

LEGACY OF IMPERIALISM
DEBATE RUBRIC

Name _____ Topic/Position _____

	Very Good-Excellent	Satisfactory-Good	Needs Improvement	Not meeting set standards
Preparation	Argument is thoroughly researched. Sophisticated integration of varied LMC primary sources. Skillfully executes role within team. Class time was well-used.	Argument is well-researched. Utilizes LMC primary sources. Executes role within team. Class time was used appropriately.	Argument is adequately researched with some holes remaining. Passing reference to LMC primary sources. Some confusion on role within team. Class time should have been used more effectively.	Argument is poorly researched. Does not use LMC primary sources. Student seems confused about role within team. Class time was not properly used.
Information	Student exhibits a complete understanding of both sides of the topic. Uses many specific examples, evidence, data, etc. to support argument. Uses balanced and varied evidence from Africa, India, Southeast Asia, and Latin America.	Student exhibits a good understanding of both sides of the topic. Uses several specific examples, evidence, data, etc. to support argument. Uses evidence from most areas studied.	Student exhibits good understanding of own topic but not the opposition. Some specific examples but tends to generalize. Evidence to support argument focused on only one or two geographic areas. Some errors in accuracy.	Student exhibits no understanding of own topic. Information is general and/or vague. Information contains many factual/historical errors.
Persuasion	Argument is made logically, coherently, and passionately. Visual aids assist the argument. Any rebuttal points convincingly refute the opposition's points.	Argument is made logically but with little emotion. Any rebuttal points directly refute the opposition.	Argument is difficult to follow at times. Rebuttals refute the opposition's topic, but not necessarily the points they made.	Argument is confusing and/or illogical. Rebuttals do not refute the opposition.
Presentation	Student speaks clearly, audibly, with good eye contact and confidence. Argument meets length requirement. Treats fellow classmates with respect.	Student is usually clear and audible. Makes eye contact and seems mostly confident. Argument meets length requirement. Treats fellow classmates with respect.	Student is mostly understandable but lacks confidence and eye contact. Argument falls somewhat short of length requirement. Treats fellow classmates with respect.	Student lacks clarity and/or cannot be heard. Student does not make eye contact with the class. Argument is less than half of the length requirement. Disrespects classmates and/or makes personal attacks.

Grade _____/50

Comments:

RESPONSIBILITIES FOR EACH ROLE

Introduction:

- Must state the basic position of the side
- Must know the topics of the 3 arguments of his/her side
- Must be able to give basic outline of each argument without giving all the information away
- May read from a completely prepared written introduction
- May start with a graphic story or quotation to illustrate his/her and appeal to emotions
- Must speak for 2 minutes

Arguments:

- Must have a clear and distinct topic sentence (check that you don't overlap with other team members)
- Must use specific evidence to prove topic sentence
- Use the text, notes, handouts and outside research to find good evidence
- May read from a completely prepared written argument
- May use pictures, maps, graphs or documents on the overhead/LCD to illustrate a point
- Must speak for 3 minutes

Rebuttals:

- Must reply directly to the opposing side's argument
- Must critique the argument not the person making the argument
- Must use specific evidence to support each point
- May use notes to be prepared with evidence
- Must be able to anticipate opponent's arguments and think flexibly
- Must speak for one to two minutes

Conclusion:

- Must restate his/her sides position on imperialism
- Must restate the 3 basic arguments of his/her side
- May come prepared with part of the conclusion written
- Must attempt to repair damage caused by your opponent's rebuttals (you need to show why their rebuttal was wrong)
- Must be able to think flexibly so that you can make a final critique of your opponent
- Must speak for two minutes

Anatole France Warns Against Imperialism as "The New Barbarism," 1904¹

Anatole France (Jacques Anatole François Thibault, 1844-1924), the great French novelist, was a strong pro-Dreyfusard and was sympathetic to the Socialist movement. In an article "Colonial Madness," originally published in the *Neue Freie Presse* in 1904 and condensed here, he brusquely rejected the idea that imperialism was a civilizing force, and, instead, warned that it was "the new barbarism."

Imperialism is the most recent form of barbarism, the end of the line for civilization. I do not distinguish between the two terms—imperialism and barbarism—for they mean the same thing.

We Frenchmen, a thrifty people, who see to it that we have no more children than we are able to support easily, careful of adventuring into foreign lands, we Frenchmen, who hardly ever leave our own gardens, for what in the world do we need colonies? What can we do with them? What are the benefits for us? It has cost France much in lives and money so that the Congo, Cochinchina, Annam, Tonkin, Guinea, and Madagascar may be able to buy cotton from Manchester, liquors from Danzig, and wine from Hamburg. For the last seventy years France has attacked and persecuted the Arabs so that Algeria might be inhabited by Italians and Spaniards!

The French people get nothing from the colonial lands of Africa and Asia. But their government finds it profitable. Through colonial conquest the military people get promotions, pensions, and awards, in addition to the glory gained by quelling the natives. Shipowners, army contractors, and shady politicians prosper. The ignorant mob is flattered because it believes that an overseas empire will make the British and Germans green with envy.

