Scottish Geographical Magazine

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rsgj19>

The protectorates of Great Britain in tropical Africa

Sir Harry H. Johnston G.C.M.G., K.C.B.

Published online: 27 Feb 2008.

To cite this article: Sir Harry H. Johnston G.C.M.G., K.C.B. (1902) The protectorates of Great Britain in tropical Africa, *Scottish Geographical Magazine*, 18:2, 57-76, DOI: [10.1080/00369220208733318](https://doi.org/10.1080/00369220208733318)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00369220208733318>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access

and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

THE SCOTTISH GEOGRAPHICAL MAGAZINE.

THE PROTECTORATES OF GREAT BRITAIN IN TROPICAL AFRICA.

By Sir HARRY H. JOHNSTON, G.C.M.G., K.C.B.

DURING the first half of the nineteenth century Great Britain might have assumed a Protectorate over nearly all Africa between the tropics of Capricorn and Cancer, without exciting much comment or any effective protest on the part of any European Power, provided, of course, that we respected strips or patches of coast-board actually belonging to Portugal or France. But although the United Kingdom at that period was far ahead of any other European nation in its energetic attempts to reveal the mysteries of Inner Africa, to trace the course of the Niger, the Congo, the Zambezi, the Gambia, the Senegal, and the Limpopo; although our agents, first of all Europeans, had crossed the Sahara desert from the Mediterranean to Lake Chad and the Niger, had penetrated to Darfur and the regions of South-Central Africa, now called Bechuanaland and Rhodesia, our forefathers shrank, perhaps wisely, from the enormous responsibility and expenditure involved in such an undertaking as the protection and development of Negro Africa. Strenuous efforts were made to put down the sea-borne slave-trade; the Lower Niger, the Lower Congo, the Zanzibar coast-line were policed by our bluejackets; our trade had begun to lay hold of the East and West African coasts, exceeding many times in volume that carried on under any other flag. Our friendly relations with Tunis and Tripoli, coupled with the efforts we had made to open up a way across the Sahara to the fertile Sudan, greatly increased British commerce with North Africa. In all probability, therefore, those who then ruled the destinies of the United Kingdom were wise in declining to annex or protect large portions of the interior of the Dark Continent when there was no let or hindrance to our com-

merce and no attempt on the part of other European Powers to establish themselves in these regions.

But the events which followed on Stanley's epoch-making journey along the course of the Congo from east to west compelled Great Britain to take steps to secure her control over a reasonable share of tropical Africa: for this journey of Stanley's led to the founding of the Congo Free State and the Berlin Congress, and to a rush on the part of France, Germany, Portugal, Italy, and Spain to carve out large slices of the Dark Continent as colonies, protectorates, or spheres of influence. Even the independent Dutch element in South Africa, whose separate nationality had been to a great extent created in 1881, aspired to extend its rule over the regions between the Limpopo and the Zambezi. If during the last quarter of the nineteenth century we had stood apart with folded arms, refusing to do as others did, we should have been left at the present day with a few tiny patches on the West Coast of Africa, and with Cape Colony and Natal, while our trade with tropical Africa, which now stands at a value of something like £10,000,000 per annum, would have dwindled to a perfectly inconsiderable sum; for, unfortunately, coincident with the march of the European Powers on Africa rose stronger and stronger a preference on their part for a protective tariff, or for measures which should selfishly encourage and protect the trade of the dominant European nation to the prejudice of commerce carried on under foreign, if friendly, flags. Between 1885 and 1900 two motives compelled the advisers of the British sovereign to place under the protection of the British flag about one-sixth of tropical Africa. One was a desire to carry out philanthropic tasks such as the suppression of the slave-trade and the unhampered exercise of Christian propaganda; and the other was the necessity of keeping open for Great Britain and her Colonies and Dependencies (such as India) a reasonable proportion of the Dark Continent as an unrestricted field for British commerce. Only we ourselves, and perhaps our American cousins, know how real and disinterested were the philanthropic movements which lasted throughout the nineteenth century, and which obliged Great Britain to take upon herself the tremendous expense of suppressing the slave-trade, and of attempting to Christianise a large proportion of Africa. *We* know that these efforts were wholly dissociated from interested motives, ridiculous as this assertion may appear to a Frenchman or a German; not that the French or Germans are by any means incapable of similar philanthropic work, but somehow or other since Napoleon's famous phrase about "a nation of shopkeepers" they refuse to believe that the British can really desire to put an end to the slave-trade (for instance) without making such a mission a cloak for securing valuable territorial possessions. When the history of Africa comes to be impartially written, however, it will be seen that fifty years of slave-trade suppression on the part of Great Britain led to no more than the acquisition of isolated ports or dépôts at Sierra Leone and at Lagos. Whether or not it was wise from a practical point of view, it should be perfectly clear to the same impartial historian that our assumption of a Protectorate over Nyasaland, which has extended to the wider limits of British Central Africa,

and over Uganda, were undertaken primarily for purely philanthropic motives, and without the prospect or the hope of ulterior gain. Much the same might be said about the reconquest of the Egyptian Sudan. Political motives connected with our necessary possession of Aden obliged us to acquire the opposite coast of Somaliland, and very valid commercial considerations compelled us to place Nigeria, Southern Rhodesia, British East Africa, Zanzibar, and the hinterlands of Sierra Leone and the Gold Coast under the British flag.

In one way and another (excluding the African colonies we possessed before 1880) we have added to our empire about 1,500,000 square miles of tropical Africa. On the west coast we have secured both banks of the river Gambia almost as far inland as that river is navigable for steamers. We have added a hinterland to the settlements we had on the Sierra Leone coast, which is nearly the size of Scotland. At the back of our ancient settlements on the Gold Coast we have acquired the Ashanti country and other kingdoms beyond it, stretching northwards to the tenth degree of north latitude. Yoruba has been added to Lagos, and the three governments of Lagos, Southern Nigeria, and Northern Nigeria, whose boundaries fuse one with the other, rule over a magnificent territory between the Niger delta and Lake Chad which in area is nearly twice the size of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. North of the old limits of Cape Colony and Natal, and of the formerly independent Dutch states, we have added to the British Empire Bechuanaland, Rhodesia, and British Central Africa—a mass of territory nearly equal in extent to the united areas of France and Spain. In East Africa we have undertaken the Protectorate of the two islands of Zanzibar and Pemba, of Uganda, and of East Africa, which together offer an extent of about 300,000 square miles, and all Northern Somaliland, which has an area not far off that of Ireland. We have in addition assumed the responsibility for the maintenance of law and order in the Egyptian Sudan—another four or five hundred thousand square miles of tropical Africa.

