesaler bought from the European firm on credit. Some of the biggest firms in this country traded entirely on credit. He thought this was sound business."

(5.) The fifth reference is that of R. W. Playfair, Esq., Manager, National Bank of India, Ltd., Nairobi :—

"Indian profits generally remained in the country. Indians were mostly working on credit. Their profits went in increased stock and purchase of land. An Indian to start with needed little money. The big Indian financed the small man."

(6.) The sixth reference is that of H. H. Heatley, Esq., Farmer, Nandi :—

"He was not keen on natives learning to read and write, though perhaps it would be advantageous in some cases. . . . He did not favour natives learning English. He thought that, wherever possible, Goan and Indian clerical labour, artisans, etc. should be replaced by white men, British taking preference, both in Government Offices and Railway."

(7.) The seventh reference is that of Colonel W. K. Notley, Commissioner of Police :—

"Checks on Indian immigration were stringent. A man had to prove himself able to earn his own living, or else give a bond for the cost of his passage. A European without employment had to deposit £25/- if required by the Immigration Office or give a bond. There was also power to deport undesirables within twelve months of landing. There was no influx of poor Indians going on. Last year (1917) and the year before (1916) Indian emigration exceeded immigration."

(8.) The eighth reference is that of E. Battiscombe, Esq., Conservator of Forests :—

"One of the great difficulties to contend with at present is the absence of litterate native employees : the only medium of communication between the European and the raw native is the

Asiatic clerk or skilled Indian artisan. This class demand very high wages which are in many instances out of all proportion to the duties demanded of them and the class of work they turned out. . . . Many of the more receptive natives could be trained as Assistant Foresters and they would be far more satisfactory than the Asiatic both for acquiring an intimate knowledge of what is going on in and around the forests, for becoming acquainted with the various species of trees, and as "go between" the European and the Native."

(9.) The last reference is that of the same witness :—

"Of first importance in the training of the natives in any trade or profession is the entire elimination of the Asiatic element. If the native is to be taught, the teaching should be conducted on European lines, e.g. take the case of carpentry. If a native is taught by an Indian carpenter it is highly probable that he will adopt Indian methods, never learn to finish off any piece of work properly and moreover never succeed in making himself more useful than the average Indian. . . . It is the same with other professions : the average Indian artisan in this country cannot be said to excel in his art which appears to be more a matter of tradition than training : and it is unreasonable to expect the African to become more proficient than the Indian if he merely has these traditions instilled into him."

These are the only references to Asiatics, in the whole body of evidence, which have been regarded worthy of indexing; and I have quoted them in full. The evidence, such as it is, appears to me extraordinarily unconvincing. Even as it stands, it by no means points in one direction only. The Manager of the National Bank of India, Ltd. (which is the oldest established in the country, and accepted as the Government Bank), declares pointedly that Indian profits generally remain in the country and go to the increase of stock and purchase of land. The Commissioner of Police reports that already checks on Indian immi-

gration are stringent, and that for two years past more Indians have gone out of the country than have entered it. Even those, like Mr. Battiscombe, Conservator of Forests, who wish to replace the Indian by the African, acknowledge at the same time that the number of Africans, who have had any training, or education, is infinitesimal.

If the case against the Indians were to be decided on the evidence alone, I do not think that any learned Judge on any bench would give a verdict such as the Commissioners have given.

One is driven to the conclusion, that they have made up their minds, not so much on the evidence set before them, as in accordance with their own private inclinations. I am not myself acquainted with the workings of such Commissions, and therefore cannot say whether such a line of action is technically in order. To me, as an amateur on the subject, the whole proceeding seems essentially unfair. Not only was no Indian evidence taken; not only was no Indian representative allowed to sit on the Commission; but even when the very scanty European evidence was of doubtful value, and, in one case at least, contradictory, even then the Commissioners (who took oaths from the witnesses in a judicial manner) summed up against the Indian Community on practically every point and condemned them to ultimate exclusion from the whole of Africa.

I shall deal with the different counts in the indictment against Indians, officially published by this Report, in later chapters. I have first to bring forward for comparison certain other parallel documents. I would only call attention here to one single point. The most serious indictment against the Indians, brought forward by the Commissioners,—namely that of “moral depravity,”—*has not one single word to substantiate it in any of the passages quoted above from the volume of Evidence itself.*

CHAPTER II.

: o: —————

THE NAIROBI CONVENTION.

[T is clear, when comparing actual dates, that December, 1918, and January, 1919, were two months in which the "Indian Question" reached a critical stage in East Africa. The Economic Commission was at that time bringing its sessions to an end; it was already looking forward to framing the main outlines of its Report. The Armistice had been concluded with the Central Powers, and the greatest excitement had been aroused in European minds by Sir Theodore Morrison's ill-advised proposal, that the conquered territory of German East Africa should be made into a special reserve for Indian colonisation. I was in India at the time that this suggestion was made and can bear witness that the leaders of Indian public opinion, either ignored Sir Theodore Morrison's proposal altogether, or else discountenanced it. Mr. M. K. Gandhi, whose judgment on such a subject would naturally carry the greatest weight, both with the Indian Government and with the Indian people, condemned the proposal from the very beginning; and the others more or less fell into line. Even in British East Africa, I have discovered, on inquiry, that it was only the name and reputation of Sir Theodore Morrison, and his personal influence during his visit, which induced Indian residents to take up his suggestion! How artificial it all was may be easily seen by the half hearted way in which the suggestion itself was ultimately canvassed. A deputation, which was sent to India on this and other matters, soon found it best to drop this question out altogether; and the Indian Congress meeting held at Nairobi, in November, 1919, did little more than pass a formal resolution which had no enthusiasm behind it. The subject has now been abandoned.

European life in East Africa is so far aloof from things Indian, that it was impossible for these things that I have related to be accurately known by Europeans. During the months that followed the Armistice, new boundaries were being marked out on the map of the world every day with bewildering rapidity. It seemed not impossible, in December, 1918, that the Home Government might decide at once,—under the sanction of the Great Four at Versailles,—the fate of the conquered German territory, without any consultation with East Africa at all.

This, among other matters, appears to me to account for the very activity of the European Associations in British East Africa on the "Indian Question," so soon after the termination of the War. It was a time of reaction,—a feverish period of strain and tension and exhaustion,—the very worst time for calm constructive statemanship. The documents, which I shall bring forward in this chapter and in that which follows, have all the signs of an inflamed racial imagination and must be judged accordingly. I cannot help reading into the Economic Commission Report itself, where it touches the "Indian Question," the same excited racial feeling. That, at least, is the genuine impression left on me as I have studied these documents,—coming fresh from the outside. And I would add, quite frankly, that I have felt the very atmosphere of this Protectorate, while I have been living here—among Indians and Europeans alike,—to be abnormal. There was an immediate relief, about which I shall write later, when I passed from East Africa to Uganda.

I have considered that this long explanation has been necessary, before quoting the Convention Resolutions, because I am coming more and more to believe that they do not represent the final opinion of my own fellow-countrymen, but rather their transitory temperamental outlook during an altogether unusual period.

It is important to notice that five of the Economic Commissioners took a leading part in the Convention of Associations held at Nairobi in January, 1919, about which this chapter is written. They are signatories both to the Economic Commission Report on March 21st, 1919, and also to the Draft Resolutions, circulated on December 21st, 1918, on behalf of the Convention. Thus they were actively participating in two different Committees, dealing with the "Indian Question," at the same time,—the one official in character, and the other non-official.

I have made careful enquiries about the Convention of Associations, as to how far it truly represents the united non-official European opinion, in accordance with its name, "The White Men's Parliament." The assurance has been given me, that its representation is very wide indeed. What follows, may be taken, therefore, as expressing a very high percentage of European opinion in East Africa.

The leading members of the Convention published first of all certain draft resolutions, to which I have already referred. I will quote them in full as they appeared in the "East African Weekly Standard," Nairobi, on December 21st, 1918:—

SIR,—

I have been asked by the undermentioned Colonists to request you to be so kind as to publish this letter and the enclosed resolutions in your paper.

These resolutions are about to be sent to every British Colonists' Association in the country with a request that they may be submitted to the members for an expression of their opinion.

The sum of the expressions of opinion so obtained will, we believe, constitute a true declaration by the British Colonists of this country on this crucial question.

Our object in asking you now to publish these resolutions is to give every one the longest and fullest opportunity for discussing them before he votes upon them, so that when he does so he will be recording his considered opinion.

The Right Honourable Lord Delamere, Member of Legislative Council, Elmenteita.

The Honourable Mr. W. C. Hunter, Member of Legislative Council, Nairobi.

The Honourable Mr. K. H. Rodwell, Member of Legislative Council, Mombasa.

The Honourable Mr. P. Uys, Member of Legislative Council, Uasin Gishu.

The Honourable Mr. A. E. Phelps, Member of Legislative Council, Songhor.

E. Powys Cobb, Esq., Molo.

E. S. Grogan, Esq., Nairobi.

R. W. V. Bunbury, Esq., Donyo Sabuk.

F. G. Furguson, Esq., Nairobi.

A. C. Tannahill, Esq., Nairobi.

T. A. Wood, Esq., Nairobi.

Captain E. Fey, Naivasha.

H. Jowers, Esq., Nairobi.

F. O. B. Wilson, Esq., Ulu.

Conway Harvey, Esq., Koru.

N. B. Tovey, Esq., Thika.

F. B. Hill, Esq., Athi River.

RESOLUTIONS.

1. That whereas our nation has assumed responsibility for the future of the indigenous East African peoples and of the countries they inhabit.

And whereas our national ideals of enlightenment and progress are crystallised in our Western civilisation, and it is our duty to make sure that the best contained therein is readily available for the needs of awakening Africa.

And whereas certain Indians have entered this country as traders, clerks and artisans.

And whereas these people follow in all things a civilisation which is Eastern and opposed to ours, and whereas they, being of a race intermediate between the European and African, come more frequently into personal contact with the African and so at all times subject him to intimate personal influences antagonistic to the ideals of the West.

And whereas the African has shown that he possesses latent qualities which under Western guidance hold promise of intellectual development and an aptitude for filling various needs of industry, more particularly those which involve the use of mechanical appliances, and whereas Indian competition denies him all incentives to ambition and opportunities of advancement.

And whereas the more restlessly ambitious among these Indians are agitating for adult suffrage and by this means seek to gain control over the destinies of this country.

And whereas the Imperial Conference at a meeting held on July, 1918, considered the matter of reciprocal migration between India and the other component parts of the Empire, and passed four resolutions of which the principal is as follows :

“ It is an inherent function of the Governments of the several communities of the British Commonwealth including India, that each should enjoy complete control over the composition of its own population by means of restriction on immigration from any other communities.”

And thereby recorded as the final judgment of the British Commonwealth that the principle of self-determination shall govern migration and the composition of populations.

We the members of pray His Excellency the Governor to approach the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies so that the function thus solemnly pronounced to be inherent in the Government of this British Community may be exercised by declaring that the population of this country shall be composed of British subjects of European origin, of East African Arabs and of the indigenous native peoples, and by restricting immigration and by denying Indians any form of franchise, in order that this stronghold of European colonisation in Central Africa may take her stand beside her sister colonies in their policy of ultimate Asiatic exclusion.

Further, we beg His Excellency the Governor to make known to the Imperial Conference through the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies our earnest petition that to the conquered territory, formerly called German East Africa, the same policy of ultimate Asiatic exclusion be applied; for the indigenous peoples of this country and of the conquered territory are of the same types, even to the extent of tribes having been cut in two and economic relations centuries old having been interrupted by the late artificial frontier. We can conceive, short of the retrocession of the territory to Germany, of no transaction more immoral, and more certain to recoil on our heads than the betrayal to the Asiatic of a section of the African peoples whose destinies have fallen into our hands.

We submit that to buy off Indian agitation at the expense of the native of Africa is a generosity neither politic nor honourable.

2. In view of the honourable part which the British community has played in the great War now victoriously ended, and of the far reaching issues involving the whole future of East and Central Africa which are at stake, we . . . pray His Excellency the Governor to make application to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies for the appointment of a representative, chosen by the British colonists of this country, on the Imperial conference.

N.B.—The above resolutions have been unanimously passed by almost all the European Associations with the exception of the Ruiru Coffee Planters' Association who have deleted the words "ultimate exclusion" from the resolution. The Nairobi Political Association has suggested the substitution of the words "Western Christian Civilisation" instead of the Western Civilisation."

These draft resolutions appear to have been very fully discussed and canvassed at the different meetings of the European Associations during the weeks that followed their circulation. Then, at last, at the January Sessions of the Convention, which met at Nairobi, the "Indian Question" came first on the agenda paper and the following revised resolutions were unanimously accepted and carried :—

This Convention wishes to point out to the Government that during the discussion of the petition re: Indians, as also those affecting the native peoples of this country, they had the assistance of four Mission-

aries, one being Roman Catholic and three being from the Missionary Conference, which was sitting in Nairobi at the same time as the Convention.

That whereas our Nation has assumed responsibility for the future of the indigenous East African peoples and of the countries they inhabit,

And whereas our National ideals of enlightenment and progress are crystallised in our Christian Western Civilisation and it is our duty to make sure that the best contained therein, is readily available for the needs of awakening Africa,

And whereas the maintenance of this country depends entirely on the prestige and force of character of the white man,

And whereas certain Indians have entered this country as traders, clerks and artisans,

And whereas these people follow in all things a civilisation which is eastern and in many respects repugnant to ours,

And whereas their social status brings them more frequently into contact with the African and thus subjects him to intimate personal influence, antagonistic to the ideals of the West,

And whereas the African has shown that he possesses latent qualities which under Western guidance hold promise of material development, and an aptitude for filling various needs of industry, more particularly those which involve the use of mechanical appliances,

And whereas Indian competition denies him all incentives to ambition and opportunities of advancement,

And whereas the Indian community in this country are agitating for adult suffrage and by this means seek to gain control over the destinies of the country,

And whereas the Imperial Conference at a meeting held on July 20th, 1918, considered the matter of reciprocal migration between India and other component parts of the Empire, and passed four resolutions of which the principal is as follows :

" It is an inherent function of the Governments of the several communities of the British Commonwealth including India that each should enjoy complete control over the composition of its own population by means of restriction on immigration from any other communities "

And thereby recorded as the final judgment of the British Commonwealth that the principle of self-determination shall govern immigration and the composition of populations.

We, the Convention of Associations, representing the White Community of the country pray His Excellency the Governor to approach the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, so that the functions thus solemnly pronounced to be inherent in the Government of this British Community may be exercised by declaring forthwith that the right of self-determination rests with the European Government of this country acting for the Europeans and in trust for the Native peoples and should ask the Secretary of State to rule that the position should not be prejudiced by giving any system of franchise to Asiatics nor by allowing them to acquire land except in townships on short leases, nor by the employment of Asiatics in Government work and that steps should be taken at once to restrict Asiatic immigration in order that this stronghold of European Colonization in Central Africa may stand beside her sister Colonies in their Asiatic Policy.

And further we beg His Excellency the Governor to make known to the Imperial Conference, through the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, our earnest petition that to the conquered territory, formerly called German East Africa, the same policy towards the Asiatic be applied: for the indigenous peoples of this country and of the conquered territory are of the same types, even to the extent of tribes having been severed and economic relations, centuries old, having been interrupted by the late artificial frontier. We can conceive, short of the retrocession of the territory to Germany, of no transaction more immoral and more certain to recoil on our heads, than the betrayal to the Asiatic of a Section of the African peoples whose destinies have fallen into our hands and who at present are unable to protect themselves. We submit that to buy off Indian or other agitation at the expense of the Natives of Africa would be a policy neither wise nor honourable.

In view of the far-reaching issues, involving the whole future of East and Central Africa, which are at stake, we, the Convention of Associations, representing the white community of East Africa, pray His Excellency the Governor, to make immediate application to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, for the appointment of a Representative, chosen by the British Colonists of this country, on the Imperial Conference.

DELEGATE TO THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

It was proposed, seconded, and carried, that this Convention very strongly urges that it has acquired the right to representation on the Imperial Conference.

And in the event of this being conceded that Lord Delamere should be nominated by Government to the post.

There are certain points in connection with these Nairobi Convention Resolutions which are worthy of special notice :—

First of all, it will at once be recognised by any careful reader that the "Petition re : Indians," as it is called, which was passed unanimously by the Convention, bears a marked resemblance to the paragraphs dealing with the same subject in the Government Economic Commission Report. Indeed, in some prominent passages, the phrases used are identical.

This may be accounted for by the fact, already mentioned that all the non-official members who served on the Economic Commission were serving at one and the same time on the Executive Committee of the Convention of Associations. It may be well, in this place, to give their names in full as follows :—

The Right Honourable Lord Delamere.

The Honourable W. C. Hunter.

Major Ewart Scott Grogan.

Thomas Alfred Wood, Esq.

E. Powys Cobb, Esq.

These gentlemen came out, at different times, to East Africa as settlers. Hon. Mr. Hunter is an estate agent and accountant.

The two official members, who served on behalf of the Government on the Economic Commission, are as follows :—

The Honourable Francis William Major, Chief of Customs, Chairman of the Commission.

William Alfred Kempe, Esq., Treasurer of the East African Protectorate Government.

Neither of these two Government officials raised any protest against the insertion of the paragraphs on the "Indian Question" in the Report. Both of them signed their names to it. They must therefore take their full responsibility for the position finally adopted. It would not, however, be difficult to surmise that Lord Delamere and Major Grogan were leading personalities in deciding the "Indian Question," both on the Economic Commission itself and on the Convention of Associations.