Will this colonial madness never end? I know well that nations are not reasonable. Considering their composition, it would be strange, indeed, if they were. But sometimes they know instinctively what is bad for them. Through long and bitter experience they will come to see the mistakes they have made. And, one day, they will realize that colonies bring only danger and ruin.

W. S. Blunt: Some Fruits of Imperialism, 1900¹

At the turn of the century, Wilfred Scawen Blunt (1840-1922), British poet, diplomat and publicist, was skeptical about the nature of imperialism. A critic of British policy in the Sudan and elsewhere, Blunt became a sympathizer of Muslim aspirations and Pan-Islamism.

The old century is very nearly out, and leaves the world in a pretty pass, and the British Empire is playing the devil in it as never an empire before on so large a scale. We may live to see its fall. All the nations of Europe are making the same hell upon earth in China, massacring and pillaging and raping in the captured cities as outrageously as in the Middle Ages. The Emperor of Germany gives the word for slaughter and the Pope looks on and approves. In South Africa our troops are burning farms under Kitchener's command, and the Queen and the two Houses of Parliament and the bench of bishops thank God publicly and vote money for the work. The Americans are spending fifty millions a year on slaughtering the Filipinos; the King of the Belgians has invested his whole fortune on the Congo, where he is brutalizing the negroes to fill his pockets. The French and Italians for the moment are playing a less prominent part in the slaughter, but their inactivity grieves them. The whole white race is reveling openly in violence, as though it had never pretended to be Christian. God's equal curse on them all! So ends the famous nineteenth century into which we were so proud to have been born.

¹ Wilfred Scawen Blunt, *My Diaries*, 2 vols. (London, Martin Secker, 1919-20), vol. I, p. 464.

Josiah Strong on the Anglo-Saxon Destiny, 1885¹

Nationalists and racialists in all the major countries argued eloquently that it was the destiny of their own "master race" to dominate "backward" peoples. In the United States, Josiah Strong, a Congregationalist minister, contended that it was the historic mission of the "Anglo-Saxon race" to carry its ideals of civil liberty and spiritual Christianity to remote peoples of the earth. Later, Rudyard Kipling substituted the phrase "white man's burden" for the "backward peoples" concept.

Every race which has deeply impressed itself on the human family has been the representative of some great idea—one or more—which has given direction to the nation's life and form to its civilization. Among the Egyptians this seminal idea was life, among the Persians it was light, among the Hebrews it was purity, among the Greeks it was beauty, among the Romans it was law. The Anglo-Saxon is the representative of two great ideas, which are closely related. One of them is that of civil liberty. Nearly all of the civil liberty in the world is enjoyed by Anglo-Saxons: the English, the British colonists, and the people of the United States. . . .

The other great idea . . . is that of a pure spiritual Christianity. . . . That means that most of the spiritual Christianity in the world is found among Anglo-Saxons and their converts; for this is the great missionary race. . . .

It follows, then, that the Anglo-Saxon, as the great representative of these two ideas, the depository of these two greatest blessings, sustains peculiar relations to the world's future, is divinely commissioned to be, in a peculiar sense, his brother's keeper. . . .

Another marked characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon is what may be called an instinct or genius for colonizing. His unequalled energy, his indomitable perseverance, and his personal independence, made him a pioneer. He excels all others in pushing his way into new countries. It was those in whom this tendency was strongest that came to America, and this inherited tendency has been further developed by the westward sweep of successive generations across the continent. So noticeable has this characteristic become that English visitors remark it. Charles Dickens once said that the typical American would hesitate to enter heaven unless assured that he could go further west. . . .

¹ Josiah Strong, *Our Country* (New York, 1885), pp. 159-179, *passim*.

The Pan-German Creed of Lebensraum, 1904¹

In the period before 1914 the Pan-German movement was designed to unite all German-speaking peoples in a common empire. It called for Lebensraum (living-space) for the German people, a plea that was to be echoed later by Adolf Hitler. The program also included a demand for expansion in Eastern Europe, as well as anti-Semitism. According to the Pan-Germans, Germany's only choice was between the alternative of relapsing into the ranks of the territorial peoples, bound by narrow boundaries, and that of conquering by force a place alongside the Anglo-Americans on the world scene.

A people needs land for its activities, land for its nourishment. No people needs it as much as the German people which is increasing so rapidly and whose old boundaries have become dangerously narrow. If we do not soon acquire new territories, we are moving towards a frightful catastrophe. It matters little whether it be in Brazil, in Siberia, in Anatolia or in South Africa, as long as we can once again move full of freedom and fresh energy, as long as we can once more offer our children wholesome light and air in plenty. Once more, as 2000 years ago when the Cimabri and the Teutons were hammering at the gates of Rome, sounds the cry, now full of anguish and unappeased desires, now arrogant and full of confidence—sounds more and more strongly the cry "We must have lands, new lands!"

¹ . . .

The idea of an international conference to settle the territorial disputes arising from European activities in the Congo region, suggested by Portugal, was later taken up by Bismarck. The conference was held at Berlin between 15 November 1884 and 26 November 1885. The news that such a conference was to be held increased the intensity of the scramble. The conference did not seriously discuss either the slave trade or the lofty humanitarian ideals that were supposed to have inspired it. Delegates contented themselves with passing empty resolutions regarding the abolition of the slave trade and the welfare of Africans.