And now the cold fit has succeeded to the hot flush of excitement. These African additions to the empire have involved us in heavy expenditure for administration and development and for defence against internal or external enemies; for the rivalry of European Powers still continues. Prince Bismarck, not without malicious forethought, laid down the principle at the Congress of Berlin that these African Protectorates must be effective, that it was not sufficient to paint the country on the map of Africa with the national colours of the state that aspired to protect it; these Protectorates must be followed up to a great extent by effective occupation. It is true that the convenient term, "*sphere of influence*," was adopted later on, which was supposed not to entail quite such heavy responsibility: but what have we seen whenever we contented ourselves with obtaining a recognition of our sphere of influence? Uganda was brought within our sphere of influence in 1890, but the journey of Dr. Peters and the agitation of the French missionaries entailed on us effective occupation if we wished to maintain that country under British control. Our several-times-delineated sphere of influence in Nigeria

was continually transgressed by French expeditions until the whole of it was dominated by British forces. We were ourselves tempted to disregard Belgian and Portuguese claims which were merely paper claims, and compelled both the Congo Free State and Portugal to show effective occupation before we respected their rights.

On the other hand, to those who argue that it would have been sufficient to have bargained with foreign Powers for a fair field to be kept open for British commerce, and that after such arrangements we might have seen without misgivings huge territories in tropical Africa pass under the French or German flags, I would say: How far have the implicit assurances regarding free-trade in all the Congo regions under the sway of France been respected? Is it not the case at the present time that, despite the greater part of French Congo having been included within the free-trade area, the only two British firms still able to trade there are not allowed to purchase an ounce of rubber? How much trade under the British flag now exists with German East Africa? I call attention to these facts with no desire to say disagreeable things about France, Germany, or any other European Power. To my thinking—and I have travelled in Africa since 1879—the only way to secure a fair field for British commerce was to place a reasonable proportion of Africa under the British flag, and to cease wrangling about our rights to trade in those other portions of Africa which came under the sway of other European Powers. We should not propose to go to war with France to insist on her respecting the provisions of the Berlin Act, however much we may regret the treatment accorded to Messrs. Hatton and Cookson in French Congo. It is to be hoped that Messrs. Hatton and Cookson will turn their attention now to territories like Uganda, British Central Africa, and Southern Nigeria, where rubber quite as good as that produced by French Congo may be found growing.

Public opinion in the United Kingdom is still kept in a healthy state of activity by the want of unanimity which prevails amongst our advisers in the press and on the platform. Besides those who are still ardently in favour of acquiring or developing territory in Africa, there are those who would try to prove in the first place that all such acquisitions are absolutely unprofitable, and that in regarding these Protectorates as laudable enterprises in philanthropy, we are wilfully deceiving ourselves; a great deal of exaggerated nonsense is talked about the introduction of gin and clothing and bloodshed into happy Arcadias where naked, teetotal negroes led placid lives in happy ignorance of the wicked world without. I will take this last contention first, and attempt to show you that if we have been pursuing philanthropic aims purely and simply, then we have had our money's worth in the results already achieved in these African Protectorates.

Whether or not formulated in so many words, we set out a quarter of a century ago to suppress the land slave-trade, put down internecine war and cannibalism among the natives, secure a fair field, if no favour, for Christian propaganda, and introduce some degree of civilisation to the negro. In the prosecution of these objects we had to war against Arabs, Fulahs, Somalis, and negroes who were opposed to our inter-

ference; and in the course of these wars or in the rough administration which followed them, there occurred, no doubt, isolated and regrettable acts on the part of Europeans which were immoral, or cruel, or thoughtless, but which were little grains of sand compared to the huge boulders of abominable wrongdoing which negro has flung against negro.

Our critics point to the wars which have occurred between the British forces and the natives as a proof that our protection was not desired and had to be imposed by force. They single out an individual atrocity as a sample of the white man's daily conduct; and having thus shown the supposed fallacy, from the philanthropical point of view, of our expensive efforts to administer an area in tropical Africa, which equals the united extent of Europe without Russia, they allege that there has been no justification in results achieved for the bloodshed which seems to have been inevitable in the founding of these Protectorates.

Those who read the works of the English, German, and French explorers who travelled at the back of our West African colonies on the Niger, in the Western Sudan, and about Lake Chad down to, let us say, six years ago, must admit that unless one and all of these travellers had been deliberately lying, the bloodshed and misery that went on in these regions was incomparably more awful than the whole sum of "atrocities" inflicted by ill-conducted Europeans, or produced by European warfare with the natives incidental to the extension of European rule over the western third of Africa. I for one, with every desire to be unprejudiced, cannot come to any other conclusion than that the natives of Nigeria have immensely gained in happiness and security of life and property wherever we have undertaken the direct administration and control of the countries in which they live.

Those who may desire to realise what the condition of the natives was before British control of some kind was established in Nigeria should especially read the works of Barth, Rohlfs, and Baikie, and perhaps may not find beneath consideration the epitome of a negro's life in the Western Sudan which I penned in a little book called *The History of a Slave*, not a single incident in which was not based on facts either known to and seen by myself or credibly reported by European travellers. Two hundred, three hundred negroes may have been killed in a war which abolished the bloody rule of Benin, but this caused the death, often under circumstances of horrible torture, of at least a thousand negroes *per annum*, while under this dominion no one but the king or the sorcerer dared to grow rich, or had any security that the property accumulated by his industry would remain with him and descend to his children. Visit the rivers of the Niger Delta now, and see if you can state with truth that the negroes are not happy, numerous, and commencing to lead a civilised and comfortable life. Then again, in British Central Africa. Prior to the effective development of British control continual loss of life was going on amongst the natives. The Arabs and their adherents, the Muhammadan Yaos, traded and raided all through the eastern part of the territory for slaves, this slave-raiding resulting in a very great loss of life, whilst the miseries