When we examine further the two parallel documents, we find that a claim is made by each in a very solemn manner to be allowed, under a decision lately reached by the Imperial Conference in London about immigration control, to exclude Indians from Africa. I have pointed out elsewhere that the controlling party in this decision of July 24th, 1919, was a self-governing Dominion, and that in its original form it did not refer to Protectorates at all. That, however, is a merely technical point.

What is far more serious to notice is the assumption made by the Convention of Associations that it, and it alone, truly represents the British Commonwealth in its colonising and civilising work in the East African Protectorate; that the White Community alone has acquired the right, by the very fact of its belonging to the dominant European Race, to represent the East African Government; that the Indian Community does *not* belong to the British Commonwealth, and has *no* right of representation before the Imperial Conference,—not even in its own defence.

Interpreting as well as I can the resolutions passed at the Convention concerning the Indian Community, I paraphrase them as follows :—

"Certain people, called Indians, have entered this country. The White Race has no community of sentiment with them. Their habits and mode of life are repugnant: their ideals are antagonistic. These intruders are now standing between the

natives and the natural protector of the natives, the White Community. The Indians must therefore be made to leave the country as quickly as possible. For the only protector of the native must be in future the dominant White Race.

“ This exclusion of the Indian ultimately from the whole of the British Commonwealth in Africa must be carried out by a definite policy,—on the same lines in Central Africa as those adopted by the sister colonies further South. That is to say, restriction of immigration must be immediately enforced by law, all trading and land rights must be curtailed, and no franchise must be granted. No Government service, in future, must be open to the Indian. Thus when every avenue of trade and land and franchise and Government *within* the Protectorate is closed more and more tightly, and when all further immigration *into* the Protectorate of new families is restricted, the whole position of Indians will be so insecure that very few will remain. Short leases in townships might still be permitted for a few Indian traders, but the lease should not be long enough for any permanent building to be erected, or any settlement foothold to be obtained. As leases fall in, these Indian lease-holders also may be dealt with individually. Thus East Africa,—“this stronghold of European colonisation in Central Africa,” may “take her place besides her sister colonies in their Asiatic policy.”

“In the end, all British Africa, from Mombasa to Capetown, will be reserved for European settlement. There will be no complication of the problem by the presence of a third race.

“When the Indian by these political methods has been compelled at last to leave the country, then the White Race can fulfil its true function, solemnly committed to it as a trust by the Imperial Government, of civilising the native. It will perform this function by means of its own Christianity and its own Christian Western ideals of enlightenment and progress.

“To sum up the whole matter, Indians cannot in any true sense be identified with the British Commonwealth, or associated with its government in East Africa. Wherever Indians are found in Africa side by side with the British they are aliens. They are antagonistic in their ideals. They are repugnant to the White Race. This is not a question of temperate zones merely :—It refers to tropical zones as well. Indians can, in no sense, be regarded as a ‘Community of the British Commonwealth.’ Self-determination of the “communities of the British Commonwealth” rests with the European Government acting for Europeans. This position of the White Community, as the only ‘Community within the British Commonwealth’ possessing self-determining and representative powers, must not be prejudiced by giving any system of franchise to the Asiatic.”

This assumption,—that the White Community alone in Africa can represent the British Commonwealth, and that citizenship in that Commonwealth must never be extended beyond the White Race—this assumption, if once finally accepted and endorsed, would change the whole structure of the British Rule abroad and would throw back all the progress that has been made in constitutional reform for many generations. It would at once put the British dominions far behind the French in political advancement. What is far more serious, it would be a direct breach of charter after charter, treaty after treaty, and covenant after covenant. On the basis of these charters and treaties the British Commonwealth throughout the world has been built up. The Queen’s Proclamation of racial neutrality which brought peace after the Great Mutiny is only one example of such covenants between sovereign and people. Each sovereign, on coming to the throne, has repeated these covenants and on the faithful fulfilment of them to the very letter the stability of the whole structure of the British Constitution abroad depends.

India herself, within her own interior dominions, has gone forward for a century past, slowly but certainly, towards the

fulfilment of her great charters. In the last five years of the War the pace has been far more rapid. The reason for this has been that, in spite of all expectation of the enemy to the contrary, in spite of the dead-weight of subjection and disarmament which had enervated her manhood, in spite of a thousand hindrances of autocracy and racial domination, India when the time came gave with both hands all that was left to her, all she still possessed, to carry on the great struggle. She remained steadfast to the Allied Cause up to the end.

On the fields of Flanders and Gallipoli, in Mesopotamia and Palestine and in East Africa, Indian soldiers have fought under the British Flag as comrades and free men, not as slaves. All too late the King's own Commission has been given, but it *has* been given at last, to Indian Officers. India herself has been welcomed as a self-governing Nation of the British Commonwealth within the League of Nations, side by side with Australia and New Zealand, South Africa and Canada. The new era which all this represents has been proclaimed by His Majesty the King and the King's eldest son will inaugurate it on his coming visit to India.

It is strange indeed that at such an hour as this, when history is being made and the British Commonwealth throughout the world is starting upon a new career of progress, the members of the Nairobi Convention should be so out of touch with the spirit of the times that they should endeavour to limit the boundaries of that world-wide Commonwealth in which we live to the franchise of a single race. Nothing could be more out of harmony with all that the great War has been fought to achieve. On every side there has been a breaking down of racial barriers, not a building up. The tide is still flowing that way, in spite of the reaction which the exhaustion after the great struggle has caused.

What I ask of my fellow countrymen is a reconsideration of this Convention position with regard to the constitution and frame

work of the British Commonwealth. I feel certain that it was adopted in a time of unnatural tension without sufficient calmness of thought. Now that life has become more normal, I would urge that the whole problem of the Commonwealth be studied afresh thoroughly and closely in all its consequences and its bearings.

Before closing this chapter, I am obliged to refer to one more assumption made by the Nairobi Convention which is even more gravely serious in its consequences than that which has already been pointed out. The fact that it seems to have been made unconsciously tells me again of the strained and abnormal conditions under which the Resolutions were framed. I will try to explain it with perfect clearness.

If there is one thing more than any other that has differentiated the British Commonwealth abroad from other great European dominions of the past, it has been the pledge, faithfully given and undertaken, of complete religious neutrality. Only with such an understanding could vast countries containing many millions of Mohammedans, Buddhists, Hindus, and followers of other creeds (far outnumbering those professing the creed of the Sovereign himself) have been kept together, with the utmost loyalty, in a common allegiance.

Yet this Petition re : Indians of the Nairobi Convention of Associations advocates a policy for the Protectorate Government which would directly favour one special religion and would penalise others. That is to say, it openly demands a breach of religious neutrality on the part of Government.

This is the only meaning I can deduce from the clauses of the Petition which, for the sake of clearness, I will quote again in full at this point :—

“Whereas our National ideals of enlightenment and progress are crystallised in our Christian Western Civilisation and it is our duty to make sure that the best contained therein is readily available for the needs of awakening Africa.

And whereas these (Indian) people follow in all things a civilisation which is Eastern and in many respects repugnant to our own,

And whereas their social status brings them more frequently into contact with the African and thus subjects him to intimate personal influences antagonistic to the ideals of the West.”

The Petition re: Indians, goes on to demand that in consequence of these very things the Indian settlers should be excluded from East Africa, and the Protectorate should be made a close preserve for Christian Western Civilisation.

I have been told on good authority that the word “Christian” was deliberately added, after a prolonged discussion, to the petition re: Indians, and that it was at last accepted by all the representatives of the Associations. There can be no question that, as the petition now stands, in its final shape, this word “Christian” is emphatic and affects vitally the meaning. The presence of missionaries, to which special attention is drawn by the petition itself, gives point to the word “Christian” and makes clear the reason for its insertion. To paraphrase very briefly, it is because the Indians follow a mode of life which is not Christian, that their presence among the Africans is undesirable.

We find, then, that the Convention of European Associations of East Africa, claiming to represent not only the British Nation, but also the British Commonwealth throughout the world, has actually framed a Petition re: Indians asking for permission from the Imperial authorities to carry through a campaign of religious persecution of Indians in the name of Christianity. The ultimate aim in view is to drive the Indians out of Africa, because their religious beliefs embodied in their own civilization are antagonistic to the religious beliefs of the petitioners which are embodied in their own civilisation. After the deliberate insertion of the word “Christian” in the petition I do not see how there can be any logical escape from that interpretation. It is a policy which has always had a great fascination for the missionary propagandist and it would appear to me that the presence of the missionaries influenced the leaders of the Convention of Associations far more than they supposed and caused them to make this fatal blunder.

It hardly needs to be pointed out that any such breaches of religious neutrality under the British Constitution would be unthinkable. They would be a far more serious infraction of all treaties and treaty rights than the breach of racial neutrality referred to in a previous paragraph. The racial neutrality clauses in the different treaties have been always conditional: the words have been added to the treaties "as far as may be": what has been aimed at in all such covenants has been a hope for the future which must be steadily and persistently fulfilled. But the *religious* neutrality clauses have from the first been absolute and unconditional; and to any one who has studied constitutional history breaches of neutrality such as that which the Convention of Associations deliberately contemplates are absolutely and I would almost add the word ridiculously impossible. If a direct infraction of racial neutrality, destroying rights already won, would have serious consequences to the stability of the British Commonwealth established throughout the world, breaches of religious neutrality, if once put into practice, would shake it to its very foundations.

Again, as I look back at the special period when the Convention petition re: Indians was drawn up, the conviction becomes all the stronger that the constitutional blunders which have been committed by the Convention, have been due to the strained condition of men's minds directly after the war and to the impossibility, during such a period, of calm and collected thinking.

Now that the Government of the East Africa Protectorate and also the Imperial Government itself have repudiated the findings of the Economic Commission on the "Indian Question" and by so doing invalidated the position taken by the Convention of Associations, I have a great hope that the justice of the plea which I have made for a reconsideration of the whole position will be acknowledged and that an armistice will be called immediately to this internecine war between Indians and Europeans such as may ultimately be transformed into a settled and permanent peace.

CHAPTER III.**THE BISHOP OF ZANZIBAR.**

I have now reprinted, in full, with a slight running commentary of my own, the two documents recently published which are by far the most important on the "Indian Question." To repeat what I have said about them, for the sake of clearness, the Economic Commission Report has gained a semi-official sanction on account of its members having been appointed by the Government and its Chairman having been a high Government official. The latter accepted, without any qualifying Minute of Dissent, the findings of the Commission on the "Indian Question" and in this way undoubtedly compromised his own Government. The Convention of Associations' "Petition re: Indians" is of hardly less marked importance, because it represents the unanimous vote of all the European Associations of British East Africa assembled in Council. It also included on this special question the advice of four missionaries who were present.

We may take it for certain that both these documents were carefully considered and revised before they were finally published. It is true, as I have pointed out, that the whole issue was raised at a time of intense irritation and reaction after the Armistice was signed. But the conclusions were deliberate and there has been no sign as yet of any going back upon them.

In order to explain in a more personal and living manner the situation to those who have never visited East Africa and to give an individual character to the dry impersonal tone of the documents already quoted, I propose in this and the following chapters to quote the opinions of three of the most striking personalities in the country, men who stand outside Government circles altogether.

The first of these is the Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Zanzibar, whose evidence, though hostile, needs to be carefully weighed, because of the transparent sincerity of his character and his fearlessness in declaring to his countrymen unpalatable truths.

The second is Lord Delamere, who had formerly been regarded by the European Public as the Grand Old Man of East Africa. But, of late, he has come in for severe criticism because of what has had the appearance of flagrant profiteering in land transactions after the war.

The third is Major Grogan,—an author, an Irishman, and an orator of no mean repute,—who has been for many years past the “enfant terrible” of the East African Administration, constantly getting into hot water with Government for some outrageous statement.

The Lord Bishop of Zanzibar lives outside the East African Protectorate. He only came into the controversy because of Sir Theodore Morison’s ill-starred proposal, that the conquered German territory should be made into an Indian Colony. The Bishop’s own personal experience of Indians has been limited to Zanzibar and German East Africa.

I have mentioned already that Lord Delamere and Major Grogan acted together on both the Economic and the Convention Committees and took a leading part in the proceedings. They wield an immense influence in British East Africa and possess huge tracts of land, which they have obtained, directly or indirectly, from Government. Lord Delamere is stated, in the official records, to own 100,000 acres of pastoral and arable land. Major Grogan is recorded as having something between 200,000 and 300,000 acres,—chiefly of forest land. I am told, on good authority, that his entire holding in East Africa comes nearer to the second figure. Thus these two enterprising European settlers have lost no time in exploiting for their own purposes the land of their adoption. Lord Delamere is now busily engaged in

selling off a part of his property in blocks, on the instalment system, charging eight per cent. per annum on all unpaid instalments.

Though I have not been able to obtain any direct statement of Lord Delamere's in print, dealing with the Indian problem, I have a copy of a speech delivered on his behalf by Mr. W. C. Hunter when he was detained himself by illness. As Mr. Hunter was actually proposing at the time Lord Delamere's resolution, the words which he then spoke may be regarded as substantially what Lord Delamere would have said, if he had been well enough to be present.

The letter of the Bishop of Zanzibar, which I shall quote in this Chapter, appeared in the East African newspapers on Christmas Day, December 25th 1918. It was hailed at once with a chorus of approval by the press and the European public. It was regarded as a kind of "ex cathedra" Episcopal judgment passed upon the Indians for their many sins and vices. The Bishop was suddenly elevated into a protagonist in the drama that was being enacted.

So great an effect had this one letter on the public mind, that even a year later, wherever I tried to put forward a defence for the Indian position before my fellow-countrymen, I was confronted with the question,—“Have you read the Bishop of Zanzibar's letter”? The Editor of the *East African Standard*, in a leading article, suggested that, if I wished to get really reliable information on the Indians I should call at the Bishop's house and have a quiet talk with the Bishop of Zanzibar.

There was one result from its publication that was of great practical importance. The letter was published just at the time when the European Associations were deliberating concerning the Indian problem. His inflammatory words, at this juncture, became the staple of conversation throughout British East Africa at all Association Meetings. They influenced very materially the decisions of the Nairobi Convention, because they were regarded as endorsing the statements of the Missionaries who

were present, and as expressing the mind of the Christian Church on the whole subject. They must also have carried weight with the Economic Commissioners themselves, who were busy drafting their Final Report soon after the letter appeared in the Press.

The Bishop's letter read as follows :—

SIR,

Sir Theodore Morison, in his proposals for handing German East Africa over to the Indians, has done great injury both to the Empire at large, and to India in particular: he has harmed the Empire by recalling us to a consciousness of race-distinction when we needed to leave it behind us. And he has harmed India, by calling out from so many Indians approval of the scheme for the subjection of Africans at the very moment they are clamouring for their own precious, national right. He has unconsciously exposed the hollowness of Indian belief in Home Rule—or is Home Rule the private perquisite of countries spelt with an "I"?

If I may make a positive contribution to the solution of the question thus raised I would suggest that German East be an Imperial Colony in which no racial distinction shall be allowed. Let the distinction be drawn between Natives and Immigrants. Let the Government see to it that the Natives have the fairer field and the favour; protecting them against suits for recovery of all debts, the alienation of their land, and the injustice of so many employers of labour. Let undesirable immigrants of all races be excluded. But let all immigrants, who can assist the due development of the Colony, be received.

Indians, under this scheme, would bid against Europeans for German plantations. But the dumping of undesirables, Indian and European, would be illegal.

A Colony where colour was not recognised by Government would be of immense value to the Empire. The success of the experiment would, however, depend upon the Home Government of the Immigrants. Only the better men and women of each race could be allowed to share the experiment. For only by so doing can mutual respect and confidence be expected. And it goes without saying that there would be no kind of room for modern policies on the basis of race distinction. The immigrant would have one policy and one only, subject to the Guardians of Native interests. Cities of immigrants would be run for all by all.

May I now state a case against the proposal to place Africans under the rule of Indians?

1. The proposal is contrary to our pledge given to the small peoples of the world. We and our Allies are bound in honour to give freedom to all alike, as soon as may be. If then we carry the burden of Africa under our Imperial Flag, we do so in no spirit of conquest. We will administer the new colonies for the inhabitants; not for Europeans or Indians. Much less can we permit any one country within the Empire to acquire it as a peculiar possession.

2. If it be argued that Indians are Britishers, and may well be employed by the Empire to administer this new colony, I reply:—

- (a) The Africans too, are Britishers in the sense that Indians are.
- (b) The Africans have suffered for the Empire far more than have Indians in actual numbers, as well as in proportion to the populations of the two countries. If India deserves a colony as a reward, the Africans deserve to keep their own country.
- (c) We cannot yet trust one tribe of Indians to rule another tribe of Indians.
- (d) If Britishers require rewards in kind for loyal service, and if India must have Home Rule, let the Indians who served the Empire during War have the preference over all other Indians in the new schemes of self-government. Pay those who earned their pay but pay them at home.

3. Indians are at the moment exceedingly unpopular with Africans because of their gross conduct during the war. Their war-profits are an Imperial scandal. In German East, especially, have they won a reputation for greed and hardness of heart they will not easily lose. The Africans have in times of famine paid them almost their last piece, and pledged to them their hard-won crops, for the right to live. Must they now hand over their country and their freedom, a thanksoffering to India?

Sir, I am a Scot, but even I can see a joke here.

4. I am able to speak for several thousands of the literate Africans of German East, and without fear of contradiction I say that they entirely abhor the proposal. Is their opinion to be ignored?

5. Again, German East must be so governed as to give Africans the chance of filling all posts that lie within the competence of a well educated African.

No other policy will be approved by our Allies and America; no other policy will be permitted by our own Parliament: unless the facts are hidden away.

6. Once more. The Indians who have built up their trade on this coast are not all of one sort. There is a very large number of Indians on the East Coast and in the Islands who have won no respect at all from the Africans as a whole, and India must bear the consequence.