It was not, ostensibly, the initial intention of the conference to attempt a general partition of Africa. It nevertheless ended up disposing of territory, passing resolutions concerning the free navigation of the Niger, the Benue and their affluents, and laying down "the rules to be observed in future with regard to the occupation of territory on the coasts of Africa".

According to Article 34 of the Berlin Act, any European nation which took possession of an African coast or declared a "protectorate" there, would have to notify such action to the signatories of the Act in order to have its claims ratified. This was the so-called "sphere of influence" doctrine, to which was linked the absurd concept of the "hinterland" which came to be interpreted to mean that possession of a coast also implied ownership of its hinterland to an almost unlimited distance.

Article 35 stipulated that an occupier of such coastal possessions must also demonstrate that it possessed sufficient authority there "to protect existing rights and, as the case may be, freedom of trade and of transit under the conditions agreed upon". This was the so-called doctrine of "effective occupation" that was to make the conquest of Africa such a murderous business.

Indeed, by recognizing the Congo Free State, by permitting territorial negotiations and by laying down rules and regulations for "legal" appropriation of African territory, the Concert of Europe had arrogated to itself the right of sanctioning the principle of sharing-out and conquering another continent.

There was no precedent in world history to justify one continent boldly talking about the sharing-out and occupation of the territory of another continent. This was the major significance of the conference for African history. The argument that, contrary to popular opinion, the conference did not partition Africa is correct only in the most technical sense; in any case it is irrelevant. The appropriation of territory did take place at the conference and the question of future appropriation is clearly implied in its decisions. By 1885, in fact, the broad outlines of the final partition of Africa had already been drawn.

Prior to the Berlin Conference, spheres of influence had been acquired by settle-

ment, exploration, the establishment of commercial posts, the occupation of strategic areas and treaties with African rulers. Following the Conference, influence by treaty became the most important method of effecting the paper partition of the continent. These treaties took two forms—those between Africans and Europeans, and bilateral agreements between the Europeans themselves. The African-European treaties were basically of two kinds. First, there were the slave trade and commercial treaties, and, secondly, there were the political treaties by which African rulers either purportedly surrendered sovereignty in return for protection or undertook not to enter into treaty obligations with other European nations.

African leaders entered into these arrangements for a variety of reasons. In some cases they hoped that the prestige of such a relationship would give them political advantages in dealing with their neighbours. An African sovereign might desire a treaty in the hope of using it to keep recalcitrant subject States in line. Sometimes a weak African State would desire a treaty with a European power in the hope of using it to renounce allegiance to an African overlord or as a means of warding off a threat to its independence from another European power.

Godfrey N. Uzoigwe

The colonial heritage

by Albert Adu Boahen

BY 1935, colonialism had been fastened on Africa like a steel grid, and it looked as if it was going to remain there for ever. However, colonialism proved just as ephemeral as any other institution created and maintained by force. Within a matter of only some forty-five years from 1935, the colonial system had been uprooted from over ninety per cent of Africa and confined to that part of the continent south of the Limpopo River.

What legacy did colonialism bequeath to Africa? Did it constitute an important revolutionary episode in the history of the continent? Was it a major break with the past, or was it, after all, merely a passing event?

To some historians its impact was on balance either a blessing in disguise or, at worst, not harmful for Africa:

"It is easy to cavil today" wrote P. C. Lloyd, "at the slow rate of economic

development during the half-century of colonial rule... Nevertheless, the difference between the condition of African society at the end of the nineteenth century and at the end of the Second World War is staggering. The colonial powers provided the infrastructure on which progress in the 'independence' period has depended: a fairly efficient administrative machine, reaching down to villages in the most remote areas, a network of roads and railways, and basic services in health and education."

Others have contended that the beneficial effect of colonialism in Africa was virtually nil. The Black Guyanese historian, Walter Rodney, has taken a particularly extreme position:

"The argument suggests that, on the one hand, there was exploitation and oppression, but, on the other hand, that colonial governments did much for the benefit of

Africans and that they developed Africa. It is our contention that this is completely false. Colonialism had only one hand—it was a one-armed bandit."

From the available evidence, however, it would appear that a much more balanced assessment is necessary. The impact of colonialism was positive as well as negative. However, it should be emphasized that most of the positive effects were, by and large, rather accidental by-products of activities or measures intended to promote the interests of the colonizers.

POLITICAL LEGACY - POSITIVE
The first positive political impact was the establishment of a greater degree of continuous peace and stability in Africa than before. The nineteenth century was the century of the Mfecane and the activities of the Swahili-Arab and Nyamwezi traders such as Tipu Tip and Msiri in central and southern Africa, of the Fulani *djihads* and the

rise of the Tukolor and Mandingo empires in western Sudan, and of the disintegration of the Oyo and Asante empires in west Africa; and all this caused a great deal of instability and insecurity.