endured by the slaves on their way to the coast have scarcely if at all been exaggerated by travellers like Livingstone. Mlozi, the Arab raider, who lost his life in the final struggle at the north end of Lake Nyasa, must have been responsible in his time for the death of something like 10,000 negroes of the surrounding Wankonde tribes. The Arab often killed for the mere lust and joy of killing. His black slaves and soldiers shared his ferocity. Captive women were needlessly murdered in cold blood. Their children were torn from them and thrown into the camp fires or spitted on spears. A large number of boys were mutilated to provide eunuchs for Muhammadan harems. Bands of Zulus who had left South Africa owing to the civil wars in the early part of the nineteenth century established kingdoms which involved perpetual bloodshed in civil wars, in witchcraft persecutions, and in aggressive attacks on other tribes in the territories west of Lake Nyasa. Half-castes of Goanese extraction set themselves up as independent chiefs on the central Zambezi, and slew, with the same ferocity as the Arab, those whom they could not enslave. There was scarcely a wilderness which one crossed in the early days of the British Central Africa Protectorate which did not bear traces, old or recent, of destroyed villages and abandoned plantations. To possess a few cattle, or to have cultivated a little more corn than was absolutely necessary for the food of one's family was sufficient to draw down on one the attacks of robbers or the pressure of one's own chief. A warlike tribe like the Awemba would devastate the countries round their home in a ring fifty miles broad and of immense circumference. If you visit the Kazembe's capital near Lake Mweru at the present day you will still see a large proportion of the population without hands or without ears, or mutilated in some other fashion, these being the punishments or acts of spite to which the native ruler was chiefly inclined. I should think until the British Protectorate became effective ten per cent. of the negro population of these countries was killed every year by the poison ordeal. In most districts there was not a woman who had reached fifty years of age but had had perhaps ten times in her life to flee into the bush and conceal herself there, half starved, whilst her native village was in the hands of slave-raiders, invading Zulus, or the soldiery of her own chief, who were amusing themselves and their master by a little rapine and shedding of blood. In the wars which were necessary with Arab, Yao, and Zulu to found the Protectorate—wars, it must be remembered, carried on in the main by natives of the Protectorate fighting under our flag—there cannot have been killed from first to last more than 1500 people on both sides. The subsequent growth of the population is sufficient witness to the gain in human life and happiness which has been purchased by the death of those 1500 men.

It has been the same in Uganda. If one reads the works of Speke, of Stanley, of the Rev. W. P. Ashe, of Lugard and Colville, one realises what a bloody country was the kingdom of Uganda before it came under British control. The flow of human blood must have been such a common sight as to render its inhabitants singularly callous. Speke gives a pathetic account of Mwanga's wives being hurried off to a cruel

execution, for most trivial reasons, raising their wailing cries of "O my Lord, O my Master" as they passed him on the way. Sometimes the reasons for these death-sentences were that a wife had failed to close the door as she passed out of a courtyard, or she had pulled the door to when to do so was a breach of native etiquette. The worship of the spirits in Uganda and Busoga involved constant human sacrifice. At the accession of a new chief in Busoga disgusting mutilations took place of young men and virgins which must have resulted in their death after dreadful tortures. In the countries speaking the speech of Unyoro, native custom positively required the suicide of wives on their husbands' graves. But the warfare that took place—the constant loss of life occasioned by civil wars, slave raids, or the aggressions on or by other states; raids from Uganda into Unyoro to obtain extra wives for the chiefs, raids from Unyoro into Toro and Ankole to snatch cattle and seize women. Then again farther east: whole tribes wiped out of existence. This has occurred again and again. The population of parts of Kavirondo on the slopes of Mount Elgon, of the Nyando valley, and of much of the Nandi plateau has been absolutely extinguished, most of the men, women, and children being slain, and the remnant starving to death in the bush. One can only say that in every district there prevailed absolute insecurity for life or property. There may have been the most carefully framed native laws and customs inflicting on the native's daily life an amount of etiquette which we should find intolerable; but although these may have secured the law and order of a village, they were no defence against aggression from a rival village, or the downward swoop of some robber tribe who scarcely even felt the common tie of humanity with the peaceful cultivators whose blood they shed with positive enjoyment, whose habitations they laid waste, and whose cattle they stole. Famines, epidemics of smallpox or of bubonic plague, attacks of a virulent dysentery caused by bad water and semi-starvation, would slay here six thousand, here ten thousand, elsewhere wipe out a whole nation. The cattle plague would come down from the north, and since there was no central government to check it, or to segregate it, disease among the cattle would wipe off all the herds of a country as large as Wales, reducing its inhabitants, who had hitherto depended solely on the produce of their flocks and herds, to starvation or a disastrous emigration.

As regards famines, I may be told that British rule in India has of late been coincident with terrible famines. That is true; but the people who put this forward do not stop to inquire how bad the famine would have been if there were no British Government, or whether the famine could ever have taken place but for the enormous and unchecked increase of population which has taken place under British rule, whereby India possesses almost more inhabitants than she can support. As regards Uganda and Busoga and the countries to the north of Mount Elgon, where famine has occurred since our acquaintance with these countries, it has been of a kind which will henceforth be certainly preventable under a well-organised administration. Warfare and the deflection of cultivators to unprofitable fighting was one reason. Partial

failure of rain was another; but this last would have been of but little effect if the natives had been taught to irrigate their fields from streams which never fail.

Freedom of religion has certainly been one result of a British administration established in these Protectorates. A man may now be Catholic or Protestant, Muhammadan or Pagan without fear of his life or without loss of his property. I am honestly convinced, and so I think would be any unprejudiced observer, that so far as happiness of the natives goes, our Protectorate over Uganda has been justified as it has been elsewhere in Africa.

It is not within my province to pronounce on the work of other nations on the same lines. I should certainly say that the condition of Tunis, Senegal, and Dahome under the French was a hundred times better than the state of those countries when entirely left to the devices of native rulers. Here and there a native of Unyamwezi may feel the heavy hand of a German sergeant, but the people know at any rate that as long as they pay their taxes and obey the law their lives and property are secure. But I feel we have quite enough to do to look after our own possessions and spheres of influence in Africa without turning aside to criticise the work of other nations. Until we are sure that not a fault, not an error in judgment remains in our own rule, that there is not a thing left undone that ought to be done, we may save ourselves the waste of time and energy involved in trying to show how badly the French, Germans, Belgians, Italians, and Portuguese manage their possessions. Let their work be judged eventually by its results. If the results are good, then the work cannot have been wholly bad. If all these nations are treating the natives abominably, or—as is sometimes complained of the French in Senegal—with mistaken kindness, then no doubt the expensive failure of their efforts will be sufficient punishment to the countries at fault. We have at any rate secured a sufficient share of Africa in which to put our own philanthropic theories in practice, and in which to give our commerce absolutely free play.