There are many Indians who, if they would, could learn much from Africans about sanitation and cleanliness. While there are not very many who could be relied upon to teach Africans the virtue of truthfulness or to rescue them from the vices of false-witness, bribery, and nepotism.

It is also a well-known fact that Africans who dodge the liquor laws, in respect of wine and spirits, mainly depend for their supplies upon natives of India.

7. The Indian "lust of possession," like that of the European, cannot be trusted side by side with supreme control of the Africans. In a few years' time every able-bodied African would be a serf to an Indian creditor. African land, tribal, village, or personal, would be the property of private Indian owners. And if legislation made transfer of title-deeds impossible, Indians would none the less enjoy the fruit of the land year in and year out.

We who have lived in Zanzibar know something of the Indian's dealings with less sophisticated people. Unlike Sir Theodore Morison, we have no stomach for the experiment of making India the Lord of Africa.

8. Again. Before this proposal is seriously considered, the British electors must be made acquainted with the relations existing between H.H. the Agha Khan and his followers.

Europeans see in His Highness a broad-minded Westernised Indian able to meet Europeans on their own ground, political, philosophical, and social. He can share with them to the full the life of the West. But to his own followers he is a divine Pope; infallible, autocratic, at all costs to be obeyed. He has a rightful claim over all they possess, by way of offerings. His absolute power has the highest sanction of all, the sanction of religious faith. And whatever power his followers receive in Africa will be in his own, personal use. He will dominate the Africans, through his followers. And he will continue to receive the religious offerings of those who venerate him.

Is it conceivable that, in the twentieth century, after shedding measureless blood, to save the world from autocracy, the British Empire will permit a semi-divine autocrat from India to share her task of ruling German East Africa? His Highness belongs to the age of

the deified Roman Emperors. He and his followers cannot act for a democratic Empire towards a small and young colony that is to be made free.

What with H.H. the Agha Khan and the Brahmins, India can compete with the Germany of yesterday in Kaiserism. Kaiserism without array truly : but Kaiserism based on religious faith : a brand that cannot be mixed with the liberty to which we are now fully pledged.

9. Lastly, the religious problem must be faced. We of German East are, generally speaking either Moslems or Christians.

And these rulers? Our Moslems know not the Agha Khan. Neither Moslems nor Christians will acknowledge a Hindoo : whom they regard as an idolator. While the "enlightened impartial" Arya Samaj, in its book called "Satyarth Prakash," is so offensively blasphemous about us all, that were the passages read aloud in Church or Mosque, a riot would most certainly ensue. Even an African Christian will refuse obedience to the Hindoo ruler who labels the Lord Christ an ignorant barbarian.

The real truth is that no Eastern, who is sincerely religious, can be impartial towards all religions ! His own religion is so wrapped up with his social and domestic life that he cannot for a moment escape from its peremptory claims. Impartiality in religion demands a social life common to all religions, apart from religious customs and sanctions. And this the East has not yet attained.

Personally, I advise her to keep her religion well mixed with her social life; and to leave Empire to us poor Westerns who are hard put to it to keep religion in touch with life at all. Western Christians, sincere followers of our Lord; have proved themselves impartial. Without such impartiality, no Empire can do God's will for the various races that go to make it. But in twenty years I have met no African or Indian keen of faith, whom I would trust to govern men of a religion he did not himself profess. As I have said, I do not regret that I have not met one. There are plenty of Westerns to do the actual job of ruling and judging. Let the Easterns fulfil as faithfully their own vocations, as useful, as honourable, and as meritorious.

Now, Sir, I have done. Pray shew kind indulgence to the inordinate length of this letter. And allow me to ask pardon if I seem to have said hard things. I have lived over twenty years in these parts; I have seen a good deal of both parties to the proposed colony, and as the Africans have not yet acquired the art of newspaper correspondence, I have dared to write on their behalf. What I have written

comes from my heart: a heart moved to its depths by Sir Theodore Morison's cold contempt for the Africans who have saved the Indians' life and property, wives and daughters, during the past four years.

I appeal to all Indians who sincerely love National freedom, and heartily admire self-sacrifice for the Empire, to separate themselves from this most selfish and criminal proposal.

For every Indian who, by his signature or vote, adheres to the Morison scheme, confesses thereby the moral right of England to hold India under an alien authority and surrenders his whole case for the gradual nationalisation of Indian Government.

Sir, let us at least be logical and sincere, even if we cannot easily be unselfish.

Yours, etc.,
FRANK ZANZIBAR,
Bishop's House, Zanzibar.

It need hardly be said that the earlier part of the Bishop's long letter, advocating equal treatment of Europeans and Indians in "German East," was left out of count by the Press and the European public. It was the second part of his letter, with its bitter, excited attack upon Indian character, which was eagerly taken up and approved.

To deal with certain sections of the Bishop's letter separately,—it is unfortunately true that a great deal of scandalous profiteering and money-making out of the illiterate Africans did go on unchecked during the War. The Indians were not the only ones to blame; nor was East Africa the only country where such profiteering occurred. When condemnation is pronounced, as it certainly should be, on the profiteers, it should be remembered, also, how many Indian merchants in the conquered German territory have been literally ruined by the War. When I visited Dar-es-Salaam, I was distressed to find the impoverished Indian merchants there. This is another side of the picture, which the Bishop would do well to examine before he passes such sweeping condemnations. It should not be

forgotten, also, that a deliberate campaign of vilification of the Indian in the eyes of the African native has been carried on by a large number of Europeans in British East Africa and in the conquered territory; and it has been in no way difficult to make the illiterate African believe that the Indian trader, with whom he deals, has been the cause of the high war prices.

With regard to the Bishop's fulmination against His Highness the Agha Khan, it is hardly necessary to take his words seriously. They shew an extraordinary ignorance of that section of the Khoja community, which acknowledges the Agha Khan as their leader,—and this after 20 years residence next door to them in Zanzibar. I have had the privilege, which the Bishop probably has not, of living as a guest of their families in different households of the community, both in South and East Africa, and while living among them, I have found how democratic the community is and how self-governing are its powers. The devotion to His Highness, the Agha Khan, which I saw, was mainly due to an intense belief in his enlightened leadership; and certainly the community, with its schools for girls as well as for boys, shews marks of that enlightenment. What, further, is their actual *religious* belief in (what the Bishop has named) the "semi-divine" powers of the Agha Khan, neither he nor I myself, as Christians, are likely to understand,—any more than my Khoja friends would be able to understand the religious nature of the "semi-divine" priestly power which the Bishop of Zanzibar believes in as a High Churchman of the Anglican Church.

In relation to the Arya Samaj the Bishop's attacks are hardly less violent than are his strictures upon the character of the Agha Khan. It is quite true that, in the Appendix to the "Satyarth Prakash," there are crude and mistaken statements about other religions which Swami Dayananda himself only very imperfectly understood,—sometimes through utterly unreliable and misleading translations of their scriptures. He never was a close student, for instance, of Christianity, as was the late Raja Ram Mohun Roy.

A large and important section of the Arya Samaj have wished for a long time past to withdraw these chapters of "Satyarth Prakash" out of circulation and to publish the constructive chapters only. These Arya Samaj leaders hold that at the time when Swami Dayananda wrote there were needed the downright, smashing blows of an iconoclast, in order to break the outer shell of age-long superstitions and idoltries with which the spirit of pure religion had become encrusted. They think that these chapters had a powerful effect then, but that their utility has now passed away.

One thing is historically certain. Swami Dayananda did not attack the superstitions of other religions first. He first attacked the idolatries of his own people. He was regarded as the deadly foe,—not of Christianity or Islam—but of the orthodox Hindu religion. It was against that orthodoxy that his chief controversies were waged. The rest were side issues, compared with this life-long struggle. In that struggle, he was so utterly fearless that his own life was constantly in danger; he was persecuted from city to city; he was obliged to abandon his own kith and kin; he was at last, in all probability, poisoned,—such bitter hatred was directed against him, because he would not acknowledge idol worship.

Such an absolutely fearless and devoted and sincere religious reformer, as Swami Dayananda Saraswati undoubtedly was in his own lifetime, was surely worthy of respect, rather than contempt, from the Bishop of Zanzibar. For the Bishop himself has been all his life a controversialist of no mean order in religious matters. He, like the Swami, has been recklessly outspoken concerning the truth, even against his own people. If Swami Dayananda Saraswati had been living to-day and the Lord Bishop of Zanzibar had met him in religious controversy, I am quite sure that the Bishop himself would have been the first to recognise the Swami's heroic and essentially virile character,—his hatred of all shams, and his love of truth itself. I cannot imagine the two men parting from one another, after their con-

troversy was over, without a sincere mutual regard.

I would add one word concerning my own position. I am certain that, in the present changed conditions, the leaders of the Arya Samaj Movement are right in wishing to retain in circulation only the earlier constructive portions of the "Satyarth Prakash" and to omit in future editions the controversial chapters of the Appendix.

With regard to the Arya Samaj Movement as a whole, the Bishop is strangely out of date and out of touch. I wish that he could have been present on a recent occasion, when I was invited, as a Christian, by the Arya Samaj leaders of the Bishop's own city of Zanzibar to speak in their Arya Samaj Mandir and from their own pulpit. We had with us, at this remarkable religious gathering, Musulmans, Sikhs, Hindus, Parsis, as well as Christians; and I do not think that any single person felt his own faith compromised by such a brotherly gathering. In India itself, and among Indians in Africa also, the old idea of religious segregation and exclusion is rapidly passing away. In its place, the spirit of brotherhood and unity is everywhere increasing. This religious spirit of brotherhood has been extended not only to all creeds, but to all races. The Bishop himself, who deploras the racial spirit in the West, will understand the significance of such a religious unity as this that I have mentioned. The East is teaching the West in this matter in our own times, and not vice versa.

To give one instance only of the new spirit which is prevailing India—the great leader of the Arya Samaj Movement in Northern India, Swami Shraddhananda, was recently invited by the universal acclamation of the Musulmans in Delhi, not only to enter the Jama Masjid, but actually to speak from the *Mimber*. The audience of more than 20,000 people was composed of Hindus as well as Musulmans. The Hindus had been invited into the Mosque itself to join in religious worship. As Swami Shraddhananda spoke from the *Mimber* of the great Mosque on brotherhood and unity, the whole vast audience was so deeply moved that they

broke through the hatreds and enmities of centuries in a moment of time. Hindus and Musulmans, within the Mosque itself, embraced one another as brothers. They went together to their homes and drank out of the same vessels and shared the same common food. This was their sacrament of unity.

Similar incidents have been taking place during the last year in every part of India. The President of the Arya Samaj meeting in Zanzibar referred to them in his opening speech and stated truly that the same spirit of brotherhood and unity prevailed among Indians in East Africa. As for the truth of what he said, I can bear personal testimony. I have spoken in every kind of sacred religious building, belonging to the different religions, and on each and every occasion Indians of all religions were present and were welcomed as they were welcomed in Zanzibar.

The Bishop has pointedly referred in his letter to the Kaiserism of the Hindu-Brahmins. If he can find a trace of that Brahminism in East Africa to-day, still retaining its old tyrannous autocracy unimpaired, he will have seen more than I have seen, though I looked for it with keen eyes. And in India itself, which moves very slowly at first but like an avalanche later on, the Bishop cannot even remotely understand how Brahminism, in its despotic aspect has been defeated. His words read to me like those of a person who is moving in another world of experience than that in which my life in India is passed. He has spoken of the democratic movement in the West caused by the great War. But I wonder whether the effects of this world convulsion upon India will not be more remarkable and more permanent—more permanent, because religious rather than political?

The real living Kaiserism, which I have found in Africa, is in little groups of Europeans from the West trying to keep the races in subjection and to refuse to give them any power. What, for instance, could be more unashamed Kaiserism than the Convention Petition re Indians to the Secretary of State? One

section runs as follows :—

“That the (European) position should not be prejudiced
 “by giving any system of franchise to Asiatics, nor by
 “allowing them to acquire land in townships except on
 “short leases, nor by the employment of Asiatics in
 “Government works and that steps should be taken to
 “restrict Asiatic immigration in order that this strong-
 “hold of European civilisation in Central Africa may
 “stand beside her sister colonies in their Asiatic Policy.”

If the Bishop is in earnest in seeking to attack Kaiserism as a living, and not as a rapidly dying force, in the world, he should attack it, here in this religion of Racialism which is being preached all over Africa to-day. Surely he can see that this must inevitably lead to another great world struggle, if not checked in time. I speak about this with intense pain at heart, because my own Christian faith, in Africa, appears to have become itself infected with the plague.

I shall deal with certain of the more general accusations brought against Indians by the Bishop's letter when the whole question of the position of the Indian in East Africa is discussed later in this book. At this point, I would only state that in the speeches which I have delivered at many different places I have tried to sound the clearest note of warning concerning the danger of what is called in East Africa “Making money out of the Native.” I can see with open eyes how terribly real that danger is in dealing with a people steeped in ignorance and only just emerging out of the savage state. I have myself felt that this money making spirit has deeply infected the Indian Community as well as the European population. I have condemned this spirit utterly, wherever I have found traces of its presence. There can be few things more mean and cowardly and cruel than to take advantage of ignorance and simplicity and helpless weakness in order to make money out of it. I can, however, state in this matter from my own experience that I have been struck everywhere by the kindly and almost chivalrous treatment, that

the Indian, who is in a superior position, gives to the Africans who are serving under him. I could not have wished, for instance, to have seen anything better than the treatment on the estate of the Hon. Abdul Rasul Allidina Visram near Jinja. I have also had daily experience,—by always living with Indians in Indian houses,—of their domestic treatment of servants and dependents. Again I can bear witness that I have never once been pained by any act of harshness committed by an Indian on any African. “Friendliness” is the one word that best expresses all that I have seen. There is absolutely no race feeling. It does not seem even to exist. It is quite easy to see that the African feels this friendliness on the part of the Indian. He is less aloof from the Indian than from the European. This is naively admitted in the Convention Petition as follows :—

“That whereas the social status of the Indians brings
 “them more frequently into contact with the African
 “and thus subjects him to intimate personal influences.”

It is these “intimate personal influences” which make the Indian relationship with the African so much more human than that of the European.

But when all this is said,—and it needs to be said very strongly in the face of the utterly false picture of the Indian relation to the African, which is being advertised as a part of the Anti-Asiatic propaganda in Africa to-day,—there still remains the fact that “money-making” is the one great danger of the Indian, from his very position in East Africa, and it will remain so till that position itself is radically altered.

For the only way to overcome this besetting evil is to open out to the Indians, as widely as possible, other avenues of life besides those of huckstering and bargaining and petty trading. What is needed is to give Indians, everywhere, free access to the land,—not to segregate the land for Europeans; to give Indians full responsibilities and rights of citizenship,—not to segregate these rights for the Europeans; to offer Indians, in every pro-

fession, opportunities for the exercise of their high intellectual gifts,—not to segregate these posts for the Europeans.

There is one very striking historical parallel to the Indian situation in British East Africa which has constantly been present to my mind. The Jews were originally a liberal and open-hearted people with exceptionally kindly laws and customs with regard to the poor, the fatherless, the widow and the stranger within their gates. These laws were a religious duty most scrupulously performed. But when, in the Middle Ages, the Jews were treated as outside the pale of European civilisation, except in business, then they naturally gained the character of usurers. They were driven to this, not because they liked it, but because every other avenue of life was closed to them.

Let the Bishop of Zanzibar,—whose word now carries such weight with the Europeans in East Africa concerning Indians,—denounce in his own most forceful way the ever-increasing cruelty of racial segregation. Let him urge for British East Africa, that breaking down of racial barriers which he so nobly advocated (in the first part of his letter) for the conquered German territory. If he will take up strongly this Christian position and carry it through, he will do far more to conquer the sin of usury among Indians than by merely denouncing acts of usury when he comes across them.

With regard to the conquered territory itself the Bishop of Zanzibar should know clearly that his whole letter was founded on a mistaken impression about Indian leaders. As far as my own personal knowledge goes, not a single responsible Indian leader took up with any enthusiasm Sir Theodore Morison's proposal to make the conquered German territory into an Indian Colony. A deputation, which came over from Zanzibar and British East Africa to put forward the proposal, was, on this point, quite coldly received. Sir Theodore Morison's idea fell altogether flat and was not taken up. The greatest Indian leader of all,—whose authority among Indians on African affairs is final,—Mahatma Gandhi, condemned the proposal openly.

All these things need widely to be known; for I find that entirely false impressions are still abroad.

I wish to identify myself with the Bishop in the indignation he has expressed that Sir Theodore Morison should have made his cold-blooded proposal, entirely over the heads of the Africans themselves and without any consultation with regard to their wishes. If Indians had greedily swallowed the bait which Sir Theodore Morison offered, it would have been indeed a tragedy. It would have been the first blot of this kind on the reputation of their country. For India has never once in her past history been seized with the lust of foreign aggression. Her record in that matter is marvellously clean and pure and bloodless. And, as a self-governing nation she will keep that record unstained and undefiled.

In conclusion, I would make a plea to Indian leaders, who may read the Bishop's letter now for the first time, that they should feel the genuine sincerity of the Bishop himself and understand the provocation under which it was hastily written. He has never failed to rebuke vice in the European with all fearlessness on behalf of the African people whom he loves. If therefore he tells us, even with the exaggeration of a weak moment of excitement, that things have been wrong with the Indians in German East Africa: that there has been gross profiteering on the part of many Indian traders who have taken advantage of famine conditions during the War to squeeze money and get land: that thousands of literate Africans have received bad impressions of Indians in consequence; we may discount as much as we feel to be necessary, but we should not lightly dismiss his charges. Whatever truth there may be at the back of them, let us acknowledge it frankly and take steps to put matters right. For in African matters, we start always with this one postulate, —Europeans and Indians alike have only one valid ground for remaining in East Africa and that is the goodwill of the African himself.