The first two or three decades of the colonial era, that is from 1880 to 1910, intensified this state of instability, violence and disorder and caused wholesale and unparadonable destruction and loss of population. But after the colonial occupation and the establishment of various administrative machineries, most parts of Africa, especially from the end of the First World War onwards, enjoyed a great degree of continuous peace and security.

The second positive impact is reflected in the very geo-political appearance of the modern independent States of Africa. In place of the hundreds of independent clan and lineage groups, city-States, kingdoms and empires, without any clearly defined boundaries, were now established fifty new States with, in most cases, fixed boundaries; and it is rather significant that the boundaries of the States as laid down during the colonial era have not undergone any changes since independence.

Thirdly, the colonial system also introduced into most parts of Africa two new institutions which have been maintained since independence, namely a new judicial system and a new bureaucracy or civil service.

The final positive impact of colonialism was not only the birth of a new type of African nationalism, but also of pan-Africanism. Important as this legacy was, however, it is a typical example of the accidental by-products rather than the deliberate creations of the colonial presence. No colonial ruler ever set out to create and nurture African nationalism.

NEGATIVE
But if there were positive effects, the negative effects were even greater. In the first place, important as the development of nationalism was, it was generated by a sense of anger, frustration and humiliation caused by some of the oppressive, discriminatory and exploitative measures introduced by the colonial rulers. With the overthrow of colonialism that feeling was bound to lose some of its momentum and the problem that has faced the rulers of independent African States has been how to replace it with a positive and enduring feeling of nationalism.

Secondly, while admitting that the geo-political set-up that emerged was an asset, even though an accidental one, it nevertheless created far more problems than it solved. Though the boundaries of the States that emerged were not as arbitrary as is generally believed, there is no doubt that many of the States that emerged were artificial creations made up of a medley of peoples with different cultures, traditions, origins and languages. The problems of nation-building posed by such a medley of peoples have not proved to be easily soluble.

Another outcome was that the States that emerged were of widely differing sizes with

unequal natural resources and economic potentialities.

Another important but negative political impact of colonialism was the weakening of the indigenous systems of government. The colonial officials on the spot became, in effect, dictators instead of advisers to the traditional rulers whom they used to enforce some of the measures deemed obnoxious by their subjects, such as forced labour, direct taxes and compulsory recruitment of men for the colonial armies. Moreover, the spread of the Christian religion further undermined the spiritual basis of the authority of the kings.

A product of colonialism which is often ignored by historians but which has turned out to be of crucial importance was the creation of full-time, standing armies. These armies were originally created, most of them in the 1880s and 1890s, first for the conquest and occupation of Africa, then for the maintenance of colonial control, and, finally, for the prosecution of global wars and the suppression of independence movements in Africa. After the overthrow of the colonial rulers, these armies were not disbanded but were taken over by the new independent African rulers and they have turned out to be the most problematic of the products of colonialism.

The final and probably the most important negative political impact of colonialism was the loss of African sovereignty and independence and the right to deal directly with the outside world.

This meant, above all, the loss of their right to control their own destiny, to plan their own development, manage their economy, determine their own strategies and priorities, borrow freely from the world at large the latest and most appropriate technology, and generally manage, or even mismanage, their own affairs and derive inspiration and a sense of fulfilment from their successes and lessons and experience from their failures. In short, colonialism deprived Africans of one of the most fundamental and inalienable rights of a people—the right of liberty.

Moreover, the seventy-year period of colonialism in Africa was the very period which witnessed tremendous and decisive developments and changes in both the capitalist and socialist countries. It was the period, for instance, that saw the entry of Europe into the age of the aeroplane and the motor vehicle and the nuclear age. Had Africa been in control of her own destiny, she could have benefited from or even been part of these phenomenal changes. But colonialism completely insulated and isolated her from these changes and kept her in a position of dependency.

ECONOMIC LEGACY - POS:

The impact in the economic field was equally important and equally mixed. The first and most obvious of the positive impacts was the provision of a basic infrastructure of roads, railways, telegraph, telephone and, in some cases, even airports. Completed by the 1930s, this infrastructure facilitated the movement not only of goods, the new cash crops and troops, but also of

peoples, and this latter factor helped to minimize parochialism, regionalism and ethnocentricism.

Equally important and significant was the impact of colonialism on the primary sector of the economy. It was during the colonial period that the full mineral potential of Africa was realized; the mining industry boomed while the cultivation of cash crops such as cocoa, coffee, tobacco, groundnuts, sisal and rubber spread. In west Africa these cash crops were produced by the Africans themselves, clear evidence of their willingness and ability to adapt and respond to the right incentives.

This economic revolution had some far-reaching consequences. Before the colonial era huge tracts of land in many parts of Africa were not only under-populated but also under-utilized. The introduction and spread of cash crops and the mining industries put an end to all this. Secondly, the economic revolution led to an increase in the purchasing power of some Africans and with it an increase in their demand for consumer goods. Thirdly, the growing of cash crops by Africans enabled individuals of whatever social status, especially in the rural areas, to acquire wealth.

Another significant revolutionary impact was the introduction of the money economy. This led to the emergence of a new class of wage earners and salaried groups. The introduction of the money economy also led to the commencement of banking activities in Africa, which became another significant feature of the economy of independent African States.