In theory, I maintain that inasmuch as we entered upon the assumption of Protectorates over East and Central Africa, mainly in the interests of the natives, to put down the slave-trade, and in the case of some countries to establish British protection at the natives' request, in preference to allowing them to come within the sphere of another Power; as the immediate outcome of these Protectorates is of benefit principally to their negro inhabitants, it is to the *natives* that we should look in the first instance to provide, according to their means, the funds necessary to maintain an economical but effective administration. If every adult male native in these Protectorates paid eight shillings a year in taxation, there would be little if any need to resort to the treasury of the United Kingdom for funds to supplement the cost of administration. There would also be no cause for the British taxpayer to complain if coffee or rubber or gold or ivory or all these substances combined failed to provide a lucrative commerce for the British market. The Protectorates would then be administered purely in the interests of the black man. He at least in the climate of the country wherein he was born

does not suffer to the same extent from the diseases which afflict the European who attempts to settle in parts of tropical Africa; he at least is happy and content if he can maintain flocks and herds of cattle, sheep, and goats, and grow foodstuffs suited to his country and his palate. But the native in many cases has no cash with which to pay his taxes. He can only earn the money by working (say) for a month, or by collecting and selling rubber, coffee, or some other saleable substance which he can acquire without robbing other people; or he may breed cattle for the provision market, or collect oil, which is sufficiently valuable to meet the cost of transport to the European markets. But do these countries of tropical Africa produce substances of sufficient value to induce the European and Asiatic trader to buy them from the natives, or to cultivate them on his own account by means of paid native labour? If they do—and the fact has long been established in West Africa—then again the question of an equilibrium in the Protectorate finances is ultimately decided. Supposing for a moment, however, that coffee is destined to be a partial failure in British Central Africa,¹ or that the existence of coffee, cacao, ivory, oil-seeds, hides, and live-stock in moderate quantities in Uganda are not sufficient to maintain a large and profitable commerce, is there no other way by which the natives of these East African Protectorates may prosper, make money, and, with far less sacrifice than the average inhabitant of European countries, support their own local administration? There is, I believe, a method which, properly regulated, might be productive of most beneficial results. In Africa, south of the Zambezi, there exists an enormous demand for negro labour, especially in countries where climatic and other conditions make it impossible to use white men. If between the Zambezi and the Nile there exist millions of black men by no means disinclined to work for a fair wage, and south of the Zambezi there are white men prepared to lay out millions of pounds sterling in industrial development, it is surely a pity that some adequate means should not be discovered of bringing together this capital and labour. I know there are sentimental people or others, who criticise from a sheer love of criticism, who are on the look-out to pounce on any policy of this kind as slavery in disguise. Reasonable and reflecting individuals will not levy such a charge any more than they would call “slavery” the emigration of coolies from India to tropical countries where they can gain a good wage; or the migration of Britons to British Columbia, Australia, or South Africa, by such a term. Because in the past black men have been made to work for nothing, and the conscience of Europe became in time rightly shocked at such unfair treatment, this is no reason why the black man should not now be given facilities for working in South Africa for a wage which will seem to him of Central Africa actual wealth, a wage which will enable him to purchase many things which will raise his life above that of actual savagery. Those who would argue in favour of keeping the Central African negroes locked up in Central Africa are the real slaveholders. Why should the native of Uganda, of British East Africa, of British Central Africa, of

¹ I think no such thing.

West Africa be prevented from going to South Africa to earn money in the same way that the native of India or Arabia does? Europeans under a European Government can look pretty well after their own interests and protect themselves from ill-usage. But measures have to be taken to secure fair treatment for the Asiatic. If similar measures are put in force in Africa, south of the Zambezi, to protect the Central African immigrants from ill-usage or unfair treatment, I cannot see that any honest objection can then be raised to the natives of these tropical African Protectorates seeking well-paid work in that direction. Experiments have already been made in regard to sending labourers from British Central Africa to Rhodesia, experiments which I have watched with keen interest. Some of the men thus employed actually came on to England to take part in an exhibition at Earl's Court, and I was able to converse with them there on their experiences south of the Zambezi. Colleagues of mine, on whose reports I am able to place implicit confidence, have also assured me that all these Central African negroes were well paid for their work in the Rhodesian mines, and were released punctually at the end of their term of engagement, returning to their homes eventually (for some made the journey to England, others sought work farther south in Cape Colony) with sums of money that enabled them to start as small capitalists on their own account in their Nyasaland homes. But as the result of my inquiries, I ascertained that the present conditions of service in South Africa are not wholly acceptable to these Central Africans. It remains to be seen whether the South African authorities can see their way to removing these few objections. One point raised is the inequality of the stress in their labour. These negroes would not mind regular daily work between (say) 7 A.M. and 5 P.M.; what they object to is that for some days they are perfectly idle, and at other times they have to work desperately hard night and day under contractors who have piecework to accomplish and wish to do it under the time fixed in the contract. Another objection is the method of lodging these Central African labourers. They are housed in huge barracks, which are practically prisons; that is to say, the negro labourer is unable to leave them except during the hours of work. Although these barracks are clean, sanitary, and not uncomfortable, they are still to all intents and purposes prisons, and celibate prisons. The sleeping accommodation consists of large numbers of bunks in a single dwelling. These sleeping-places are constantly being washed out with strong-smelling disinfectants. No fires are allowed, a sore deprivation to the negro, who loves his hearth better almost than does any other race. The food is substantial and nourishing, but rather unappetising, and is cooked and served out wholesale. The reasons for this method of lodging and feeding the Central African negroes is, firstly, the danger of smallpox, and secondly, the fear lest they might desert before their term of service is complete. As regards the smallpox, it would surely be preferable to vaccinate the labourers on arrival, and then they would run no risk of getting smallpox. As regards the fear of desertion, no such fear need be entertained if the men are well treated and properly fed. Moreover, if they desert before their term of service is complete,

they lose their accumulated wages. What the Central African labourer would prefer is to be allowed to build a little hut of his own, of grass or any other material that is available, a hut wherein he could live by himself and cook his food in his own way. If this facility were granted, I am sure that work in South Africa would become extremely popular amongst Central African negroes. None that I have ever questioned or have had examined have ever complained of ill-treatment at the hands of the white man, and they are all surprised and gratified by the relatively high rate of wage. On the other hand, the wages paid to these unskilled Central African labourers are far less than what is now required by the better educated, more civilised Zulus, Bechuanas, and natives of Portuguese East Africa.