CHAPTER IV.

LORD DELAMERE.

THE opinion expressed by Lord Delamere and Major Grogan, very nearly at the same time as the Bishop of Zanzibar's letter, are clearly akin both in form and substance to the conclusions of the Economic Commission and the Nairobi Convention. They betray, even on the surface, their resemblance to both documents and their spirit is the same.

Lord Delamere's opinions, as given by his lieutenant the Hon. Mr. W. C. Hunter, are couched in polite language. Major Grogan's words are brutally plain-spoken. Behind both utterances the same unconstitutional position, which the Nairobi Convention adopted, is assumed. The same false postulates are made with regard to the British Commonwealth and its ideals. The same breach of religious neutrality is advocated, with an extraordinary ignorance of what such a course would imply to the Empire as a whole. The same racially arrogant position with regard to the "white race" is taken up.

I shall give Lord Delamere's statement of his position first and comment upon it. In the extract taken from the *East African Standard* it runs as follows:—

The following motion against Lord Delamere's name was proposed by the Hon. Mr. W. C. Hunter:—"Sir, in the unavoidable absence, through illness, of Lord Delamere, I beg to propose the following motion:—

"That, notwithstanding the great services rendered to the Empire by India during the war, this honourable Council dissents from the views which have been put forward that the territory hitherto known as German East Africa should become an Indian Colony.

"That while sympathising with India's ambition to obtain a degree of self-government in India, this Honourable Council considers that the interests of the African demand that he should be given the opportunity, which Indian competition denies, of filling the subordinate posts under European supervision which technical education and contact with European civilization qualify him to fill."

"In proposing this motion I should like to express my very deep regret that the Right Hon. Lord Delamere, in whose name the motion was put forward, is unavoidably absent to-day, because, I know that this is a question on which he has bestowed a great deal of thought and on which he would have spoken with far greater effect than I.

"I should like in the first place to draw special attention to the wording of this motion and especially to that part of it which fully recognises the great services rendered by India during the war. No thinking man can fail to realise the magnitude of these services, and so far as I am concerned in what I have to say on this motion, I speak with the fullest sympathy with Indian aspirations in India; and with moderation and patience on the part of the Indian peoples, these aspirations will in course of time be fulfilled.

"But, sir, the case of Africa in connection with India is entirely different. You have, in my opinion, two main points to consider.

"The first point is that the British Empire comprising though it does many creeds and many races, stands for Christianity and for Western Civilisation. In Africa the task of the Empire is the gradual uplifting of the native inhabitants by contact with the Civilisation of the West and not the imposition of the Civilisation of the East. Western ideals and Western precepts, as vindicated by the Great Struggle now happily nearly concluded, are and must remain the guiding forces which those responsible for Imperial policy (whilst respecting as in the past other creeds and other ideals) must always seek to serve. And in my opinion, it would be a breach of trust to allow any part of East Africa to come under other than Western influence. This question must be looked at from the broad point of view; and, as I have already stated, the preponderant force of the British Empire is the Civilisation of the West.

"The second point involves the economic interest of the African races. No one who has lived in Africa for some years can fail to be impressed by the great potentialities of these native races.

"In the mass, uncivilised and uneducated, it is to me a constant source of amazement with what aptitude and with what intelligence the African Native, under European supervision, fills some of the needs of industrial organisation; particularly in work which involves mechanical training.

"I recognise fully that the education of the natives as a whole can only be very gradual and that they cannot hope to begin at a point to which it has taken Western Civilisation hundreds of years to attain. Gradually the native must be taught the value and the benefit of work,

and my own view is that manual labour is what he must be taught, and that, with exceptions for which provision should certainly be made, only by long painful stages can he appreciate and make use of a literary education in its higher sense.

“It is in connection with the progress of the natives in manual work, and particularly in the work of the skilled artisan, that I think the native is even now prejudiced by Indian immigration into East Africa, and will be still more prejudiced unless it is properly controlled. Many natives show a remarkable aptitude for technical trades as smiths, carpenters, masons, engine drivers, mechanics, etc., etc., but in this country when such work is often undertaken by Indian artisans, (some of whom are by no means trained as they ought to be) the native does not get as full opportunities of development as he ought. It is my belief that in course of time African natives can fill all the needs of industry in this connection, and I say that they ought to be given the fullest possible scope and should not be permanently subjected to the competition of the Indian immigration. Cases are not infrequent where Indians have refused to work, if natives are admitted to the freemasonry of skilled labour. That the native needs supervision is of course obvious; but that supervision,—the British Empire being what it is,—should be Western and not Eastern.

“Therefore, sir, with fullest possible respect for Indian aspirations, it is my firm belief that this Honourable Council ought to support the motion now before it and should affirm with no uncertain voice its unanimous opinion, that the territory hitherto known as German East Africa ought not to be allowed to become an Indian Colony.”

With regard to the question raised as to whether the Indian in Africa does or does not stand in the way of the African's advancement in mechanical and other forms of work,—I shall write later. Here, I wish to draw attention to the same issue that was raised by the Nairobi Convention resolutions.—For the sake of perfect clearness this issue may be stated once more as follows:—

Has the Proclamation of Religious and Racial Neutrality first given by Queen Victoria and repeated by every sovereign since, been all the while a clever and convenient piece of stage management, meant to deceive? Or is it the most vital and necessary factor in the whole constitution of the British Government, on account of which, and which alone, a small Island in the

North Sea has been permitted,—more by consent than by force of arms,—to assume control over one-sixth of the land surface of the globe and one-fourth of the world's population?

The principle of Religious and Racial Partiality is advocated by Lord Delamere and the Hon. Mr. W. C. Hunter as follows,—I give their exact words:—

“The British Empire stands for Christianity and Western Civilisation.

“In Africa the task of the Empire is the gradual up-lifting of the native inhabitants by contact with the Civilisation of the West and not the imposition of the Civilisation of the East.

“Western ideals and Western precepts are and must remain the guiding forces which those responsible for the Imperial policy must always seek to serve.

“It would be a breach of trust to allow any part of East Africa to come under other than Western influence.

“The preponderant force of the British Empire is the Civilisation of the West.”

I will add, at this point, one passage from Major Grogan. He says:—

“It is our Western Civilisation that we are imposing in principle, on the African native and adapting in particular to his or our needs. I am not prepared here to argue that our Western Civilisation is superior to the fundamentally distinct Civilisation of the East. The issue is, that, for good or ill, we are imposing ours.”

These sentences are very tersely put. They sum up a great deal of loose thinking that is everywhere floating about at the back of people's minds all over British East Africa. They are the stock arguments brought forward by Europeans at almost every discussion on the “Indian Question.”

Again and again, I have found myself obliged to go over the same ground and to point out that Religious Neutrality is not like a glove that can be put on or taken off at will, but a fundamental principle of the British Commonwealth; that racial neutrality,

again, is a definite pledge of our King Emperor which has to be realised as far as possible in action.

Let us consider, by means of two concrete examples, what these vague phrases about the British Empire "standing for Christianity and Western Civilisation," and about our duty to "impose Western Civilisation" on other people really imply, if carried out in practice.

(i) We have to count, first of all, roughly speaking, within the British Commonwealth, 120,000,000 Musalmans,—reckoning, in one calculation, Nigeria, Egypt, Soudan, Aden, Somaliland, East Africa, Zanzibar, Malaya, etc., together with the immense body of 70,000,000 Musalmans in India itself.

Is it our duty to impose Western Civilisation on these? Would it be a "breach of trust" to allow any part of Africa to come under their Eastern influence? Is it the Imperial policy to seek to serve the guiding forces of purely Western ideals and Western precepts in relation to these 120,000,000 Eastern people, who have absolutely trusted our good faith and honour not to disturb their religion? Does the British Empire "stand for Christianity and Western Civilisation" in respect to all these 120,000,000 Musalmans?

These many millions of Musalmans gave themselves freely in the late war, sacrificing much to the British cause, because under British rule they had been able to exercise perfect freedom in their religion and to propagate Islam as a religious duty whenever and wherever they wished to do so. Now that the great war is over, are we to say to them :—

"The British Empire, which you have helped to defend, is in future to be kept as a close preserve for Christianity and Western Civilisation. It is these for which the British Empire stands, not for your ideals and precepts. We have been cheating you all the while with empty phrases about religious neutrality. We are not neutral at all. We are out to spread Western ideals. Western precepts; and the chief of these are to be found in the Christian religion for which as an Empire we stand."

(ii) We have in India, roughly speaking 240,000,000 Hindus, who are perhaps the most religious people on the face of the earth. They have rejoiced hitherto in a toleration and protection of their Hindu religion and in a freedom to exercise it on all occasions and to propagate its principles, which has made them willing to accept the British Raj. Being an intensely religious people, this full religious liberty has reconciled them more than anything else to acknowledge with heart loyalty, as their King-Emperor, a foreigner in a far-off Island whom very few of them have ever seen. They have relied, at all times, in matters of religion on the good faith of this foreign Emperor who has pledged his word to observe religious neutrality in his government of all his subjects.

These many millions of Hindus have also, side by side with Musalmans, paid their toll in death and sacrifice during the great war. Now when the war is over, if there is the slightest breach in their Emperor's word of honour, which had pledged their religious freedom, their allegiance would be outraged and violated worse than that of Belgium—for this would be a religious violation, while that was political.

Yet the whole trend of Lord Delamere's argument implies a direct breach of religious and racial neutrality : a direct favouring of Christianity and the white Christian race : a direct penalising of Hinduism and Islam and of Hindu and Islamic peoples within the Empire. There can be no other meaning than this in the phrases used as to the duty of imposing Western Civilisation and excluding Eastern Civilisation from the British Empire in Africa. "The issue is,—," says Major Grogan, speaking of the two civilisations, "the issue is, for good or ill, we are imposing *ours*." And in order to impose it effectively, Indian immigration is to be restricted and every legal means employed to drive Indians out of Africa back to their own land.

I can easily understand the answer being given that India can go on as it likes and have as much religious and racial neutrality as it likes, but all these phrases are really meant to be

applied only to the African; that it was the African native upon whom the Christianity and Western Civilisation were to be imposed.

Let us then work out this problem by itself. I would ask the question,—Where is the line to be drawn in Africa? There are some 40,000,000 African Musalmans,—what is to be done with them? Are all these millions of Africans to have the Western ideals, which include the Christian ideals, imposed upon them by Government, or is it only the pagan Africans that are meant?

If it is only the pagan Africans that are meant, then what about Mohammedan propaganda? Is that to be allowed? Surely not, for we are told :—

“It would be a breach of trust to allow any part of East Africa to come under other than Western influence.” If this means anything at all, it means that it would be a betrayal on the part of the East African Protectorate Government to allow any further spread of Islam in East Africa.

There is yet another statement, which reads as follows :—
 “Western ideals and Western precepts are and must remain the guiding forces which those responsible for the Imperial policy *must always seek to serve.*”

Quite obviously the East African Protectorate Government is directly responsible for the Imperial policy. Western ideals and Western precepts include Christianity. We are told expressly that the British Empire stands for Christianity and Western ideals. It follows therefore, that the Government of East Africa must seek to serve those guiding forces, which are Christian and Western, here in Africa. It equally follows that the Government must not seek to serve the guiding forces that are Islamic and Eastern. We come to the same position, namely, that according to Lord Delamere’s argument, the East African Government cannot be neutral in matters of race and religion. It must at all times preserve the prestige of the white man’s race and the white man’s religion.

When once this position is taken up, the conclusion inevitably follows that the Government may use all the forces of the Empire (Musalman and Hindu troops included) in order to carry out in East Africa the expansion of the white race and the propagation of the Christian religion among the pagan Africans. It follows also that those Eastern peoples, such as the Indians, who have already entered this "stronghold of European Civilisation" called East Africa, must be compelled to leave; or, if they cannot be repatriated, they must be prevented from holding any position that might influence the white Government of the Protectorate, either through the franchise, or by holding landed property, or through departmental service. All these things must be withheld from Indians as much as possible, because the entire guiding and directing policy of the Government must be purely Western.

Coming as I did from the outside, this intolerance of race and religion, which I have found rampant in British East Africa, has appeared to be the strangest travesty of the British Commonwealth that I have ever met in any part of the world, not even excluding that strange phenomenon which I found in the Boer States. For in the Transvaal, the issue was kept strictly on political lines, however harsh and crude. Here, religion has entered into politics, and a combination of forces has resulted which lends itself all too readily to cant and hypocrisy.

Each fresh study of the ultimate ground-work of the British Commonwealth, both in theory and practice, has made it more abundantly clear to me that racial and religious neutrality are the pillars on which it stands; that the policy of racial and religious partiality is certain to lead to destruction.

The criticism may naturally be made by those of my readers who are not living in British East Africa, that I have laboured at far too great length over a perfectly obvious point. But the truth is this, that in Africa it is just these obvious points which are being challenged and disputed and circumvented at the present crisis of its history. There is scarcely a single ideal of freedom and toleration and impartial treatment that is not being called

in question, in Africa, to-day. The old enthusiasms appear to have vanished, and the hard selfishnesses seem to be coming in to fill their place.

General Smuts, in a recent speech on "The Future of South and Central Africa," delivered in London, made this gloomy forecast :—

"Central Africa," he said, "shows signs everywhere of a past civilisation. Rhodesia also shows signs of former civilised life. Where are those civilisations now? They have all disappeared, and barbarism once more rules over the land, and makes the thoughtful man nervous about the white man's future in South Africa. There are many people in South Africa,—and not foolish people either—who do not feel certain that our white experiment will be a permanent success."

What General Smuts has here stated in his own arresting way, has been said, in some form or other, by almost every thoughtful European whom I have met and talked with in Africa. I have not found even one, as far as my own limited experience goes, who has been even moderately at ease concerning "the white experiment."

On the one hand, on every side there is a great fear about the European race. "Africa plays havoc with the white man," is a phrase I remember being used by an elderly government official who had seen West Africa as well as East.

On the other side of the picture, there is a great and increasing fear concerning the effect of the white race upon the African himself. There have been such terrible scourges,—slavery, the gin traffic, the forced labour, the rubber scandals of the Congo,—each of which have destroyed or enfeebled whole populations. But more insidious even than these has been the gradual dissolution of tribal life and morality by commercial and land and mining exploitation on an enormous scale. "We are destroying every day," said one, who knew intimately the problem. "We are pulling down, we are not building up."

It seems an impertinence, where such age-long difficulties abound to make any personal comment or suggestion after so short an experience. But just because I have come freshly up against the situation from the outside, after long years spent in the East pondering over racial questions, there are certain things that immediately strike the mind. And the chief thing of all is this, that in East Africa the "white experiment" is being attempted under such unnatural conditions of race segregation—each race needing separate water-tight compartments for fear of human contact—that humanity itself is becoming distorted. For human nature cannot possibly be treated on the cattle-pen system. Life, in such a case, gets out of perspective,—bizarre, grotesque, artificial, and ugly in the extreme. And to bring up little children in such an unnatural atmosphere is the cruelest of all educations.

One thing is certain,—the British Rule, which helped so materially to abolish, in Africa, slavery and other evil things, did stand out clearly and unmistakably in the past for equal treatment between man and man. But to-day there are thousands of British citizens of the Empire who have frankly abandoned any such idea of equal treatment and speak only of the "White Race." And because the Indian has dared to suggest that, owing to his intellectual powers and sobriety of life, he may claim equal treatment with the "White Race," as between man and man, for that very reason he has become hated and despised, insulted at every turn and bullied out of the country.

Now that military power, such as never in all history was wielded before, has come into British hands at the end of the war, temptation to use that power, in order to brush away hastily any difficulties, or to bring about any arbitrary changes that suit the fancy of the moment, or to eliminate any seemingly insoluble factors, is very great.

In Africa, with its enthusiasms at such a low ebb and its selfishnesses rising on so high a tide, the temptation is even greater than elsewhere. It will depend mainly on the present

generation of Englishmen, who have come through the great struggle of the war and have survived, whether those primary principles of freedom and fairness, for which the war was ostensibly fought, will be maintained, or whether the purely commercial and selfish view of life will take their place.

CHAPTER V.

MAJOR GROGAN.

IN Major Grogan, we come across one of the most interesting personalities in East Africa at the present time,—a man of marked genius, who might have made a brilliant writer, if he had desired to become a man of letters; or an orator of a very high order, if he had given himself to politics in the home country; but whom an insatiable thirst for adventure drove out to Africa, when he was still at College, and has never from that day to this allowed to rest. His feat in getting through from Capetown to Cairo has been recorded in a book, which contains the following characteristic preface by Cecil Rhodes, dated from Government House, Buluwayo, September 7th, 1900:—

MY DEAR GROGAN,

I am sorry to say that literary composition is not one of my gifts, my correspondence and replies being conducted by telegrams. I must say, I envy you, for you have done that which has been for five centuries the ambition of every explorer, namely, to walk through Africa from South to North. The amusement of the thing is that a youth from Cambridge during his vacation should have succeeded in doing that which the ponderous explorers of the world failed to accomplish. There is a distinct humour in the whole thing. It makes me the more certain that we shall complete the telegraph and railway; for surely I am not going to be beaten by the legs of a Cambridge undergraduate."

The same man who as an undergraduate accomplished such a remarkable feat of hardihood and endurance, has now reached middle age and commands an extraordinary influence over European public opinion in East Africa. His superlative courage has made him all through his life, reckless of personal danger, and his eccentricity of temper has led him into wild acts, for which he has had to suffer, but which have made him all the more extravagantly popular with his supporters. While it is important to note how this side of his character has marked him out for an adventurous and romantic career, there has been mingled with it the very worst characteristic that African life produces (which is not romantic at all, but fundamentally brutal and cynical), namely, an intolerant spirit towards other races which seems to make him absolutely regardless of their personal feelings.