By 1935, the economy of Africa had become inextricably tied to that of the world in general and of the capitalist economy of the colonial powers in particular. The years after 1935 merely deepened this link and not even independence has fundamentally altered this relationship.

Was the colonial impact on Africa in the economic field then a desirable one? Far from it.

NEGATIVE
In the first place, the infrastructure that was provided by colonialism was not as adequate or as useful as it could have been. Most of the roads and railways were constructed not to open up the country but merely to connect the areas having mineral deposits and the potential for the production of cash crops with the sea, and there were hardly any feeder or branch roads. Nor were they meant to facilitate inter-African travel and communication.

In the second place, such economic growth as occurred in the colonies was based on the natural resources of the area and this meant, therefore, that areas not naturally endowed were totally neglected.

Thirdly, a typical feature of the colonial economy was the total and deliberate neglect or discouragement of industrialization and the processing of locally-produced raw materials and agricultural products in most of the colonies. Simple and basic items such as matches, candles, edible oil, lime and orange juice, all of which could

easily have been produced in Africa, were imported. All African States were therefore turned into markets for the consumption of manufactured goods from the metropolitan countries and producers of raw materials for export. This total neglect of industrialization by the colonial powers should be chalked up as one of the most unpardonable indictments of colonialism.

Fourthly, not only was industrialization neglected but such industries and crafts as had existed in Africa in pre-colonial times were almost destroyed as a result of the importation into Africa of cheap, mass-produced commodities. African technological development was thereby halted and was not resumed until after independence.

Fifthly, even though agricultural crops came to constitute the main source of income for most African States, no attempts were made to diversify the agricultural economies of the colonies. On the contrary, by 1935, the production of only single or, at best, two cash crops had become the rule—cocoa in the Gold Coast, groundnuts in Senegal and Gambia, cotton in Sudan, coffee and cotton in Uganda and coffee and sisal in Tanganyika. Most African States, on the attainment of independence, found themselves saddled with monoculture economies and were therefore highly sensitive to the prevailing international trade winds. Colonialism did indeed complete the integration of African economies into the world international economic order, but in a very disadvantageous and exploitative manner.

Because of the concentration on the production of cash crops during the colonial era, Africans were compelled to ignore the production of food for their own consumption. It was this neglect of food production, coupled with forced labour, which caused so much malnutrition, severe famine and so many epidemics in some parts of Africa during the early colonial days. Thus, under the colonial system, Africans were in most cases made to produce what they did not consume and to consume what they did not produce, clear evidence of the lopsided and exploitative nature of the colonial economy.

The colonial presence also led to the appearance on the African scene of an increasing number of expatriate banking, shipping and trading firms, and from the 1910s onwards their amalgamation and consolidation into fewer and fewer oligopolies. Since it was these trading companies that controlled the export as well as the import trade and fixed the prices not only of imported commodities but also of the exports produced by Africans, the huge profits that accrued from these activities went to the companies and not to the Africans.

Colonialism also virtually put a stop to inter-African trade as the flow of trade from each colony was reoriented towards the metropolitan countries.

Finally, whatever economic growth there was during the colonial period was achieved at a phenomenal and unjustifiable cost to the African—forced labour, migrant

labour, compulsory cultivation of certain crops, compulsory seizure of land, forced movements of populations with the consequent dislocation of family life, the pass system, high mortality rates in the mines and on the plantations and brutal repression of the protest and resistance movements these measures generated.

SOCIAL LEGACY - POSITIVE
What is the record of colonialism in the social field? The first important beneficial social effect was the overall increase of the population of Africa during the colonial period of nearly forty per cent after an initial decline during the first two or three decades. This increase was due to the establishment of an economic base, the spread of roads and railways which ensured that food could be rushed to famine areas, and the campaigns launched against epidemic diseases such as sleeping sickness, bubonic plague and yellow fever.

Closely connected with this was the second social impact of colonialism—urbanization. The kingdoms and empires of Africa had such capitals or political centres as Kumbi Saleh, Benin, Ile-Ife, Kumasi, Gao and Zimbabwe, commercial centres such as Kano, Jenné, Sofala and Malindi, and such educational centres as Timbuktu, Cairo and Fez. But there is no doubt that, as a result of colonialism, the pace of urbanization was greatly accelerated and completely new towns came into existence.

Moreover, the population of both the already existing towns and the new towns grew by leaps and bounds during the colonial era. The population of Nairobi, founded in 1896 as a transit depot for the construction of the Uganda railway, increased from a mere handful to 13,145 in 1927 and to over 25,000 in 1940, and that of Lagos from 74,000 in 1914 to 230,000 in 1950, that of Dakar from 19,800 in 1916 to 92,000 in 1936 and to 132,000 in 1945.

There was also undoubtedly an improvement in the quality of life, particularly for those living in the urban centres. This was the result of the provision of hospitals, dispensaries, pipe-borne water, sanitary facilities, better housing and the abolition of such practices as domestic slavery by the colonial rulers as well as the increase in employment opportunities.