I would sum up this section of my address, which deals with the justification of our assumption of these Protectorates from the philanthropic point of view, by emphasising this principle: Between the Zambezi and the southern frontier of Egypt, between Mombasa and the Gambia, the countries under our rule, which are mostly inhabited by negroes, must, in the first place, be governed simply, economically, and effectively, in the interest of these negroes, on the understanding that the negro on his part contributes taxation according to his means—say, an average ten shillings a head per adult per annum—which will relieve the British taxpayer from the cost of supporting these Protectorates. The Protectorate will be maintained mainly in the interests of the negro quite independently of whether the country proves profitable or healthy to the white man. In that case the native must contribute to its support in the same degree as is expected of the citizens of any civilised state. It would be most unfair if the already heavily burdened taxpayer of the United Kingdom were to continue to put his hand in his pocket in order that negroes in far away African countries should be preserved from foreign invasion, from civil war, or from the slave-trade. The negro of course in these countries must be guaranteed the possession of the soil he occupies. He must be a free man, free to take his labour where he will, free even not to work provided he has fulfilled his very simple obligations towards the State. But if he is to expect to be governed by us without any sacrifice or contribution on his part, then I maintain it is unfair that he should be given for nothing the rights and privileges of citizens of civilised communities.

But is there to be no profit then to the white man, no return for the capital he has invested in this African undertaking? As a matter of fact, I maintain that in principle the Imperial Government should take note of the money it has expended in the creation and development of these Protectorates, and attach the sum-total of this expenditure to these native States as a debt, an advance of funds which in days of coming prosperity should be gradually repaid to the Mother-Country, or on which, at any rate, interest might be paid into the Imperial exchequer. (I wonder if it is sufficiently realised that it is the taxpayer of the United Kingdom who, with rare exceptions, finds the money for all these experiments in empire, and for the defence of these additions to the British hegemony? With the exception of a contribution made by

Australia towards the administration of New Guinea, and possibly small contributions made by Cape Colony towards the administration of Basutoland, I believe I am correct in saying that it is the 40,000,000 inhabitants of England, Scotland, and Ireland alone that pay for these additions to the empire, and it is to the exchequer of these islands that any repayments should be made of these grants-in-aid.) I think as regards West Africa it is hardly necessary to expatiate on the profit our commerce derives from the British possessions on the Gambia, at Sierra Leone, on the Gold Coast, and in Nigeria. Manchester, Glasgow, Liverpool, Bristol, London, and Belfast would lose a notable section of their commerce, some of their most thriving industries would come to grief if there were not these extensive dominions in West and West-Central Africa under the British flag. I do not need to expatiate here on the valuable trade products which come from this part of the continent; you have only to turn to the numerous books of reference dealing with British trade to ascertain statistics about gold, palm oil, palm kernels, india-rubber, coffee, ivory, oils of many kinds, wax, and skins which come from West Africa to British ports, and the enormous quantities of cotton, woollen, and cloth manufactures, hardware, provisions, and trinkets which are exported from English and Scottish ports to the West Coast of Africa in British ships, which form a not inconsiderable section of that huge mercantile carrying-trade of the British Islands. There is no doubt about the profits we derive from our West African possessions. Those who look deeply into these matters may, however, tell me of the apparently barren expenditure which is forced on us far in the interior of Northern Nigeria, and ask whether this is profitable, and what British firms are established on Lake Chad or in Sakatu? To these I would reply that it is really indirectly the British ports on the Niger Delta and on the West Coast of Africa towards which many of the productions of these interior countries find their way by native traders. So far as my personal predilections go, I would in all these possessions be inclined to take one thing with the other, to make a rich port on the coast contribute towards the expenditure of maintaining peace in a valuable hinterland. I should be disposed to suggest to his Majesty's Government that our African Protectorates north of the Zambezi and south of the Sahara might all be brought under one department and one simple direction from London; that all our possessions in West Africa between Lake Chad and the Gambia should have but one budget; that the same thing should take place in East Africa, where the Protectorates of Zanzibar, East Africa, Somaliland, and Uganda likewise should frame inclusive estimates for expenditure and revenue and be brought under one general plan of administration. A similar unification might be effected for British Central Africa, even though Nyasaland, North-Eastern Rhodesia, and Barotseland were brought under the South African Commission. We have a High Commissioner for British South Africa whose general direction of affairs might well be extended to Tanganyika. If there were another High Commissioner for all British East Africa, and likewise another for British West Africa, greater unity of direction would be given to matters of local policy, and a certain

economy in administrative expenditure might be effected. Profits made in the revenues of Zanzibar or Somaliland might assist in defraying the deficits in the local budgets of Uganda and East Africa. Surplus revenue in the Gold Coast or on the Gambia might go towards that expenditure which will be necessary to keep the peace in Northern Nigeria and open it up to profitable trade.