A phrase which comes in an early chapter of his book, tells its own tale and sticks in the mind,—“the slouching, coarse insolence of the hideous African.” This phrase is not less but rather more offensive, because it is introduced in a comparison which he makes with the gentlemanly bearing of the Sikh. One feels instinctively that the man who could invent that description,—“the slouching, coarse, insolence of the hideous African,”—and use it and publish it as a summary condemnation of a whole people, would not be a safe person to be let loose with a rifle in Central Africa: and many incidents of shooting, which are recorded, with an air of satisfaction, in the later pages of the book, confirm that instinctive feeling. The native African appears, to the author, to be scarcely a human being with natural human feelings at all.

The incident which set Captain Grogan (as he then was) on a pinnacle of fame, among his many European admirers in East Africa, was the flogging, with his own hands, before the door of the court house, and in spite of the protest of the Magistrate, of two African servants who had been quite wrongfully accused of an assault upon two white women and had been acquitted. What

really happened and was proved in open court, was that one of the servants had tried to make the two ladies, who were in a Rickshaw, understand that they should lean back instead of forward, and in doing so had touched the arm of one of them. This was exaggerated into an assault, and when the Magistrate refused to convict in the case, it was made the ground for this act of lynching in which Captain Grogan took the principal part.

Captain Grogan was convicted and the Colonists' Association immediately complained by telegram very loudly on his behalf to the Secretary of State, and asked for a Commission to be appointed. The Secretary of State in refusing the Commission wrote in his Despatch as follows :—

“The contention of the defendants was that the flogging was justified because the natives had been guilty of insulting white women, *e.g.* the defendant Bowker expressed himself as follows :—

“As it has always been the first principle with me to flog a nigger on sight who insults a white woman, I felt it my bounden duty to take the step I did, and that in a public place as a warning to the natives.”

“I fully appreciate the importance attached by the white settlers to the protection of their wives and families from insult and assault. But I have to point out that the law provides most severe penalties for such offences. Moreover, it appears from your telegram of the 3rd ultimo, that the insult alleged was of the most trivial character, and involved no indecency.

“The place and circumstances of flogging in front of the Court House and in spite of the protest of the Magistrate make it clear that it was intended to be a deliberate defiance of settled order and government, and the offenders were fortunate in not being convicted on the more serious charges of riot and assault on a public officer. The conduct of the defendant Fichat, who appears from the evidence to have deliberately spread a report that white women had been indecently assaulted, well knowing

it to be false, cannot be too strongly reprobated. No doubt many persons were thus led to take part in the assembly who would not have done so if the true facts had been known to them.

“With regard to the telegraphic message from the Colonists’ Association, I see no ground for saying that the prosecution of the offenders to this case was a political one, unless there is a party in Nairobi which advocates as a policy the indiscriminate flogging of natives for trivial offences without trial; and the question whether many of the Europeans present at the flogging were armed or not does not materially affect the gravity of the offence committed. I see no reason, therefore, for appointing a Commission to enquire into the circumstances of the flogging, which are in other respects sufficiently established by the evidence given at the trial.

“The fears of a native rising which induced some of those who took part in the flogging to demand arms and ammunition for their protection do not appear to have had any foundation. I am bound to observe, however, that the commission of such flagrant acts of lawlessness and injustice as those of which the defendants in this case have been found guilty is the surest way to provoke an outbreak.”

It has been worth while quoting Lord Elgin’s despatch almost in full, though the incident happened sometime ago and does not directly bear on the case of the Indians themselves. For it shows with remarkable distinctness the environment in which the life of Indians is passed in British East Africa. It also reveals the temperament of Major Grogan, who has been, if one may make a safe conjecture, more responsible than any other man for inspiring and possibly drafting the final conclusions on the “Indian Question” both of the Economic Commission and the Nairobi Convention. Still further it explains clearly the immense powers which the settlers themselves wield,—either with the law or without the law,—and how forcefully they make their will obeyed. In this special case, Lord Elgin proved himself a

strong Secretary of State and upheld British justice. But Secretaries of State and Governors and Chief Secretaries of Government are not always strong and independent men. Again and again, in East Africa, one feels that the settlers have forced the administration into a line of policy which they did not wish to take. The whole aspect of the "Indian Question" at the present time bears that appearance. The main anxiety for the Indians is whether the Government will prove strong enough to resist the pressure of the European settlers, or whether it will give way under that pressure.

The words of Major Grogan, which I shall now quote, were uttered on a famous occasion when the new Governor, Sir Edward Northey, immediately after his arrival, having been invited to a public dinner, was lectured at for two hours in a speech by Major Grogan himself, who dictated to the new Governor in a hectoring manner exactly what the settlers expected him, as Governor, to do on every point of policy. The impertinence of such a speech, at such a time, was only equalled by its length. The fragment of his speech concerning Indians has been reported in the press as follows :—

Major Grogan referred to the Indian question as being the most urgent of the lot, but he pointed out that it had been forced upon the Europeans by the Indians themselves. It was not likely that British people would submit to the rule of inferior people (Hear, hear). There might be a few decent and intelligent Indians in the country, but no more.

He said : "If they base their claim on what the Indian has done in this war, I dispute it, sir. I believe, they contributed one hundred and fifty stretcher bearers, certainly some have given one-tenth of one per cent. of their profiteering profits. When we were on the War Council and were given authority to compel Indians to take part in this campaign, I think, we selected something like twenty Indians. Now almost without exception these gentlemen burst into tears; they all pleaded incapacity, an aged parent, etc., etc., and such as were selected went back to Mombasa, where some deliberately contracted venereal disease to escape Military obligations. If that is their claim to obtain control of the position in Africa it is wonderful.

“No English cabinet has the right to settle this problem, because, if you once establish a precedent, there will be no possible line of demarcation. The right to take part in the business of the country is a general right, and everyone—Indian or otherwise—must be so entitled. But give the Indian participation in the control of the country, and before you know where you are the vast majority of control will have passed over to a race that has never been able to govern itself, much less anybody else. The Union of South Africa has definitely closed the front door to Indians. We are the guardians of the back door, and I say that no man, until this matter has been decided in full Council, not only in the Union of South Africa, Nigeria, Sudan, and Nyasaland, I say, no man has the right to establish a precedent which is going to make it difficult for any of those other countries. (Cheers). That it is a difficult position we all realise, and sympathise with you in the task you have before you, sir, but I think it is only right—English that we should state to you unequivocally, definitely what our views are.” (Applause).

It is difficult to speak in measured terms about the indecency of such an attack on Indian courage, as this made by Major Grogan, directly after the war was ended. I have heard from a young English political officer the account of an Indian regiment which was ambushed on the shores of Lake Victoria Nyanza and was decimated before the order for retreat could be given. It waited for the order and came back under heavy gun fire in perfect line formation, without a single man hurrying. “I saw it with my own eyes,” he told me, “and it was magnificent. A crack British regiment from home could not have behaved more admirably.”

It is surely things like these that should be remembered after the great war, not stories picked up from the gutter. Even if it were proved that a handful of Indians, who had been pressganged as recruits, shrank back from the firing line, or that some had purposely contracted disease,—could not every town in England tell the same story, if these things had to be dragged into the light? But would such things prove that Englishmen were all cowards? And in the case of Indians the sneer of Major Grogan is all the more unworthy, because he has ignored the vital fact,

that these very Indians in their own homes have been forcibly disarmed and deliberately kept without the use of weapons of defence for many generations by *Englishmen themselves*. To parody Major Grogan's style,—“No, sir, it is not right—English—to disarm men first and call them cowards afterwards.”

Leaving on one side this accusation we notice at once in his concluding paragraph how Major Grogan would exactly reproduce the parallel between the Indians in Africa to-day and the Jews in Europe in the Middle Ages. I have referred to and explained this analogy already. I would only here point out that it is business alone—*i.e.* money-making,—which he would leave open as a “right” to the Indian. He expressly states, that the Indian is to have no participation in the control of the country. I believe it is also a fact that Major Grogan has been one of the strongest advocates of the segregation of Indians in special quarters, called the Indian locations, in each rising township. If, therefore, he had his way, we should get all the factors brought together to create the very conditions in East Africa for the Indians, which in Europe reduced the Jews to such abject misery and squalour.

“There is no greater cause,” says Sir John Seeley, the historian, “of moral degradation than permanent subjection to a foreign rule.”

Those, like Major Grogan, who would advocate permanent subjection, by depriving Indians of all other rights, except that of money-making, are themselves responsible if Indians, when thus treated become morally degraded. And one thing is certain, the nemesis of such acts will fall on the heads of those who bring about these evil effects. It is the oppressor who sinks lowest in the moral scale, not the oppressed.

The short speech of Major Grogan, which I have quoted, contains one famous phrase which is likely in Africa in time to become a classic, and leave a history behind it. He declares:—

“The Union of South Africa has definitely closed the front door to Indians. *We are the guardians of the back door.*”

This phrase, "the guardians of the back door" has been rapidly taken up and it is remembered to-day in all parts of East Africa. I have heard it used in places as far distant as Uganda, Nairobi, and Zanzibar. No expression could put more pointedly the hard deliberate policy of exclusion of Indians from the whole of Africa which is now aimed at.—Just as Australia is guarded back and front, so Africa also is to be guarded back and front. At no port of entrance whether in the Tropics, or in the South, are Indians to be allowed to land. The assumption is made, that every single British Protectorate in Africa,—even those as far apart as Nyasaland, Nigeria, and the Soudan,—are likely to wish to join hands in this exclusion of Indians from all Africa. It is significant to note the fact that there is never one word said as to any restriction of Arab immigration.

It appears to me that this assumption, so casually made, that every Protectorate in Africa would combine against the Indian, reveals almost more than anything else, the extreme gravity and danger of the Indian position. For, with a very large body of Europeans in British territory, it is now becoming not so much a matter of reason as a creed,—an unreasoning, fanatical creed,—that the Indian must be made to disappear from African soil.

Major Grogan is not speaking at random or without experience. He has wider knowledge of the different parts of the continent of Africa than almost any other European. He has travelled much. His name is well known in distant provinces. He has the quick instinct to seize on a popular current of thought and to shape it by the peculiar force of his own personality. He has, also, that very rare gift of coining a word or a phrase, which, once heard, can never be forgotten. Just as the phrase, "White Australia" has stuck in men's minds in the Southern Pacific, so Major Grogan's phrase "the guardians of the back door" is now clinging to and shaping men's thoughts in Africa.

The second speech of Major Grogan, which I shall quote, was delivered at a mass meeting at Nairobi on December 18th, 1918. He said :—

“We have recently been treated to certain idle and,—I would suggest,—hysterical pretensions on the part of our Indian friends.

“Now it cannot be laid down too clearly, too unequivocally, too soon, or too emphatically, that we do not propose now, or at any future time within the purview of living man, to endorse those pretensions. It is our Western Civilisation that we are imposing, in principle, on the African native and adapting, in particular, to his or our needs.

“I am not prepared here to argue that our Western Civilisation is superior to the fundamentally distinct Civilisation of the East. The issue is that, for good or ill, we are imposing *ours*.

“We, who are instinct with that civilisation,—we, and we alone, can and shall define policy: we cannot and shall not concede any part in the decision of policy to others, who, however cultured they may be, in terms of their own essentially different philosophy, can never be else than coypists—spiritually alien coypists of ours.

“It is our duty to watch the proper interests,—the balanced interests,—of all the people under our care and even to strain equity in their favour as we have done in the case of Indians in our midst.—We may even welcome members of these races to our Councils in a consultative capacity, but to give them any voice in the ultimate decision of policy would mean abdication on our part, the negation of all justification of our presence in these lands, the cutting of the local knot which ties the multitude of individually helpless people which lie within the Imperial orbit, into one unassailable Imperial whole.”

It is a strange and ominous thing that such arrogant words as these could be received with applause within a month of the close of the great war. That war had been entered upon with the determination to prevent the imposition of a Kultur on unwilling

peoples. Yet Major Grogan's words concerning the imposition of Western Civilisation, whether for good or ill, upon the African have the same note of over-bearing intolerant imperialism. They read like a passage from Trietsckke or von Bernhardt.

“It is our Western Civilisation that we are imposing in principle, on the African native.”

“The issue is that for good or ill, we are imposing *ours*.”

How utterly cynical and callous Major Grogan himself is concerning the fate of the African native may be seen from a study, side by side with this speech, of a paragraph at the end of his book in which he sums up his conclusions. We have seen what he says about ‘imposing Western Civilisation’ in his speech. The following are the words of his book :—

“The other point of view is that of the man in their midst with work to do. We are dependent upon their aid. To assist us they must be moulded to our ways. But they do not want to be, and yet they must. Either we give up the country commercially or we must make them work; and mere abuse of those who point out this impasse can never change the fact. We must decide and soon. Or rather the white men of South Africa will decide. May History (the philosophy, which teaches by example) teach us at last to be discreet. I have seen too much of the world to have any lingering beliefs that Western civilisation benefits native races. Socially physically and morally its advent is their death-knell. Still we have taken up the task. Let us see with open eyes the issues which that task entails. For sure as the tide, comes the moment when there is no longer room for both peoples to live their own individual lives; at that moment one must bow or leave the path.

I have small sympathy with the capitalist regime, and am convinced that the immediate future of South Africa is already nipped by the frost of land monopoly. But it is the regime in which we live as yet, and till it top-heavy crumbles to the ground the native too must fall in line. We have stolen his land. Now we must steal his limbs. The setting apart of native reserves does but defer the issue. In time the white man will have all. It is happening in New Zealand; it is happening in the United States; it will happen in Africa none the less.”

Here in these damning phrases, we have one side of the truth revealed at last in an unguarded moment of candour. And the truth is this. With these exploiters, the African native does not count at all, except as a pawn in the huge game of grab. As for Western Civilisation it does not really matter whether it is good or bad for the African. It has got to be imposed, because the European must make money quickly, and he cannot do so without imposing the veneer at least of Western Civilisation on the African. The Indian comes in as an intruder on these exploiters' preserves. His chief offence is that, if allowed, he can make money faster than the European himself. For this simple reason the Indian must go, otherwise he will interfere with the European monopoly of grab. It does not really matter whether the African may prefer the Indian and his civilisation: the African has no voice in such a concern. Whether for good or for ill he has to take the white civilisation. And if the secret must be let out before the tragedy comes to its last act,—this Western Civilisation, in the long run, is going to be the ruin of the African, just as it has been the ruin of the Redskin in North America or the Bushman in Australia. The great world rolls on, and these incidents of race elimination must continually occur. It is part of that great play of forces in nature which learned scientists call the "Survival of the fittest."

It is not fair, of course, to tie Major Grogan down to every phrase he wrote, in unguarded moments, in his book some years ago. But in his latest utterances, I seem to recognize the same cynical indifference concerning the destiny of the African native that is apparent everywhere in his book. There is also the same arrogant intolerance of anything except the imposition of the white man's will. The phrase—"The issue is that, for good or ill, we are imposing *ours*."—is another of those phrases of his, which stick in the mind when read, and will not be forgotten. In the actual light of Major Grogan's second speech on the "Indian Question," which I have quoted, it would really seem as if, when he freely speaks out his mind, he has not changed his

main fundamental opinions. What does seem to have changed in him,—and I cannot say it is a change for the better—is that, in spite of such opinions, he seems to have been ready and willing to join with the missionaries in framing that somewhat unctuous document of the Nairobi Convention, called “Petition re. Indians.”

While Major Grogan in his book has let out the truth about the gross underlying selfishness of much that is forming public opinion in Africa, I cannot at all believe that it is the whole truth; or even the major truth. Personally, I have never reached,—even in darker moments, when selfishness and greed appeared rampant,—the despair concerning Western Civilisation and its effects on the African native, which Major Grogan’s book implies. I have never lost faith in the bed rock sense of justice which my own fellow country men have, deep down in their heart of hearts, below the unscrupulous lust for money which makes the surface of life so hideous,—like some violent blotch or eruption.

I do not think that Cecil Rhodes, for instance, ever reached that cynical state of mind about the “white experiment.” It is always a delight to me to remember that he held firmly to the last, as the basis of the future African Parliamentary Constitution “The Franchise for every civilised man.” This, by itself, put him above the fanaticism of the “white race” superstition. It must not be supposed that, because he wrote an approving letter, patting a young author on the back, he for that reason endorsed every thing which the author put down as his final judgment on things African.

One turns from the hard selfishness which meets one on every side in Africa,—among Indians as well as Europeans—to those lonely out-stations where the much abused government official or the missionary each in his own way, is seeking to let in some ray of light into dark places of the earth and then despair becomes impossible. The pay of the Government

official is a mere pittance, as prices go to-day: that of the missionary,—especially in the Roman monastic orders,—is even less. Fever and sickness are constant, almost daily, companions. And yet there is something in the work itself that appeals: something in the work itself, and the joy of the work, that carries the man forward and when the work grips the soul, there is nothing in the world which will shake off its fascination, its joy of achievement.

Even in Cecil Rhodes himself, that great Englishman, there was below the surface this austerity of soul, which kept his inner spirit clean from ultimate monetary greed. The lust of possession was there, the “grab” of the Englishman was there, all too patently; but in that vast domain of his complex personality, there were secret and retired shelters and corners where pure idealisms blossomed and bore fruit. His grave on the lonely mountain heights, looking out on the far distance, records the fact to the world that he was a visionary to the end.