The spread of Christianity, Islam and Western education was another important impact of colonialism. It was during the colonial period that Christianity gained a firm foothold in eastern and central Africa, at times following and at times being followed by the flag and trade. Islam also spread rapidly in western and eastern Africa as a result of the general improvement in communications during the colonial period and the patronage of both the French and the British rulers. It should be emphasized that these gains were not made at the expense of traditional religion. What colonialism did, then, was to strengthen and perpetuate religious pluralism in Africa, thereby enriching its religious life.

Closely associated with the spread of Christianity was that of Western education. Certainly, by the end of the colonial regime,

there were relatively few areas without at least elementary schools. The spread of Western education had far-reaching social effects, among which was an increase in the number of the westernized educated African élite, an élite which now constitutes the ruling oligarchy and the backbone of the civil service of African States.

Another important colonial impact, a mixed blessing as we shall see, was the provision of a *lingua franca* for each colony or set of colonies. In all the colonies, the mother tongue of the colonial power, either in its pure or pidgin form, became the official and business language and, in many cases, the main means of communication between the numerous linguistic groups that constituted the population of each colony. It is significant that, except in north Africa, The United Republic of Tanzania, Kenya and Madagascar, these languages have remained the official languages to this very day.

The final beneficial social impact was the new social structure that colonialism introduced into some parts of Africa or whose development it accelerated in others. Although the traditional social structure allowed for social mobility, its class structure appeared to give undue weight to birth. The new colonial order, on the other hand, emphasized individual merit and achievement. All these changes radically altered the traditional social structure.

Thus, by the 1930s, in place of the pre-colonial social classes of the traditional ruling aristocracy, the ordinary people, domestic slaves and a relatively small educated élite, a new society emerged that had become more sharply divided than before into urban and rural dwellers, each of which was differently stratified. Mobility within this new structure was based more on individual effort and attainment than on ascription.

NEGATIVE
On the negative side, however, the phenomenal growth of the population of the urban centres was not the result of the natural increase of the urban population but rather of the continuous pull of young men and women to the urban centres by the need for education and employment and the push from the rural areas by famine, epidemics, poverty and taxation. Moreover, since the Europeans tended to live in the urban centres, all those facilities that improved the quality of life were established only in those areas. The rural areas were therefore virtually neglected as this in turn accentuated the drift from one to the other. A huge gap exists even today between urban and rural areas in Africa and there is no doubt that it was the colonial system that originated and widened this gap.

Nor did the migrants find the urban centres the safe and rich haven they had expected. In no town were the Africans accepted as equals and fully integrated. Moreover, nowhere did a majority of them find jobs or decent accommodation. Most of them found themselves crowded into suburbs and the shanty towns in which unemployment, juvenile delinquency

drunkenness, prostitution, crime and corruption became their lot. Colonialism did not only impoverish rural life, it also bastardized urban life.

A second serious social legacy has been the European and Asian settler problem. What made their presence so inimical to Africans was that the Europeans came to occupy most of the fertile lands while the Asians monopolized the retail and wholesale trades. By 1935, this Asian and European problem had assumed very serious proportions for Africa and it has not been entirely resolved to this day.

Furthermore, though colonialism did introduce some social services as we have seen, it must be emphasized that not only were these services grossly inadequate and unevenly distributed in each colony, they were all, by and large, meant primarily for the benefit of the few white settlers and administrators, hence their concentration in the towns. In Nigeria in the 1930s, whereas there were 12 modern hospitals for 4,000 Europeans in the country, there were only 52 for Africans numbering over 40 million.

In the field of education, what was provided during the colonial days was grossly inadequate, unevenly distributed and badly orientated and therefore not so beneficial as it could have been for Africa. Five different types of educational institutions were established under colonial rule: primary, secondary, teacher-training, technical and university. But while many primary schools had been established by 1860 in British West Africa, it was not until 1876 that the first secondary schools were established in the Gold Coast and Nigeria. It was not until after the Second World War that technical schools and university colleges were established in most parts of Africa.

The curricula provided by all these institutions were determined by the colonial rulers and were closely modelled on, if not carbon copies of, those of the metropolitan countries and therefore irrelevant to the needs of the continent. They also struck at the very roots of African religious beliefs, traditions and taboos and thereby shook the foundations of African societies, bringing them their trail a sense of uncertainty, frustration and insecurity.

The impact of this inadequate, lopsided and wrongly orientated education on African societies has been profound and almost permanent. First, it left Africa with a huge illiteracy problem, a problem whose solution will take a long time. Secondly, the educated élite that was produced was, by and large, an alienated élite that adored European culture and civilization and looked down on African culture. However, since the élite included the wealthiest people and since they occupied the highest posts available both during and after the colonial era, they came to wield power and influence in proportion to their numbers.

Beneficial as the *linguae francae* promoted through the educational systems were, they had the regrettable consequence of preventing the development of some of the indigenous languages into national languages. Twi, Hausa and Swahili could easily have been developed as the national languages of the Gold Coast, Nigeria and the three British East African colonies respectively. In fact, an attempt was made by the colonial administrators of British East Africa to develop Swahili as a *lingua franca* during the 1930s and 1940s, but this attempt was countermanded by the Colonial Office.