I have shown that there is no question about the general value of the commerce of our West African possessions. British Central Africa and North-Eastern Rhodesia are well on their way towards providing a local revenue which meets the administrative expenditure. The annual trade in British Central Africa with Great Britain has risen in ten years from a value of something like thirty-five thousand pounds to a quarter of a million. The little Sultanate of Zanzibar pays its own way and asks for no subsidy from Great Britain. The trade in Northern Somaliland is being rapidly developed by natives of India and Arabia, and the local revenue in that Protectorate will not be long before it meets the cost of an economical administration. The doubts which are most freely expressed by critics at the present day with regard to the commercial value of these Protectorates relate more especially to East Africa and Uganda. In these countries the British Government has spent something like five millions of the taxpayers' money in building a railway nearly 600 miles long from Mombasa to the north-eastern shore of the Victoria Nyanza. East Africa is much of it (in its present condition) a disappointing country. A portion of the coast-line between Lamu on the north and the German frontier on the south has a belt about twenty miles broad of cultivated ground, and provides a commerce chiefly for British Indian merchants, of considerable value, and perhaps contributes towards the revenue of the East African Protectorate some £40,000 annually in taxes and duties. But a great deal of the interior of the East Africa Protectorate is harsh, barren steppe, very sparsely populated. Near the boundaries of the Uganda Protectorate along the Kikuyu Plateau and on the slopes of Mount Kenia there is magnificent land, covered with rich and valuable forest, and rather thickly inhabited by a somewhat turbulent race. But much of this country appears to be chiefly valuable to the natives, who are not as well disposed towards us as they should be, and not at all inclined to contribute by the payment of a small Hut Tax to the upkeep of that Administration which for several years past has completely protected them from the Arab slave-traders and the Masai cattle-raiders. I believe myself that East Africa is sufficiently rich in mineral and vegetable productions of value to make it eventually quite self-supporting by its trade. Still, this country has protected East Africa almost admittedly, not because it is valuable in itself, but because it is the coast region of the countries round the Great Lakes, especially the well-known kingdom of Uganda, and it is to the commercial development of the Uganda Protectorate that we must look for the eventual profits to be made by the Uganda Railway, and possibly for the providing of any deficit which may occur in the budget of East Africa.

With regard to Uganda, I would point out that the local revenue

rose from an annual £23,000 in 1899, to £66,000 in 1901, while at the same time the cost of administration was brought down from an average £230,000 a year to about £180,000. Thus the amount of grant-in-aid asked from the British taxpayers has considerably diminished during the last two years.

Perhaps a few notes on the principal products of Uganda, which might be turned to profit in our commerce, may be of interest to some among my present audience.

As regards minerals, a large collection of rocks was brought home by my expedition, and submitted to analysis at the British Museum. The result was to show the probability of gold being found in certain districts, and to establish the existence of graphite mines in two places. The country abounds in hæmatite iron, and in ordinary iron ore, and there is, perhaps, a little copper. Some of the rock specimens collected by Mr. F. W. Isaac in the Baringo District indicate the possibility of precious stones existing in these formations. Salt of very good quality is obtained from the salt lakes, which have become the property of the British Government in the District of Toro, in Western Unyoro, and also on Kavirondo Bay. Whether this salt would be worth exportation is a matter of doubt, but it circulates throughout a good deal of Central Africa as a valuable article of barter. It therefore has an intrinsic value as a source of revenue to the State. Broadly speaking, however, at the present time no absolute discovery of unquestioned mineral wealth has been made in the Uganda Protectorate; though it must always be remembered that Africa is the continent of surprises, and Uganda may yet be found to contain payable gold which, with the aid of the railway and steamer transport, can be worked at a profitable rate. Since, however, we can only deal with known assets, we must at present look to the development of a really prosperous commerce by means of animal and vegetable productions.

As regards animal productions, there is ivory of the very best quality. So long as the British Government can determinedly enforce the Game Regulations by a small annual expenditure, and protect female and immature male elephants from being killed by natives or Europeans, there will not be much danger of the African elephant becoming extinct in a territory so large as this, where Nature has reserved vast marshes and leagues of forest for the shelter of this beast. Provided the most rigorous care—such care is effectual in India—was taken of the females and young, there is no reason why a certain number of male elephants should not be killed yearly by designated agents of the Government, and their ivory be sold to merchants as part of the Protectorate revenues. I see no reason whatever now why attempts should not be made to tame the African elephant and use it as a transport animal. For this purpose it might eventually prove advisable to import trained Indian females which could assist in teaching the young captured Africans. The experiments I have tried myself in the way of rearing baby elephants who had not yet been weaned from their mothers proved unsuccessful, as apparently it is impossible to rear any African elephant on cow's milk. Perhaps, however, my four failures in this respect need not be held to

discourage other experiments. In any case, the late Mr. Richard Baile showed that it was possible for natives to capture young elephants able to subsist on leaves and grass, yet not so old as to be utterly unmanageable or untamable. It may be along this line that the next experiments are made, and imported female Indian elephants might be of use in taming the newly-captured elephants. In time, when African elephants had been trained to Keddah work, the whole system of capturing, taming, and training elephants might be conducted on Indian lines. If after many years of trial the African elephant is pronounced to be hopeless as a domestic animal (and it should be remembered that most African elephants in captivity, of the male sex at any rate, have shown themselves to be hopelessly savage), then at least for its magnificent ivory the creature is worth preserving as an asset to the State. If the Indian elephant shows himself to be more docile than the African elephant, it must be remembered, on the other hand, that he is of very little value for his ivory.

Zebras of two kinds (the magnificent *grévyi*, and the equally handsome but smaller Böhm's Zebra) exist in the Uganda Protectorate in countless swarms. The foals are easily captured by the natives, and can be reared by means of asses as foster-mothers, the ass being one of the commonest and cheapest of domestic animals, at any rate over the eastern parts of the Uganda Protectorate. These fine large asses, in fact (which are simply the Nubian ass slightly domesticated), might of themselves be an article of export to East Africa and India.

Giraffes, and most of the larger African antelopes, might be strictly preserved, but when they increased unduly in numbers specimens of them might be captured for sale and transmission to zoological gardens. Where any of these animals are really found in excess, and have to be thinned, it must be remembered that their hides are almost always of value commercially.

Either there is no true Tsetse Fly anywhere in the Uganda Protectorate, or it is not able to obtain and introduce into the bodies of domestic animals the malarial germs which cause tsetse fever. Therefore theoretically there is no part of the Uganda Protectorate in which cattle, sheep, goats, and horses cannot be kept. But although the Protectorate is fairly well supplied with fine cattle, and possesses enormous herds of sheep and goats, it must be remembered that at different periods during the past twenty years portions of the Protectorate have been visited, to a disastrous extent, by a cattle disease, some kind of pleuro-pneumonia, coming from the Dinka countries in the Egyptian Sudan, and gradually spreading right down to South Africa and across the continent to Sierra Leone. Some countries in the Uganda Protectorate, however, have never been ravaged by this disease. It should also be possible, perhaps, to attack the malady at its source in the Dinka countries, and eventually put a stop to these ravages which have inflicted such appalling losses on East and South Africa. At any rate at the present time Uganda has enough cattle to be able to export beasts by means of the Uganda Railway for consumption in the markets of East Africa. If cattle-breeding prospers and remains untouched by any further disease of a serious

nature, the export of hides from Uganda ought to amount to a very considerable item in its commerce.