I have passed in Africa, not once but many times, from homes of Englishmen,—those of missionaries and others, such as I have mentioned,—impressed with their powers of conscientious, laborious, solid work and their devotion to duty,—not seldom slightly marred by a certain hardness of outline which would seem almost inseparable from it,—I have passed from such homes, with an immense respect for those who lived within them, to stay the night in some Indian homestead,—possibly belonging to one, whom our modern standards would classify as illiterate and uneducated,—I have watched the kindly acts of daily life being performed in a kindly leisurely way which is different from the English method and withal so free from much of its hardness on the surface,—I have, above all, seen the Indian family life, in which gentleness to children has become a second nature and tenderness to womankind instinctive,—I have watched, in such a family, the African native made always a welcome inmate when

doing service, not feeling among Indians any racial barrier to hinder perfect freedom. All this, again, has given me hope and helped me to understand what a contribution from his own side the Indian can make—in far-off places where no Englishman could live and bring up children—to the solution of the problem of Africa.

If I have spoken in this chapter with a harshness concerning Major Grogan's own utterances, which may appear to some to be excessive, it should be remembered that I am criticising him from his written words without any personal knowledge or acquaintance. He has been in England during my stay in East Africa and I have never met him. The pain and indignation caused by his writings, which I felt so keenly, was in a great measure due to the sense I had, that he was almost wilfully and defiantly trampling under foot a generous and kindly nature of his own, which was his by birth. It is the hateful nemesis of the "white race" religion that such human sacrifices have to be offered at its shrines.

CHAPTER VI.

THE ECONOMIC ARGUMENT.

It is stated again and again, in important documents published in East Africa, that the Indian is actually retarding the economic progress of the African native; that he has taken out of the African's own hands the chief opportunities for self-advancement in industry and trade. It is pointed out, that, on the Western coast of Africa, where there are no Indian artisans or traders, the Africans have learnt to undertake skilled work for themselves, under European guidance and supervision. But in East Africa, where there are many Indians, who are cleverer than the African natives, the Indian comes in at all points between the European and the African. He is thus, as belonging to a "more crafty race" (to quote the Economic Commission Report), in a position of vantage and is able to keep all the trade and industry in his own hands and permanently to depress the African.

The European, it is said, in order to suit his own convenience, at the moment, employs the Indian who is on the spot, instead of

instructing the African. But if the Indian were out of the way, the European would be obliged, either to employ the native, or else to undertake the work himself.

It is further argued that the Indian is a poor craftsman and a poor mechanic. He is also said to be untrustworthy in business. His influence over the native is bad. If the African came directly under the influence of the European, it would be better for all concerned, and things would rapidly improve.

For these and many other reasons, it is urged, the employment of Indians in East Africa has been a mistake. It would have been much better never to have brought them out at all. In South Africa, this mistake has been discovered in time. It must be put right in other parts of Africa also. No more Indians must be allowed: they must be excluded all along the coast. East Africa must fall into line with her sister colonies in the South. Just as South Africa has shut the front door against the Indians, so East Africa must shut the back door.

It may be well, at this point to recall the exact words of the Economic Commission Report. They run as follows:—

“The African is not strong enough anywhere to stand against the competition of the more crafty race. So long as that race is organised to keep him in servitude by shouldering him out of all posts which lie in the path of advancement, he must be content to be a mere hewer of wood and drawer of water. . . . On purely economic grounds we submit that the admission of the Indian into East Africa, was a cardinal error of policy. It involved the economic stagnation of the African over a large tract of Africa and the consequent retardation of progress for the sake of what promised to be but a temporary convenience. In our view the error ought gradually, but without any unnecessary delay, to be rectified by similar means to those by which the same error is being rectified in Natal.”

The Report again speaks of the presence of the Indian as depriving the African of “all incentives to ambition and opportunities of advancement.”

It is significant that the Convention of Associations' "Petition re: Indians" contains, not once only, but many times over, phrases that are identical with those of the Economic Commission Report. For instance, one of the main heads of indictment reads as follows:—

"Whereas Indian competition deprives the African of *all incentives to ambition and opportunities of advancement.*"

As the Convention of Associations' "Petition re: Indians" was published some months before the Economic Commission Report, it seems probable that the non-official members of the Commission, such as Major Grogan and Lord Delamere, not only won over to their own side on the Indian Question the Chairman and the other official members of the Commission, but also obtained leave to draft, in a great measure, the "Indian" sections of the Report. In this matter, if one may judge by internal evidence, official opinion has been led by non official opinion and not *vice versa*. It is true that Colonel Amery, on behalf of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, as denied in the House of Commons any Government responsibility for the findings of the Economic Commission. This denial, however, must not be taken as closing the whole question. In spite of Colonel Amery's words, the main conclusions of the Report are likely to influence the administration. Then, at some later date, when the pressure of non-official opinion in East Africa gathers weight and a convenient opportunity presents itself, legislation may be hurried through. The Indians have no safeguard whatever at the present time.

The situation now brought about in East Africa by the union of prominent officials and non-officials in a clearly defined policy of ultimate Indian exclusion is one of the most sinister signs of the times. The people at home in India would be very foolish indeed, if they were lulled to sleep by Colonel Amery's assurance in the House of Commons. It was negative, not positive; and such negative answers are not seldom explained away, when overwhelming pressure is brought to bear from the other side.

The Economic Commissioners themselves were all of them Europeans. There was, as I have already related, not a single Indian Commissioner appointed; no Indian evidence was taken. It is therefore hardly to be wondered at, if there is no mention whatever in the Report concerning the exploitation of the East African *native* by the Europeans. Yet this question should have been taken up first of all by an independent Economic Commission dealing with East Africa.

For one of the tasks that humanity is called upon to accomplish in the present generation is the long neglected duty of affording to the African natives some remission from the continual exploiting of their country, in European interests, which has followed European conquest. In no rhetorical phrase, but in literal fact, the African has only too often been made "a mere hewer of wood and drawer of water." Through three centuries of slavery and through one century of many varied forms of forced labour, the European has made use of his possessions in Africa in order to make money quickly. He has first taken possession of African lands and then employed every effort in order to compel the African to work on those lands for his master's profit.

All this kind of thing was regarded with complacency and even with approval in past generations, when glory was attached to ruthless military conquest and barbaric spoliation. But it cannot possibly be regarded thus to-day, after the professions that have been made during the late war, unless, God forbid, we are to go back to those old ideas again. The whole ethics and underlying principles of "conquests" and "empires" and "possessions" have been changed. The vocabulary of the human race does not stand where it was. We have gained a new outlook. Our perspective now is different.

It is doubtful if, in the long run, the exploiting of Central and South America in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, has been more fundamentally destructive of freedom in the countries affected than this age-long European exploitation of Africa. The events which have taken place on the Belgian Congo; among the Hereros in the South West;

in Angola on the Portuguese cocoa plantations and in the recruiting of native labour, far and wide, for the Rand mines,—to mention typical examples from different European races,—have only been the natural sequence of a long series of earlier exploitations which go back to the old slave raiding days.

The conscience of the human race will not endure much longer these wrongs which have been committed by European soldiers and settlers, by European mine owners, and by European trading companies.

I do not for one moment wish to suggest that this is the sole record of European conquest in Africa. That would be a wholly one-sided impression. There is a noble record of heroism and self-sacrifice, of honest work and devotion to duty, among administrators, missionaries, and many others, which has gone far to redeem much that is altogether "of the earth, earthy." There has also been the marvellous application of modern science to the problems of mechanical transport leading to their solution; the opening up of great highways of communication from one end of Africa to the other : the stamping of the indescribable horrors and devilries of sheer naked savagery; the practical abolition of head-hunting and slave-raiding; the combating of disease in forms akin to acutest torture both in man and beast; the lessening of the long-drawn agonies of pain by modern surgery, medicine and science : the all too slow, but still perceptible spread of education raising man above the level of the beast. All this must be taken into account, and much more also which can never be recorded.

I have seen the African in his raw and savage state,—the state wherein cannibalism was practised as a matter of course. I have no illusions, therefore, about the kind of existence which used often to be led before the European intervened.

But, in the same way, I have no illusions about the consequences which follow, when the domestic and tribal life is ruthlessly broken into pieces by unscrupulous recruiting for the purposes of labour. I have seen the effects of such labour recruiting in India itself, and among the Indian labourers who have been induced to go out to the colonies under the Indenture

System. We speak to-day with loathing of the evils of the factory system of labour in England, in the early Nineteenth Century, but historians at some future date are not unlikely to speak with equal condemnation of certain forms of labour traffic in our own days.

To show that these evils are not of the past merely, but of the present, a quotation may be given from a writer, who states that he has had more than half a generation's intimate experience among the Kikuyu tribes of British East Africa, and has seen year by year, the deterioration which has taken place. He calls himself by a *nom de plume*, Fulani bin Fulani, contributing his article to the "International Review of Missions." He is not, however, a missionary, but probably, if a guess may be ventured, a medical officer in the service of East Africa Protectorate Government. He writes as follows:—

"There is no surer sign of social disintegration than for the marriage tie to become unstable among the mass of the people. In the mixture of men of different tribes in European employment in British East Africa the customary union is by the month. The African men and women arrange such unions by themselves.—the woman receiving clothing, food and money, (part of which is often sent to her family,) and serving her master at bed and board. These unions may last indefinitely for months and years. They do not exist among ordinary temporary labourers. These need their money for the tax. For them there exists an immense class of prostitutes, a totally new feature in African life. But most of the men, who have taken more or less permanently to wage-earning under Europeans, have women of their own. Their industrial life being precarious, their liabilities to their women are correspondingly restricted. They have no wives, as they have no homes. They get their wages at the end of the month; they change their master at the end of the month, to travel for days, perhaps, to other masters, *—and so they marry for a month.* These unions have no sanction in native law, or in our own. As is inevitable, children are rare, diseases are common. But such unions are not felt to be disgraceful, as by many prostitution

is still felt to be. *The system fits the life.* The State may some day awaken to the fact, that it is manufacturing disease faster than any conceivable means of prevention can overtake it."

"And so they marry for a month." "The system fits the life." I have underlined these two sentences, because the writer, in the remainder of his article, makes it perfectly clear that this corruption which has defiled the very fountain head of African native life, has been caused by the unscrupulous recruiting for the larger European estates, which must, whatever happens, take their full toll of "labour." *The system fits the life.*

Up to the present time, in East Africa, the worst stage of all,—that of the great limited liability companies,—has not been reached as a whole. There is nothing in British East Africa as yet at all comparable with the wholesale recruiting of native labour for the mining companies on the Rand. The individual owner, who lives upon his own estate, may be expected to take some personal care of the human beings who come directly under his supervision. In his case, there will be little acts of kindness here and there. But I have seen too much, in different parts of the world, of what happens under the profiteering government of large companies, to have much faith in human kindness under "company" regime. It will be a bad day for the East African native, when land speculation and the demands of modern capital bring the individual farms which now exist into large landed estates, run by directors, in a foreign country, as absentee landlords, with the amount of yearly dividend as their only vital interest. Yet it can hardly be doubted that, as things are now tending, this day is rapidly approaching.

The Europeans have, therefore, first to clear their own character of exploiting the African and keeping him in servitude and making him a mere hewer of wood and drawer of water, and they will find it extremely difficult to do so.

Many of them, such as Major Grogan himself in his book entitled "From the Cape to Cairo," written when he was younger, are frankly outspoken in declaring their aims and objects. "We have stolen," he writes, "the African's lands. Now we must steal

his limbs." The same writer looks forward, in the future, to "the division of society into two strata, of which the lower (i. e. the African) does the menial work and draws sufficient of the proceeds to meet all the simple wants; while the upper (i.e. the European) organises, directs, and *takes all the surplus produce*" (the italics are mine). Compulsion is his only weapon. "Short of compulsion," he writes, "direct or indirect, the main mass of Africa's inhabitants will never take part in the development of their country. We can never develop their country without their cooperation, (sic) because where negroes are, white men will not do manual work. And the negroes will not disappear, as have savages of other lands."

It would be difficult to express in cruder terms the policy of perpetual subjection of the African native. One may surely demand of Europeans such as these, that they should turn their attention to their own shortcomings in dealing with the African, and judge the Indians by the same standard which they apply to themselves.

While I have thus felt it necessary to bring forward quite plainly and bluntly this claim against the European,—insisting that he should not play the hypocrite by charging others with the very evils of which he is guilty himself,—I do not wish in any way to shirk the main issue, on the Indian question, which the Commissioners have brought forward. If it could be proved, that, entirely apart from the conduct of the Europeans, Indians also themselves, by occupying posts of vantage, had reduced the Africans to merely servile positions in their own country, then I, for my part, as far as lay in my power, most strongly and strenuously would advise the Indian people, to do their utmost to stop their fellow country-men from going out to East Africa at all. The last thing that I should wish would be, that India should take any share in the general European scramble to get rich at the native African's expense.

But after taking all the pains and care I could, to find out the actual facts, by examining reliable European witnesses, and by obtaining at first hand from Africans themselves (*e.g.* in Uganda)

their own opinions about the situation, I have no hesitation in saying that I am confident, that the charge brought forward against the Indian by the Economic Commissioners is substantially unfair. On the evidence which I have received I am convinced that the very opposite is the case. It has become clear to me beyond dispute that the Indians as well as the Europeans, have done much to help forward the development of Africa.

I do not wish to imply that the Indian's record, with regard to exploitation, has not been fraught with evil. He has followed the fashion of seeking for large profits, instead of being content with moderate returns. He has often cheated the African mercilessly. But this is entirely different from the charge of the Economic Commissioners, that he has kept the native in servitude as a "mere hewer of wood and drawer of water." It is that, which, on the evidence, I now regard as entirely unproved.

Put briefly, the situation in East Africa and Central Africa appears to be this. The advance already made in bringing the native forward out of the state of raw savagery (scarcely above the animal level, in a great number of instances) has been due to two causes, which have both been working together. There has been, first, of all, the initiative and supervision of the European, whose scientific and practical ability and higher educational training have made him usually take the lead. The European has also had overwhelming force at his disposal, in the face of which any violence on the part of the savage could easily be held in check. This force has frequently been ruthlessly used, and its ruthlessness should never be condoned or excused. At the same time, it appears to me obvious, after what I have seen, that the interior of Africa could hardly have been opened up without having force in the background at command; and the very fact, that it was there, has put an end to head-hunting, cannibalism, and internecine tribal fighting. —

Secondly, the Indian had been, even before the arrival of European, in close contact with the African native along the coast and to a much lesser degree in the interior. He had met the native in trade and barter and had performed in doing so a civiliz-

ing work. Since the arrival of the European, the Indian has pressed forward into the interior far more than before, often advancing into malaria-stricken districts where no European could possibly settle. Wherever the Indian has gone, his association with the African has been far more intimate than that of the European. The latter cannot undertake sustained manual labour in the tropics. Therefore, the actual daily apprenticeship of the Africans has been carried forward to a successful issue by the Indian artisans and mechanics. They have trained more African workmen than all the industrial and technical schools put together. Indian traders have also carried forward successfully the same kind of apprenticeship in other necessary directions, initiating the natives into the mysteries of trade and barter and the value of money.

I have been able to obtain the opinions of many of the largest European employers of native labour in East and Central Africa. It was a striking fact to me that nearly every one of them took practically the same general view of the situation as that which I have outlined above. I was told by the men on the spot who were responsible for the work being done, that without the presence of the Indian as an intermediary, such rapid progress would have been absolutely impossible.

These men, with whom I talked, were practical men, not theorists. They had borne the burden and heat of the day, through long years of practical experience, in railway construction, railway workshops, harbour works, municipal works, district administration and in the management of large estates. They told me that, for the most part, their skilled African labourers had been trained by the Indians. They told me also the interesting fact, that, whenever the African native attained sufficient skill in manual work, he got the job as a matter of course in preference to the Indian. The reason was quite simple. The African was always economically cheaper, because there was no expensive passage to and from India to be paid for.

I will give typical instances, taken from my notes. While I was passing down the coast of Africa, on board ship, I

found that two of my fellow passengers at the same table were European mechanical engineers. I put to them the question, whether East Africa could have progressed so fast in works of railway and other mechanical construction without the Indian. They both answered "No." The present rate of progress they said would have been impossible. Furthermore, to exclude the Indian to-day, would be to delay things almost indefinitely. On another occasion, I was asking the manager of a large workshop the same question. I mentioned to him the argument derived from West Africa, where no Indians had helped in the development of the country and things had yet gone forward.

"Yes," he said, "it may be that in West Africa they got forward without the Indians. But *how many centuries* did they take to do it?"

I have constantly carried about with me, while on my journeys, a copy of the Final Report of the Economic Commission, and I have shown it to European employers of labour asking them to read the Indian sections. The drafters of these sections would not have felt complimented by some of the remarks that were passed upon their performance.

I have been often told by practical men,—and from what I have seen with my own eyes, I can well understand it,—that the one main difficulty, at the present time, is not to exclude the Indians, but rather to get out a sufficient number of Indians artisans, in order to press forward the important work which is being held up for lack of workmen. The one great trouble is, that owing to the reconstruction which has to be undertaken all over the world after the great war, every country, including India, wants its own mechanics and artisans at home and cannot spare them abroad.

"What on earth are these settlers crying for?" said a manager to me. "It's new roads, new railways,—something new every time. And how do they expect us to get through their work with raw natives? We want more Indians, not less,—that's my opinion."

I gathered also from these same employers of labour that it was absurd to talk about the Indian retarding the native labourer and keeping him in servitude and reducing him to economic stagnation.

“Why!” said one employer to me, “who is going to get the native over the first stage? Will the European take his coat off and teach the native how to handle a saw, or oil a machine, or turn a screw? You must always remember, that, when we came, the native was a raw savage. He has to be got out of that savage state, and he can only do it by imitation.”