— Another highly regrettable social impact of colonialism was the deterioration that it caused in the status of women in Africa. This is a new theme which needs further research, but there does not appear to be any doubt that women were inhibited from joining in most of the activities introduced or intensified by colonialism. The colonial world was indeed a man's world and women were not encouraged to play any meaningful role in it.

Moreover, under colonialism Africans in general were looked down upon, humiliated and discriminated against both overtly and covertly. In his recent Reith lectures, Ali Mazrui emphasized this legacy of humiliation imposed on the African by the triple sins of the slave trade, apartheid and colonialism when he declared:

"Africans are not necessarily the most brutalized peoples, but they are certainly the most humiliated in modern history."

Some historians have concluded that "colonialism produced its own grave-diggers", while Maugham has maintained that "On the tombstone of the British Empire may be written 'Lost by snobbery'".

Worse still was the impact of colonialism in the cultural field. Throughout the colonial period, African art, music, dancing and even history were all not only ignored but positively discouraged or denied. As one speaker declared at the Second Congress of Negro Writers and Artists, in Rome, in 1959: "Among the sins of colonialism, one of the most pernicious, because it was for a long time accepted by the West, was the concept of people without culture."

Nevertheless, in the cultural field, the impact of colonialism was relatively speaking neither profound nor permanent. Such changes as were introduced in the cultural field, such as racial discrimination as was practised, and such condemnation of African culture as was preached, even in the heyday of colonialism, were all confined to the coastal areas and the urban centres and never penetrated into the rural areas where life ran gaily on very much as before. African dance, art, music and traditional religious systems held their own and any

borrowings and adaptations were additions rather than substitutions.

In the rural areas, and even to some extent in the urban centres, new beliefs, new gods, new utensils, new artifacts and new objects were added to the old ones. Certainly, in these areas many Christians did and still do retain their belief in their traditional gods. Indeed, in the field of religion, it was if anything the European religions that were Africanized, as is obvious from the rituals of some of the syncretic and millenarian churches, and not the other way round.

What is more important, the ground that was lost in the field of culture, even in the urban centres, has virtually been regained. Today, African art, music and dance are not only taught in educational institutions of all kinds but are now booming in Africa and gaining recognition in Europe. Thus, as far as the cultural field is concerned, colonialism was certainly only a brief episode and its impact skin-deep and ephemeral.

From all the above it should be clear that it is an over-reaction to write off colonialism as an unmitigated disaster for Africa that caused nothing but underdevelopment and backwardness. Equally guilty of over-statement are those colonial apologists who see colonialism as an unqualified blessing for Africa.

But whatever colonialism did for Africans in Africa, given its opportunities, its resources and the power and influence it wielded in Africa at the time, it could and should have done more. As P.C. Lloyd wrote:

"So much more might perhaps have been done had the development of backward territories been seen by the industrial nations as a first priority."

It is precisely because colonial rulers did not see the development of Africans as their first priority or even as a priority at all that they stand condemned. It is for these two reasons that the colonial era will go down in history as a period of growth without development, of the ruthless exploitation of the resources of Africa, and, on balance, of the pauperization and humiliation of the peoples of Africa.

In the long history of Africa, colonialism was merely an episode or interlude in the many-faceted and variegated experiences of its peoples. It was nonetheless an extremely important episode politically, economically and even socially. It marks a clear watershed in the history of Africa whose development has been and will continue to be very much influenced by the colonial impact. The most expedient course of action for African leaders to embark upon today, then, is not to write off colonialism, but rather to be conversant with its impact and to try to redress its shortcomings and its failures.

■ Albert Adu Boahen

The Rise of Our East African Empire

Lord Lugard

Probably the most apparent motive for the new imperialism was economic. With new conquests made, people expected to develop new commerce and particularly new markets for manufactured goods. This attitude is reflected by Lord Lugard in his Rise of Our East African Empire (1893), largely an account of his experiences in colonial service. Lugard, as a British soldier and administrator, helped bring large parts of Africa into the British empire. Here he analyzes the "scramble" for Africa.

Consider: How Lugard connects nationalistic and economic motives for imperialism; some of the main arguments presented against imperialism and how Lugard responds to them; Lugard's perceptions of Africans and how such perceptions might facilitate the new imperialism.

The Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom have unanimously urged the retention of East Africa on the grounds of commercial advantage. The Presidents of the London and Liverpool chambers attended a deputation to her Majesty's Minister for Foreign Affairs to urge "the absolute necessity, for the prosperity of this country, that new avenues for commerce such as that in East Equatorial Africa should be opened up, in view of the hostile tariffs with which British manufacturers are being everywhere confronted." Manchester followed with a similar declaration; Glasgow, Birmingham, Edinburgh, and other commercial centres gave it as their opinion that "there is practically no middle course for this country, between a reversal of the free-trade policy to which it is pledged, on the one hand, and a prudent but continuous territorial extension for the creation of new markets, on the other hand." Such is the view of the Chambers of Commerce, and I might quote endless paragraphs from their resolutions and reports in the same sense.

This view has been strongly endorsed by some of our leading statesmen. Space forbids me to quote extracts from speeches by our greatest politicians, which I might else adduce as proof that they held the opinions of the Chambers of Commerce, which I have quoted, to be sound and weighty....