The ostrich of the North African species, with fine white plumes in the male, is a native of the northern and eastern districts of the Uganda Protectorate. Its eggs and recently hatched young are constantly brought in by the natives for sale. There is no reason why, in the Rift Valley, and over the greater part of Uganda, ostrich farms should not be established. It is possible that the feathers of the North African ostrich might average slightly more in the market than those of the South African species.

Honey bees exist over the greater part of the Protectorate, and in many districts are partially domesticated by the natives, to whom honey is an important article of diet. The wax of these bees would certainly form in time an article for export.

Turning to vegetable productions, we have in the first place coffee. Whether originally introduced or not from Abyssinia, coffee is at any rate native now in a semi-wild form to the better forested regions of the Uganda Protectorate, its berries producing a coffee of excellent flavour. Not only might the wild coffee be gathered and sold by the natives, but it would seem as though this country was singularly well adapted for coffee plantations as the forested regions have a regular and ample rainfall, the soil is very rich, and abundance of shade trees exist. Coffee could be grown on the lake shore all round the northern half of the Victoria Nyanza. Steamers could carry the coffee to the railway terminus on Kavirondo Bay, and it is probable that by steamer and rail and steamer again from Mombasa coffee could be landed at the European markets charged with a freight of not more than £2, 10s. a ton. On the other hand, I am not certain whether Uganda would produce the local labour for the coffee plantations as cheap as that which would be obtained in British Central Africa. Perhaps on the whole the advantages of the two Protectorates for coffee-planting are about equal.

Regarding the soil of Uganda proper and the adjoining districts of Busoga and Toro, Mr. Alexander Whyte says: "Generally speaking this soil is a reddish loam on a sub-soil of rich red or chocolate clay, sometimes of a great depth. At times patches of poor, gravelly soil crop up, more especially on the hill-tops. These are formed of disintegrated ironstone or igneous rock, and do not retain the moisture. The country is wonderfully free from surface stones and boulders. . . . The soil of the swamps and marshes is a black humus, formed by the decay of rank vegetation. One would naturally expect to find a deep deposit of this mixed with soil washed down from the surrounding hills; on the contrary, I have been surprised to find this black deposit often very shallow and almost invariably overlying a subsoil of kaolin clay. The question generally put is, What will *not* grow and flourish in Uganda? The furze and the broom grow so well that we are making hedges of them. Tomatoes grow quite wild. One plant was left by the boys when weeding my compound; it flourished so amazingly that I determined to keep the tally-fruits picked from it. The yield in two

months has been three thousand! It still goes on bearing clusters of lovely fruits, and covers a space of twenty feet square."

I have taken a photograph of a sunflower in the Botanical Gardens at Entebbe, which grew up in a few weeks and produced more than two hundred blossoms, all of them producing seed full of excellent oil.

Oats thrive well on lofty regions like the Nandi Plateau. Up to the present time wheat in Uganda has not been a great success. Inasmuch, however, as it has proved a success in German East Africa to the south of the lake, our comparative failure probably means that we did not select the right kind of wheat for the very varying altitudes of the Uganda Protectorate. As to Indian corn, sorghum, millet, eleusine, and other grains native to Africa or India, they flourish exceedingly, and are at any rate excellent and sustaining food for the natives.

The Sesamum and ground nut grow in many districts, and could be converted locally into an oil of considerable commercial value. The fibre of the *Raphia* palm, of three or four species of *Hibiscus*, and of the *Sansevieria* might be worth exporting. The Baganda make excellent ropes out of locally produced fibre. Tobacco grows almost everywhere in Uganda, but whether it could possibly compete with the tobaccos of the West Indies, India, and Borneo is doubtful. But it forms a very notable object of sale and barter amongst the natives, being eagerly purchased from those who have it by those in whose districts it is not cultivated. Indeed, in making journeys to distant parts of the Protectorate, one is obliged to take tobacco as one would cloth and beads. The sugar-cane grows luxuriantly in all the tropical parts of the Protectorate, and already steps have been taken to obtain from it a sugar which should at any rate suffice for the inhabitants of Uganda. Mr. Whyte considers many portions of the Protectorate admirably adapted for the cultivation of tea and cacao, the last-named plant having, through the efforts of Sir W. Thiselton Dyer and Mr. Whyte, been successfully introduced into the Uganda Protectorate. Cotton grows wild in Uganda, but, like tobacco, might probably not be worth exportation.

Amongst the commercial assets of Uganda, timber must certainly not be overlooked. The forests of the Mau and Nandi Plateau and of the slopes of Mount Elgon contain hundreds of thousands of magnificent conifers—juniper and yew. The timber of this gigantic juniper is to all intents and purposes like cedar wood. The mere thinning of these woods, which is necessary for their improvement, and which might be carried on concurrently with the establishment of European settlements, would provide millions of cubic feet of timber, which would find a ready market on the East Coast of Africa. In the tropical forests along the shores and on the islands of the Victoria Nyanza all the best African timber trees exist—ebony, African teak, African mahogany, ironwood, and acacia. It has been considered that, without detriment to the forests along the Uganda railway, or in these lacustrine districts, wood fuel could be used instead of coal, resulting thereby in an enormous saving in the working expenses of steamers and locomotives.

We come now to what I believe to be the production of the surest value in the Uganda Protectorate—india-rubber. Mr. Whyte is of

opinion that a tree of an allied species to the guttapercha of Eastern Asia grows in Buddu, and perhaps elsewhere in the forest-covered regions of the Protectoraté. Unfortunately, the specimens collected to prove this statement have never reached their destination at Kew. But rubber of a very saleable quality is produced by two or more trees of the genus *Tabernaemontana*, and by perhaps three species of *Landolphia*. The rubber produced from these sources varies in value, according to the care with which it has been collected. The samples which we have had sold experimentally of Uganda rubbers have ranged in price from 1s. 1d. to 2s. 6d. a pound. The bulk of Uganda rubbers as at present turned out by the natives seem to realise about 2s. a pound when sold at Mombasa. Steps are being taken to properly instruct the natives in the best methods of procuring and preparing rubber for the market, and it is to be hoped that as the result not only no permanent harm will be done to the sources of rubber supply, but the purity of the Uganda rubbers may be well maintained, and secure for this article an average price of at least 2s. a pound.