I asked specially the question, whether trade jealousy came in among the Indians to prevent the Africans from learning the peculiar secrets of skilled work. I was told that such instances of keeping out the African were very rare indeed. They never finally succeeded. The boycott would break down. The European would step in to prevent it. Besides, no skilled mechanic ever lost his job through teaching another. The demand for skilled workmen went far beyond the supply. It was altogether a mistake in East Africa to think that the amount of work to be done was limited. It was unlimited, because the opening up of the whole country, and of Central Africa also, had only just begun. The Indian artisan, who would do steady and regular work, and had the intelligence to train the native under him, was in great demand and could always earn money.

A somewhat common complaint among the European employers was that the Indian's work was of an inferior quality, and that since the war it had greatly deteriorated. The Indian was therefore teaching the African to use his tools badly. As this is a technical point, it is of course impossible for me to pronounce any opinion on the subject, but the complaint itself was fairly widespread.

On the other hand, it should be mentioned that some employers have told me that they have had Indian skilled workmen who, for steadiness and cleverness of hand, were the equals of any skilled Europeans.

I was told, also, on good authority, and over a wide area, that the African was able to learn his job more quickly from an Indian than from a European. The reason for this was, that the Indian, though very careless about the way he learnt the language, had a peculiar gift of getting on with the native and making him understand quickly what he wanted to be done. He had also more patience with the native than the European.

There was a considerable amount of evidence given to me by those, on whose word I could thoroughly rely, that an immense amount of petty thieving was rife among the African natives, and that the lower classes among the Indians had often encouraged this and either bought or received the stolen goods. As the police in East Africa are naturally still somewhat new to their work and inefficient, these thefts have been difficult to check. The natives pilfered from the Indian merchants and shopkeepers as well as from Europeans. That the lower classes among the Indians aid and abet these crimes is due in some measure to the wholly unrestricted Indian immigration which has been allowed in the past. Europeans, entering East Africa, have been obliged to produce £50 in cash or securities before landing, and there is a general desire that this security should be made higher. It is clear that some raising of the security for Indian immigration is desirable. The good name of Indian is involved in the class of immigrants who come over.

Certain larger and more general facts came before me for consideration, as I journeyed into the interior or down the African coast. These appear to me, on the whole, to add greatly to the strength of the local evidence which I have already given. I would mention them in order as follows:—

I. The people of Uganda, who are the most intelligent, enlightened, and progressive Africans, whom I met on my tour, are already in favour of the retention of Indians in their country. They would have been the very first to cry out against any invasion of their rights and privileges, but they have found out by their own experience that Indians materially help them, and for this reason they wish them to remain.

While I was in Uganda, Sir Apolo Kagwa, the Prime Minister, invited me to be present at a Council of the Ruling Chiefs called the "Lukiko." The President, at my request, put the question whether they desired the Indians to remain in their country. The answer was "Yes."

Before I left Uganda, Sir Apolo Kagwa and the Baganda Chief Justice handed me a document signed by themselves, on behalf of the "Lukiko," stating that the Baganda desired the Indians to remain because they did good to the country. They also wished more Indians to come out.

I shall not forget one incident which occurred during the session of the Council on the Indian question. The Chief Justice, in a very humorous way, spoke one sentence which caused great amusement. I was told by the interpreter that he had said,---

"If the Indians were to leave our country, we should soon have to begin wearing bark-cloth again."

Perhaps the most interesting piece of evidence which I obtained in Uganda was from the young Baganda leaders. These young Bagandas are nationalists to a man. They are intensely eager to keep their country free from all outside interference. They would personally, also, be more likely to come into competition with the Indians than any one else, because they are all English educated. They asked me to meet them apart, without any of their elders being present, and I readily consented. They understood my own position as one who desired to sympathise with their national aspirations, and it was for this reason that they had invited me to meet them. When we were seated together, I asked them at once, if they wished the Indians to remain in their country. They were quite unanimous in their answer, "Yes." It came spontaneously, and I am certain that it expressed their inner mind.

This immediate answer of the young Baganda was most striking. They were very thoughtful men and remarkably intelligent. One of the young Baganda said to me at the end of my visit, "We shall look more and more to India, in the future, to help us." I believe that his expectation will be realised.

II. When I went from British East Africa to Zanzibar, I found there a contented Indian community. It seemed to me, also, that the status of the African native was higher there than anywhere else along the coast. The long Arab occupation of the Island may possibly account for this in part, but I cannot help thinking that the Indians also have been a civilising element.

The relief was very great indeed when I came from the midst of the strained racial relations at Nairobi into the calm and natural social atmosphere at Zanzibar. In Zanzibar there seems to be no racial conflict at all. Life is urbane and peaceful and full of human courtesy, not artificial and clamorous and violently controversial.

On both occasions, while visiting the island, I was fortunate enough to see the Resident and to be able to discuss with him the Indian question. He told me that there was no Indian problem at all in Zanzibar and he hoped there never would be any such problem. The Indians fulfilled their own part in the community, and no one wished to turn them out.

The Resident told me, also, that he had been for over sixteen years in Nyassaland and more than once had acted as Governor. He gave me full permission to state his opinion, that the Indians had played a useful part in Africa by opening up and developing the country through trade and industry. He had always encouraged their coming, because he had found that they helped the native forward and brought him into touch with the Europeans.

A very simple illustration that he used remained in my mind and appealed to me. It seemed to be the root of the matter.

"The first element," he said, "of progress, in dealing with the raw savage, is to gain his confidence by means of trade and barter. Here the presence of the Indian is invaluable. The native is not frightened of him, as he is of the European, and the Indian pushes out in the back regions, where no white man could go. The native comes along with a few eggs, a lump of bees' wax and other produce and sits down to bargain with the Indian. They go on bargaining, sometimes for hours,—the

European could never stand it!—and at last the native goes away contented with a bit of Manchester cotton cloth, and the Indian takes the eggs to the nearest market. There could not be a better go between for such a useful purpose of exchange.

I had many other testimonies concerning the way in which the presence of the Indian had helped the Nyassaland Administration. I had planned to go there as well as to Rhodesia in order to see things with my own eyes. But my plans fell through.

III. A third fact, which seemed to me to strengthen the argument in favour of the Indian in East Africa, had been the verdict of the German Royal Commission with regard to what is now called the Tanganyika Territory, and was then called German East Africa. There were no German obligations towards the Indians, as holding any prominent part in their Empire: they were aliens and foreigners. The Commission which came out from Berlin was for economic purposes. It was sent to gather evidence as to the utility, or otherwise, of the Indians in the development of the colonies. The Commission, after a very thorough enquiry decided in the Indians' favour.

I notice how the East Africa Commissioners suggest that all this was mere camouflage, and that it was really undertaken for political reasons. This seems to me to be a gratuitous supposition. If Indians were desirable for political reasons, the obvious thing would have been to have made no fuss about them, and to let them go on coming to German East Africa as they had done before. The Commission seems rather to point to that scientific thoroughness in their colonial work, which has been acknowledged by leading colonial experts all over the world.

If this is the true explanation, then, as an impartial testimony to the value of Indian settlement, the findings of the Commission are noteworthy.

IV. The Portuguese have had a larger experience on the East Coast of Africa than either the Germans or the British. For at least a hundred years, if not much longer, they have allowed Indians freely to reside in their Mozambique territory, at the different ports of Beira, Mozambique, Lorrenco Marques.

Indians have also settled in the interior, where they have been allowed to buy land quite freely.

It has been quite easy for me to find out, on my visit to the different ports, and especially during a somewhat long stay in Beira and on a journey inland, the conditions under which the Indians live in Portuguese East Africa. The Indians have told me, that they have been everywhere welcomed with equal treatment and courtesy and kindness. They speak very highly indeed concerning the freedom under which they live and the absence of racial prejudice among the Portuguese themselves. They receive everywhere gentlemanly treatment.

I went also to call on Portuguese officials, bank managers, merchants and others, and obtained all the evidence that I could from that side. I found it was uniformly favourable to Indians. The Portuguese not only expressed a liking for the Indians, as a sober, industrious, law-abiding people, who never gave any trouble; they also stated positively that their presence was valuable to the country and to the African native. In more than one instance, the direct answer was given to me,—"We could not get on without them."

V. I passed on from Portuguese East Africa to Rhodesia. At Umtali, the border town, I was met by the Indian community. The European Mayor, the Magistrate, and the local bank manager accompanied them, and they expressed to me their satisfaction at having Indians in their township. In the Indian address of welcome, it was stated explicitly, that, in Rhodesia, Indians were treated well and had no grievances to bring forward. The one thing that they most desired was educated for their young children. I found not only the Administration, but also individual Europeans, eager to help the Indian community in this direction.

Indians have a free right of entry into Rhodesia on a very simple educational test. No Indian woman accompanied by a relative is asked to pass any test at all. On enquiring from Indians themselves, I found that this educational test was fairly and impartially administered : and it speaks well for the immigra-

tion office staff, that no single complaint of unfairness was brought before me.

In accordance with Cecil Rhodes' maxim of "the franchise for every civilised man," the vote has been given to those Indians who have reached a certain standard.

I had many opportunities of meeting my fellow country men in Rhodesia and of discussing frankly the Indian question with them. It was a very great pleasure to find that the Indians were welcomed and that there was no movement on foot for their restriction. Every one seemed quite satisfied with the present arrangement, which goes back, in its origin, I was told, to Cecil Rhodes himself and to the following out of principles he laid down concerning the rights of citizenship, from the Cape to the Zambesi River.

What was of even more importance to notice than the legal status was the kindly feeling between the European and Indian communities. From the Administrator downwards, it appeared to me that there was a general desire to make the Indian a welcome citizen. The Indians, as might have been expected, have at once responded to the amenities. In every address that was presented to me, they emphasised the fact they were well treated and that they had no grievances to bring forward.

VI. The difference from this attitude on reaching the Transvaal was very marked. The racial antagonism has come there to a head. The Transvaal today is the storm centre of the Indian question in South Africa.

From the point of view of the present enquiry it is not necessary to discuss fully the Transvaal situation, but one fact is worthy of careful notice. The economic argument, which is used against the Indian, in the Transvaal and South Africa generally, is not the same as that which is used by the Economic Commissioners in East Africa. In the Transvaal, the argument has been that the Indian competes with and takes away the trade from the European. In East Africa the argument has been that the Indian competes with and keeps in servitude the *African*. The point is so important, that it may

be worth while to quote the passage from the East African Commission Report,—“Even in the minor spheres (of trade),” the Report runs, “the European (if the Indian would submit to the civil, moral and commercial obligations, common in European society) *has nothing to fear from Indian competition*—the contrary theory, which formerly found favour in local Government circles, *having been completely exploded by the history of the last thirteen years.*”

Thus the ground on which the hostile party in the Transvaal base their economic argument against the Indian is repudiated in East Africa and vice versa.

VII. No one can pass through the Orange Free State and then come into Natal without noticing at once the difference in cultivation. It may be rightly argued that the Boer administration in the Free State is more backward and the soil in part less fertile. But making allowance for both these differences credit must be given to the fact that Natal had Indian cultivators and artisans all these past sixty years and the Orange Free State has had none.

What is of even more importance to this argument,—it can be shown that in Natal where there is a greater number of Indians than in any other part of Africa, the progress of the African natives had been more rapid than in the Free State. So far has the African been removed from economic servitude, that his wages have risen much higher in Natal than in the Orange Free State where there are no Indians at all. So far is the African in Natal today from the position of a “mere hewer of wood and drawer of water” to the Indian, that he has actually surpassed the Indian in the average of his monthly wage; and the Africans' wages are rising while the Indians' wages are declining. I am taking count of the latest statistics from the Official Year Book of the South African Union, published by the Director of Statistics.

VIII. I have seen the treatment of the African native in the Orange Free State. I believe I am right in saying that the African of the Free State has no right to own land and no civil

status at all. He must belong to one of the European masters, who have taken possession of all the soil. If ever there existed a class of people, who, by their very principles and traditions, were determined to keep the African in servitude, the back-veldt Boers of South Africa are such. Their religion itself appears to sanction this attitude. Yet these very back veldt farmers were given special privileges for settlement in East Africa and were allowed to hold land in the upland areas which has been withheld from Indians. The Europeans in East Africa knew perfectly well the principles and traditions of these Boer settlers. Why, then, was there no protest against their admission, if it was sincerely desired to protect the African native?

IX. In the Cape Colony for many years past, Indians, along with "coloured" people and African natives, have been allowed the franchise on the two qualifications of (i) having property valued at £75 and (ii) being sufficiently literate to sign their names and write their addresses and occupations in English.

It was of great interest to me in the Cape Colony to find how entirely the Indian question has passed into the background. This is in a very great measure due to the rights of citizenship having been granted. The number of Indians is not large. They are contented with their present position and desire no alteration. With regard to the African natives, there has been no economic depression of any kind which can be traced to the presence of the Indians. Depression has come entirely from the European trades' unions, which still insist on certain classes of skilled work, (which the Africans are quite capable of doing) being reserved for the European workmen. The African native is artificially prevented by the strictest trades union rules of the "colour bar," from rising in his trade. Every effort has been made by liberal statesmen and by liberal labour leaders, to break that colour bar, but without avail.

I will give one instance, which was vouched for,—there are probably hundreds of a similar nature. A certain type of blasting in the mines has been reserved for European workmen. But the European is allowed to employ a Kaffir, on a mere pittance, to

do the actual work, while he looks on and directs and draws a high monthly wage. This insistence on the colour bar reduces the intelligent and highly skilled African workman to economic servitude.

There was one striking fact, which told in a positive direction in favour of the Indians. Dr. Abdurrahman, a leading member of the Indian community, has done more than any person in South Africa to uphold the cause of the African natives, and to raise their social and political status. He has represented them for many years in the Cape Provincial Parliament and Council, and, if ever the racial barrier is removed from the South African Union Parliament, he will be the first to represent them there also. The native and coloured population at the Cape trust him more than any living man, and he has been their champion all his life. This fact will be difficult to fit in with the theory of the Economic Commissioners, that Indians retard the progress of the African native and keep them in an economic servitude as mere hewers of wood and drawers of water.

I have now gone through, at length, the different heads of evidence which I have gathered while travelling up and down Africa. Looking back over the whole field, there is very little indeed that bears out the contention of the East African Commissioners against the Indians. On the other hand, there appears to me overwhelming evidence which tells in the Indians' favour.

The longer I have studied the main question on a wide scale, the more clearly I have seen that there is a fundamental fallacy underlying the whole position of the East African Commissioners. It is the same as the fallacy that sometimes obsesses the working man both in Europe and Australia, where he thinks that the amount of work to be done is limited and that there is only just enough to go round. The working man does not see, that new work is always being created, and that work done leads on to other work. Similarly the Economic Commissioners in East Africa seem to regard the whole amount of skilled work in the country as strictly limited. They appear to assume, that every Indian occupying a skilled post is keeping an African out. But

the truth of the matter is the reverse. Since the work to be done in East Africa is practically unlimited, each new piece of work done opens up much more work that cries out for workers. New work, new posts, come as it were, tumbling over one another, each asking for more workers.

A mere handful of Indians, (to quote the Economic Commissioners' own figures) in a country almost entirely undeveloped and of enormous area, cannot possibly fill up every vacancy. Wherever one Indian is doing skilled work, many African natives are bound to be employed as assistants. Out of these assistants, who have watched the Indian at work, there are certain to be some who are more handy with their tools than others. These Africans will be put on to do higher and higher grades of work, as soon as they are ready for it; and everything will be done to advance them, because they are economically cheaper. By the very nature and character of his work and occupation in East Africa, the Indian cannot be exclusive or restrictive. He cannot keep the African out, even if he wished to do so.

If indeed it could be proved that the yearly Indian immigration into East Africa was overwhelming in numbers; if it could be proved, that all the new posts (as they became vacant) were filled up with new Indian recruits from India, and no room was left for the skilled African; if it could be proved that the African labourer, working side by side with the Indian as an assistant, did not make progress, then there might be good reason to accept the economic argument of the Commissioners against the Indians.

But as we have seen, over and over again, not one of these points can be proved. Instead of Indians swarming into Africa, more Indians have been going out recently than those coming in; the Indian population is declining. Instead of there being no room left for the skilled African workmen, such skilled Africans are being taken on to higher jobs, for economic reasons, as quickly as possible: instead of the African not making progress, under the apprenticeship of the Indian, he has been advancing with extraordinary rapidity.

This then appears to be the conclusion of the matter. The comparatively small number of Indians, who have gone out to East Africa, have, for the most part, done useful necessary work. They have never as yet emigrated in such numbers as to swamp the progress of the African native. Their presence, if the country is to advance, is still urgently required.

APPENDIX.

LORD DELAMERE'S MEMORANDUM ON THE CASE AGAINST THE CLAIMS OF INDIANS IN KENYA.

The purpose of this Memorandum is to give to the British Public an idea of the true position of the Europeans and indigenous inhabitants of this Colony, and of the menace to their national and economic existence, if equal status with British-born subjects be granted to the Indian residents in the Colony, or if any recession from the policy embodied in the Five Principles set out in Paragraph II. below be granted to the Indian community.

1. At present the relation of European and Asiatic in the Colony is as follows :—

- (a) The population, according to the Census taken in June of this year, was 9,651 Europeans and 22,822 Indians. The natives number some two and a half to three millions.
- (b) The responsible offices in all Government Departments are held by Europeans, Indians being employed merely in the lower grades of the service.
- (c) The Legislature consists of a majority of European Officials, who are, through the Governor, under the direction of the Colonial Office, eleven elected European representatives, two Indian representatives (elected on a communal franchise) and one nominated Arab representative. The Indian section of the community has not, however, availed itself of the right of election, so that to-day the composition

of the Council is, with the exception of the Arab member, entirely European. The interests of the natives are safeguarded by the appointment to the Council of the Chief Native Commissioner.