The "Scramble for Africa" by the nations of Europe—an incident without parallel in the history of the world—was due to the growing commercial rivalry, which brought home to civilised nations the vital necessity of securing the only remaining fields for industrial enterprise and expansion. It is well, then, to realise that it is for our *advantage*—and not

alone at the dictates of duty—that we have undertaken responsibilities in East Africa. It is in order to foster the growth of the trade of this country, and to find an outlet for our manufactures and our surplus energy, that our far-seeing statesmen and our commercial men advocate colonial expansion....

There are some who say we have no *right* in Africa at all, that "it belongs to the natives." I hold that our right is the necessity that is upon us to provide for our ever-growing population—either by opening new fields for emigration, or by providing work and employment which the development of over-sea extension entails—and to stimulate trade by finding new markets, since we know what misery trade depression brings at home.

While thus serving our own interests as a nation, we may, by selecting men of the right stamp for the control of new territories, bring at the same time many advantages to Africa. Nor do we deprive the natives of their birthright of freedom, to place them under a foreign yoke. It has ever been the key-note of British colonial method to rule through and by the natives, and it is this method, in contrast to the arbitrary and uncompromising rule of Germany, France, Portugal, and Spain, which has been the secret of our success as a colonising nation, and has made us welcomed by tribes and peoples in Africa, who ever rose in revolt against the other nations named. In Africa, moreover, there is among the people a natural inclination to submit to a higher authority. That intense detestation of control which animates our Teutonic races does not exist among the tribes of Africa, and if there is any authority that we replace, it is the authority of the Slavers and Arabs, or the intolerable tyranny of the "dominant tribe."...

*

So far, therefore, as my personal experience goes, I have formed the following estimate: (1) No kind of men I have ever met with—including British soldiers, Afghans, Burmese, and many tribes of India—are more amenable to discipline, more ready to fall into the prescribed groove willingly and quickly, more easy to handle, or require so little compulsion as the African. (2) To obtain satisfactory results a great deal of system, division of labour, supervision, etc., is required. (3) On the whole, the African is very quick at learning, and those who prove themselves good at the superior class of work take a pride in the results, and are very amenable to a word of praise, blame, or sarcasm.

1901: Imperialism

Kaiser Wilhelm II

Imperialism swept through Europe with extraordinary force in the late nineteenth century. For many the step between the increasingly assertive nationalism of the time and the new imperialism was a short one. This view is illustrated in the following speech given at Hamburg in 1901 by Kaiser Wilhelm II (1888-1919) of Germany. Addressing an audience with strong commercial interests, he refers to a recent intervention by European powers in China.

Consider: How Wilhelm II connects nationalism and imperialism; by what means he hopes to spread German influence throughout the world; the ways in which this speech might appeal to both liberals and conservatives.

In spite of the fact that we have no such fleet as we should have, we have conquered for ourselves a place in the sun. It will now be my task to see to it that this place in the sun shall remain our undisputed possession, in order that the sun's rays may fall fruitfully upon our activity and trade in foreign parts; that our industry and agriculture may develop within the state and our sailing sports upon the water, for our future lies upon the water. The more Germans go out upon the waters, whether it be in the races of regattas, whether it be in journeys across the ocean, or in the service of the battle-flag, so much the better will it be for us. For when the German has once learned to direct his glance upon what is distant and great, the pettiness which surrounds him in daily life on all sides will disappear. Whoever wishes to have this larger and freer outlook can find no better place than one of the Hanseatic cities.¹ What we have learned out of the previous history of our development amounts really to what I already pointed out when I sent my brother to the East Asiatic station (Dec. 15, 1897). We have merely drawn the logical conclusions from the work which was left us by Emperor William the Great, my memorable grandfather, and the great man whose monument we have recently unveiled. These consequences lie in the fact that we are now making our efforts to do what, in the old time, the Hanseatic cities could not accomplish, because they lacked the vivifying and protecting power of the empire. May it be the function of my Hansa during many years of peace to protect and advance commerce and trade!

In the events which have taken place in China I see the indication that European peace is assured for many years to come; for the achievements of the particular contingents have brought about a mutual respect and feeling of comradeship that can only serve the furtherance of peace. But in this period of peace I hope that our Hanseatic cities will flourish. Our new Hansa will open new paths and create and conquer new markets for them.

As head of the empire I therefore rejoice over every citizen, whether from Hamburg, Bremen, or Lübeck, who goes forth with this large outlook and seeks new points where we can drive in the nail on which to hang our armour. Therefore, I believe that I express the feeling of all your hearts when I recognize gratefully that the director of this company who has placed at our disposal the wonderful ship which bears my daughter's name has gone forth as a courageous servant of the Hansa, in order to make for us friendly conquests whose fruits will be gathered by our descendants.

In the joyful hope that this enterprising Hanseatic spirit may be spread even further, I raise my glass and ask all of those who are my comrades upon the water to join with me in a cheer for sailing and the Hanseatic spirit!

¹The Hanseatic cities formed a league in the Late Middle Ages to facilitate trade.