In the preceding summary of the animal, vegetable, and mineral products known to exist in the Uganda Protectorate, I have said nothing about those which, though of local value, would not bear the cost of exportation to European markets. But it should be pointed out that although, in some instances, these products may not serve as exports, they are worth cultivation for local consumption. Take the sugar-cane, for instance. It might not pay to export Uganda sugar, but it will certainly pay—is paying—those people who have sufficient enterprise to turn the sugar-cane of Uganda into a crystallised sugar which is eagerly bought by Europeans, Indians, and natives, inasmuch as it can be sold to them at cheaper rates than sugar imported from abroad. The same thing would apply to cotton, salt, and tobacco.

Up to the present time British trade, that is to say, commerce conducted by natives of the United Kingdom, is by no means to the fore in the Uganda Protectorate. The firms of Smith, Mackenzie and Co. and Boustead Ridley were both, until recently, established in Uganda. Both have, to a great extent, withdrawn, owing to the difficulties of transport, and, in some cases, to a series of unlooked-for misfortunes. These and other British firms, in fact, have decided to hold their hands and restrain their enterprise until the completion of the railway and the placing of capacious steamers on the Victoria Nyanza. Whether they are wise or not in awaiting events I cannot say. Meantime two German firms are pushing ahead in all directions. One of these is the German East Africa Company. I understand that both the German firms are either subsidised by their own Government or by the German Colonial Society, and that this help enables them to create and carry on an extensive trade in Uganda, regardless of present profits or losses. The result has, I must admit, been most beneficial to the European officials who are not too well paid. Thanks to the enterprise of the German firms, stores were opened at Entebbe, Mengo, Fort Portal, and other places, even before the railway cheapened commerce and transport, and at these stores a great variety of European goods can be purchased. The Germans have been

selling excellent wine, whisky, groceries, and most of the necessities of European life, at prices which were certainly reasonable for the time and place. In fact, it really made existence possible for the official, who, before this German enterprise, either had to live on native food, or get into debt by purchasing provisions or wine in England and having them sent up country from Mombasa at a ruinous rate of transport and subject to innumerable risks. Almost simultaneously with the German came the British Indian. He rendered further benefits to the European community by bringing down the German prices, and by opening stores at places where even a German hesitated to penetrate. Within the term of my Special Commission Indian traders advanced their posts from Kampala (Mengo) to Toro and the vicinity of the Congo Free State, to five places in Unyoro, and all the posts at which Europeans or native soldiers were established in the Nile Province, besides opening bazaars at all the stations in the eastern half of the Protectorate. This commercial enterprise of the Germans and British Indians, of course, added largely to our local revenues, and did a great deal to encourage the natives to embark in trade in the products of their country. To the British Indians I can only wish unlimited success, since they trade under the British flag, and create trade, first in a small way, and then in a large way, where no trade hitherto existed. To the Germans, out of gratitude for their belief in Uganda, and for the comfort which they have added to the life of the European official by the opening of good shops, with provisions sold at reasonable prices, we should also wish success, since all trade in Uganda must conduce to the prosperity of the Protectorate and the increase of its revenues.

In addition to Germans and British Indians there came to trade in this Protectorate Persians, Somalis, one or two Greeks, several Armenians, and one Italian. A Persian has opened a soda-water factory at Entebbe. A native of Kach in British India is erecting hotels for British visitors at the principal stations on the Uganda railway and elsewhere in the Protectorate.

With regard to the Germans and to the Indians, they appeal to my liking as a Government official, because they make little or no pother; they ask for no guarantee and for no concession. They enter the country and pursue their trade under the laws in force, making the best of things as they find them. In the case of British firms, I am bound to admit that they are somewhat apt to ask for guarantees, for assured contracts, for concessions of land or monopolies of production before they are able to venture their capital and enterprise. I am quite of opinion that in some districts, in some directions, special steps should be taken to induce natives of the United Kingdom or of its self-governing Dependencies to engage in industrial enterprises. At the same time, so far as my own opinion goes, I am quite opposed to the handing over of large concessions or estates to companies or associations who have given no proof of their ability to develop these, who will probably only use them as counters with which to speculate on the share market, and who are likely to override roughly existing native rights and industries. I earnestly hope that our Government may share these views to a reasonable extent.

At any rate, until, say, ten or fifteen years we find that the natives of the Uganda Protectorate are hopeless, that they will do absolutely nothing to develop, under our direction and for their profit, the resources of the country in animal, vegetable, and mineral wealth—until then I consider we ought to be most careful not to repeat a policy which has been shown to be unfortunate in its results in the Congo Free State and in certain French colonies. Commerce ought to be absolutely free and unrestricted in the Uganda Protectorate. If the native profits by developing the resources of his country, the administration of the Protectorate will profit also, for the native will have money with which to pay his hut and gun taxes, the export duty on certain goods, or the import duty on others. The European merchant will find his gain in the cheapness of native labour, and consequently the low price of the native products which will be tendered to him for purchase. But do not let us—at any rate until we have tried other expedients and failed—hand over large districts as exclusive concessions to this or that company for rubber, timber, ivory, or coffee. Special arrangements in regard to mining may possibly have to be made owing to the utter inability of the native to develop that particular source of wealth. At the present time any European or foreigner (or, for the matter of that, any native) can purchase from the Crown an estate of 1000 acres in any one place, provided such estate be the property of the Crown and not of a native or natives, and unless it contains special deposits of minerals or areas of forest which for good reasons the Government may not wish to sell. Therefore there is no hindrance in the way of modest enterprise. As to *immodest* enterprise—a single association buying up a whole province, or obtaining an exclusive rubber concession over 25,000 square miles, I for one am totally opposed to any such policy, at any rate until it has been shown that a mass of small traders and four million natives cannot between them develop the resources of their country in a manner productive of profit and happiness to all.

MOUNTAINS.

By Professor JAMES GEIKIE, F.R.S.

II.

IN a former article in the *Magazine* (September 1901) we gave an outline of the geological history of Original or Tectonic mountains. Some of these, it was shown, date back to a most remote antiquity, while others are not nearly so old—not a few having come into existence in quite recent times. It was further pointed out that, in the case of the youngest Tectonic mountains, internal structure not infrequently coincides more or less closely with external form or configuration. This correspondence is most clearly seen in recent Accumulation mountains, such as our still active volcanoes—the shape assumed by those moun-