- (d) A certain portion of the Highlands of Kenya has, in accordance with the directions from the Home Government, since 1906, been reserved for European occupation.
- (c) A principle of residential segregation between the various races, European, African and Asiatic has obtained for many years.
- (f) Immigration, except in the case of criminals and indigents, is unrestricted.
- (g) The Indian Community mainly follows three paths of activity—shop-keeping, artisan and clerical employment.

2. Lately, the growing disloyalty in India, largely, it is believed, the outcome of mismanagement of Indian affairs, has caused the Indian Office to consider the possibility of throwing Kenya as a sop to India.

The movement started during the war, when practically the whole European population was on active service, and was supported by local Indian agitation, with the result that the subject in all its bearings was considered by Lord Milner, late Colonial Secretary, who in August, 1920, published a Despatch, enunciating a Policy, which, though they were by no means satisfied, the Europeans nevertheless tacitly accepted as a temporary compromise in order to avoid discord at a critical time.

The following points of the "Milner Policy," as embodied in the Despatch, are now objected to by a section of the Indian Community :—

- (a) The recognition of the right of occupation of the reserved portion of the Highlands by Europeans to the exclusion of Asiatics.
- (b) The upholding of the principle of segregation.
- (c) The limitation of the right of Indian representation on the Legislative Council to two members elected on a communal franchise.

3. However, the Indian agitators (for the demand for equal status does not proceed from the masses of the local population but from a small party of malcontents, directed by the seditionist party in India) were by no means satisfied and now, with a change in the person of the Secretary of State for the Colonies and under continual pressure from India and the India Office, the subject has suddenly become acute, for the Indian claims are now for absolute equality with the Europeans, as a step to complete supremacy.

In detail these are :—

- (a) The right to hold any position, however eminent, in the Civil Service and local Military Forces.
- (b) The right to equal representation with the European on the Legislative Council on a common franchise.
- (c) The right to acquire land in the hitherto reserved portion of the Highlands.
- (d) The abolition of the principle of segregation.
- (e) The right to penetrate the country in unrestricted numbers.

4. The above claims are advanced on the grounds (*inter alia*) (1) that the Indians are British subjects and (2) of the Indian war services.

Without wishing to disparage the achievements of the fighting races of India, under the leadership of English officers, it should be pointed out that the war record of the local Indians is not one of which they can well be proud. The adult male Indian population of Kenya, Zanzibar, Uganda and Tanganyika during the war is believed to have been about 20,000, and of these 1,383 became members of the Forces. Of this number only 376 were combatants, the remainder being employed as clerks, transport drivers and sweepers (scavengers). The large majority of the 1,383 Indians who served were automatically absorbed into the Forces by reason of the Department in which they were employed : (e.g., the Uganda Railway) being made subject to Martial Law.

The casualties suffered by local Indians were :—

Killed	nil.
Died of Wounds	nil.
Wounded	nil.
Executed for Treachery	5.

(the death sentence in 3 other cases being commuted).

The local Indian during the war was notorious for his efforts to avoid military service.

Further, it is a significant fact that of the large number of British Indian traders in German East Africa while the campaign was in progress practically none were interned by the Germans.

The advocates of equal rights for Indians in Kenya claim them as an act of Justice to those Indians who are already resident here. There is a feeling amongst the European colonists that the illuminating figures quoted above hardly justify this claim.

The war record of the native tribes presents a contrast. The total who served, either as combatants with the King's African Rifles, or in the Labour or Transport Corps or as Carriers was upwards of 600,000 of whom it is believed at least 10 per cent. were killed or perished under the rigours of the campaign.

5. The British Public is, in the main, unaware of the state of affairs in India at the present time. In England the general conception of the Indian is the cultured cosmopolitan gentleman or the splendid fighting man, both of which types are the poles apart from the political agitator class which is stirring up sedition in India at the present time and which is now seeking equal rights in Kenya. They are also entirely different from the illiterate, ignorant small trader and artisan who form the bulk of the Indian population of Kenya, and upon whom it is proposed to bestow equal franchise rights with the European colonist. That many local Indians do not even understand the meaning of an elective franchise, or what it involves, is made evident from Indian meetings recently held in Nairobi.

6 Disloyalty and sedition are rampant in India and the position is so grave that European women and children are being warned to consider the advisability of leaving the country. Indeed, the seditionist movement has recently developed into open rebellion, and the Moplah rising is merely symptomatic of conditions throughout a great part of India. That this is so is evidenced by the speech of Lord Willingdon, Governor of Madras, in the Madras Legislature early in September, in which he stated that the religious fanaticism of the Moplahs was an instrument used by the leaders of a wide-spread and dangerous organisation, who were only watching for an opportunity violently to overthrow the Government and the whole Civil Administration. He appealed to members of the Legislature to encourage the people to resist an intolerable terrorism which was the very antithesis of liberty. The leaders of the movement, at whose head is Mahatma Gandhi, are openly disloyal and have in the past been convicted or interned as such. The movement before it reached the stage of rebellion was carried to such a pitch that the Gandhi party successfully organised a boycott of the Duke of Connaught's tour through India, an action which a local Indian agitator, M. A. Desai, has approved on political grounds.

7. The agitation in Kenya is definitely identified with Gandhi-ism by the above and by the admission of the local leaders. As further evidence, two illustrations are selected at random. (i.) In July of this year a hat belonging to Gandhi was auctioned at a mass meeting of Indians in Nairobi for a large sum amidst scenes of enthusiasm. (At this Meeting, it may be mentioned, Mangal Dass, one of the Indian leaders, stated in English: "When we get self-government in India, we too can bring our cannons and rifles and fight for our rights in this Colony.") (ii.) The local Indian paper, the organ of the party, voices its approval of the following telegram from one Marcus Garvey, President of the International Congress of Negroes at New York to Gandhi "Accept best wishes 400,000,000 negroes, through us their representatives for the speedy *emancipation of India from*

the thralldom of foreign oppression. You may depend on us for whatever help we can give."

8. The present Secretary of State for the Colonies has enunciated the doctrine that all British subjects are to be equal in His Majesty's Dominions and that neither race, colour nor creed shall be a bar to the attainment of the very highest position.

As an ideal suited to some future Utopia this may be admirable, but it has not been proved to be a practical policy to-day, and where Eastern civilisations are concerned which have not yet attained the political development of the Western world, its introduction into Imperial politics will merely advance the day when the West will have to reckon with these civilisations. Such a proposition in India itself is acknowledged by General Smuts to be "One of the greatest problems in the world to-day." To force such a gigantic experiment upon primitive races, who are slowly emerging from slavery and barbarism and need helpful direction and discipline to raise them from the depths of ignorance and superstition would be nothing short of disastrous.

9. In the stress of the period following the war, and at a time when Indian aspirations were within the bounds of reason, the British Europeans of the Colony tacitly accepted the "Milner Policy" as a temporary expedient at the specific request of the Government on the distinct understanding that no further concessions to Indians were contemplated. That policy was then recognised as the "irreducible minimum" consistent with the bare political existence of the European and native communities.

But the direction which Indian agitation has since taken has shewn the extreme danger to the welfare of the native races, to the European administration, and to the larger Imperial issue of British rule in Africa, of conceding the principle of unrestricted immigration and an elective franchise to a people who have openly avowed a connection with the seditious movement in British India, and who now demand an equal voice with the European in the Legislative and Executive control of the Colony.

The grant of elective franchise, coupled with unrestricted immigration, to a race which already outnumbers the European

population by more than 2 to 1 and in a country in which, in Mr. Churchill's words, "The European has not the power to constitute a white proletariat," must ultimately give them a controlling influence in the Government of the Colony no matter what safeguards be devised. The inevitable final step will be the virtual evacuation of the Colony by its European population, since the two civilisations, from every point of view, are so opposed that a mixed community of the two races is impossible.

What the effect of a government controlled by Asiatics and the consequent infusion of Eastern laws and influences, moral, physical and intellectual, would be on the indigenous peoples is sufficiently indicated in the expressed opinions of the representatives of the Church, Missionary bodies and medical faculty quoted in Para 17 below, and in the emphatic protest of the natives themselves as expressed at meetings held in various parts of the Colony. Nor can anyone with the smallest acquaintance with the native of Africa entertain a moment's doubt on the matter.

10. A further aspect of the question of unrestricted immigration is its *economic* effect on the interests of the native. The bulk of Indian immigrants to Kenya consists of artizans, clerks and small traders.

With regard to the first 2 classes, Indians in this respect have hitherto been and to some extent still are an economic necessity, but with the intellectual development of the native, the latter is gradually being educated to take the place of the Indian. If the Colony is to continue to be flooded with Indians, not only is the prospect of the native, in his condition of inferior intellectual powers, competing with the more advanced Asiatic naturally hopeless, and all incentive to his progress removed, but the Indian will, as he does already, oppose every artificial obstacle in his power to that advancement.

As to the small Indian trader, he has already practically eliminated the native trader from his rightful position in the commercial life of the Colony.

11. For the above reason, the British European community is now definitely of opinion that the "Milner Policy," acquiesced

in under abnormal circumstances and in a spirit of moderation and concession which has been grossly abused by the Indian agitators, is inadequate for the protection of themselves and of the indigenous population. They, therefore, now insist that the ultimate Asiatic policy of the Colony must include the principles which they have for long past maintained as essential to the development of Kenya and to the maintenance of Imperial integrity; principles which the Convention of Associations of Kenya affirmed in June, 1919, and, in re-affirming in 1921, digested into the following 5 cardinal points:—

- (i). Strictly controlled immigration at present with a view to ultimate prohibition, consistently with the principle enunciated in 1917, and confirmed in 1921, by the Imperial Conference, of the inherent right of every community within the Empire to determine the composition of its own population.
- (ii). Two nominated and not elected Indian members of the Legislative Council.
- (iii). Segregation in residential areas, and, where practicable, in commercial areas also.
- (iv). No alienation to Asiatics of land in the Highland area.
- (v). Full recognition of existing Asiatic property rights.

12. As regards segregation. A people which has elevated caste into a religion and carried the principle of exclusiveness to the extreme pitch can hardly be taken seriously in their objections to segregation. In fact the leaders of the local Indian agitation have boasted that Indians have no wish to live amongst Europeans and that they claim to be entitled to live where they choose *on principle only*.

The dangers of non-segregation of an Oriental race in a European community are mainly on sanitary and moral grounds.

The views of the bulk of the local Indians on sanitation and hygiene are worse than primitive and, particularly in a tropical country, their proximity to European residential area is fraught with the gravest danger to the latter community. From the moral aspect, the breaking down of the barrier of segregation will in-

evitably lead to the establishment of mixed schools, with the undesirable consequence of English children sitting alongside Indian children who are in all probability married and initiated into the mysteries of sex.

The Europeans of Kenya cannot agree to face dangers of such magnitude for the sake of redressing a grievance which is purely artificial and in fact a mere political "catchcry." In this connection, it may be pointed out that the principle of segregation was strongly insisted on by Professor Simpson, who visited Kenya officially in 1913 for the purpose of advising Government on this subject. Not only did he advise, on social and sanitary grounds, the segregation of the communities, but he advocated the establishment of reserves or neutral zones between European and Asiatic residential areas as a further safeguard against the intermingling of the Races.

13. To permit Asiatic settlement in the area reserved for European occupation will be for Government to break a solemn pledge given to the European colonists of Kenya—given originally by Lord Elgin, and deliberately renewed last year by Lord Milner. This pledge is consonant with justice, in that the Indian, at a time when the economic possibilities of the country were entirely unknown, refused, with few exceptions, to avail himself of offers of settlement in the Highland areas, because he was incapable of being a pioneer. On the faith of this pledge our homes have been built, our farms developed, our children educated to take our place in course of time. The pioneers and colonists of many years' standing, who have opened up the path for Indian penetration, will suffer and, in addition, the hundreds of ex-service men who were invited to settle in the Colony after the late war and who, throughout the Country, have voiced the view that one of the inducements to settlement in Kenya was that they would be making their homes among their own kind under British Administration.

14. One regrettable feature of the Indian campaign in Kenya is that they are engaged in stirring up disaffection amongst the native tribes. Acting under cabled instructions from one of the

Indian leaders, the majority of Indian traders and shop-keepers are engaged in poisoning the minds of the native against the British Administration. This is by no means a difficult matter in the distant native Reserves where contact between the native and European is infrequent.

15. In consequence of advice from England that the well-being of the native races is the Indian's weakest political plank and requires artificial support, the local Indians have endeavoured to put a complexion on the relation of the Indian and native which it in fact does not bear. Shortly after the public statement of their policy by the English community, a number of resolutions was passed at a meeting of natives in Nairobi to the effect that the presence of Indians in the Colony was not inimical to native interests : that, next to the Missionaries, Indians were the natives' best friends : and urging the Government to confer the franchise upon all educated British subjects in the Colony.

To anyone who knows the contempt and distrust with which the Indian is regarded by the native, it was at once apparent that the resolutions had been "inspired" by Indian influence, and within a few days this was definitely proved to be the case. It appeared that the native meeting had been called at the instance of an educated Kikuyu, one Harry Thuku, the Secretary of the Kikuyu Association, and, incidentally, an ex-convict for the crime of forgery. Several days prior to the meeting, Thuku and one or two of his native associates were entertained to tea by certain of the Indian agitators and under the promise of a free trip to India for Thuku and his friends the text of the resolutions and cable reporting them was drafted by Indians then present.

These resolutions were at once cabled to the English Press, but within a fortnight the paramount Chief of the Wa-Kikuyu had called a meeting of his sub-chiefs and headmen and all influential Kikuyus, at which Thuku's resolutions were disowned and repudiated and Thuku himself dismissed from his position as Secretary of the Association. Several other meetings of natives have been held since in other parts of the Colony and all have,

without exception, been opposed to the idea of any elevation of the Indian to a responsible position in the government of the Colony.

The above has been dealt with in detail, as the original resolutions passed at Thuku's meeting appeared in the English Press, while their exposure, though cabled home by the European community at the time, does not appear to have been accorded similar publicity.

16. Although the Indian trader undoubtedly fills a niche in the commercial life of the colony, yet the results of his trade are but of transitory benefit to the country. In but few instances does the Indian settle permanently in Kenya, and the consequence is that instead of reinvesting his profits locally he remits them to India. He has every opportunity of investing his profits in the immense areas in the country which are open for Asiatic occupation, but in very few instances avails himself of such opportunity.

In times of depression, the Indian bankruptcies are out of all proportion to those of other communities.

During the last 18 months, since the currency of this country has been stabilised while the Indian rupee has been of fluctuating value, the Colony has lost an enormous sum of money by the smuggling of rupees into the country by Indians.

17. There is no room for doubt that the Church and Missionary Societies take the view that the grant of rights to India which would lead to her ultimate supremacy would sound the death-knell of native advancement.

The Bishop of Mombasa, speaking on the native aspect of the question at a Mass Meeting in Nairobi, as one who had spent many years in India and had made Indian friends there, stated that "it would be fatal to give India the Government here when our native races were beginning to realise that they had a future before them."

Canon Burns, one of the oldest and best-known Missionaries in the Colony, in the course of a speech at the same meeting, after referring to the wholesale cheating of the natives by Indians and of the utter disregard of the Indian for the uplifting or advancement of the Native, gave it as his opinion that if the proposed

concession to Indians were carried into effect, the progress of the native would be put back 50 years. It would be the most disastrous thing that could happen from the native point of view, and if it happened, he doubted whether he could continue his work in Kenya.

The medical faculty has been equally emphatic in its condemnation of any change of status which would have the effect of placing the Indian in any position where he could influence the native. Dr. Burkitt, the senior private medical practitioner in the Colony, who for many years was a medical officer in India, in dealing with the subject, said :—“I say as a medical man who has been up against all this, that no sanitation or hygiene can be carried out in the face of the abominable religious customs of Indians and judging by what I myself have seen of them, I say unhesitatingly that they are much more degrading and debasing than anything I have seen or heard of amongst the Natives of this country. Venereal disease, in peoples following such debasing religious customs, I need hardly say, is rampant, more rampant probably than anywhere else. The statistics, as far as they can be taken in Bombay City this year, and as given in last month’s British Medical Journal, exceed anything yet known. The same may be said of bestial sexual offences, also generated by these religions and which are almost unknown among primitive peoples. With regard to plague, our greatest disease danger in this country, I have not the remotest hesitation in saying that its incidence in this country is due to the insanitary customs of our Indian compatriots.”

19. And there is the wider aspect. Our concern for our homes in Kenya and the well-being of the native people does not blind us to the fact that the danger to the Empire and to Christianity is greater. If the East is permitted to penetrate Africa and the Trusteeship of the vast native population be transferred to other and alien hands, then gone is the dream of a series of Christian African States, created and linked together by the genius of British colonisation.

20. Australia, New Zealand, Canada and South Africa have all closed the door to Indian immigration—all have seen the danger. To those on the spot the menace is apparent, to those at home it is vague and indefinite. For this reason we desire investigation here.

21. To sum up:—

Is England to be marked with the stain of betraying the African native to Eastern rule?

Is the young growth of Christianity and western civilization to be supplanted by Eastern creeds and superstitions?

Is the pioneer and the man who, in the words of the Colonial Secretary "is up against the wilderness" once again, in spite of solemn pledges, to be the sport of political opportunism?

On behalf of the Unofficial
Members of the Legislative
Council of Kenya,
(Signed) DELAMERE.

On behalf of the Convention
of Associations of Kenya,
(Signed)
C. KENNETH ARCHER,
Chairman.