

IMPERIALISM
IN PRACTICE AND IN THEORY

Books by the same author :—

Problems of Greater India (1916 Madras)

Educational Reconstruction (1920 Madras)

Indian Nationalism

Its Principles and History (1920 Faith Press,
London)

Sri Harsha of Kanauj. (in the Press)

IMPERIALISM

IN PRACTICE AND IN THEORY

BY

K. M. PANIKKAR,

late Scholar of Christ Church, Oxford,
Senior Professor, and Chairman of the Department
of History, Muslim University, Aligarh,
and Member of the Academic Council.

MADRAS

ARKA PUBLISHING HOUSE

1922

PRINTED AT
THE INDIA PRINTING WORKS,
MADRAS.

To
G. V. K.

As a token of personal friendship.

CONTENTS

In Practice and in Theory	1
The Basis and Methods of Imperial Expansion			14
Imperialism and the Subject Peoples		...	30
Imperialism as It Affects India	41
Christianity as an Instrument of Imperialism	...		55
Imperial Administration	61
The Future Imperialism	76

IMPERIALISM

IN PRACTICE AND IN THEORY

Of all the political movements that have developed during the last half a century, imperialism is indubitably the most interesting and in many ways the most important. In the wide range of its operation and in the far-reaching nature of its consequences, it is certainly one of the greatest political movements that the world has yet witnessed. To some it has appeared to be a movement for progress and civilisation, while to others it has been the embodiment of all that is bad in political human nature. One set of theorists has praised imperialism as an instrument of God for the spread of European culture and civilisation, justifying the destruction it costs in human life in the pseudo-scientific jargon

of the time as the survival of the fittest and as necessary to the evolution of a higher destiny for man. To others it has merely been the expression of the desire for aggrandisement at the expense of the weaker nations.

Whatever it is, there is no denying its importance in the political thought of the world at the present time. Whether good or bad, it is one of the capital facts of the age, deserving close attention and study from all who desire to understand human history.

Imperialism as a principle is of recent growth.* The Spanish, Portuguese and Dutch Empires were merely commercial concerns run entirely for the benefit of the mother-country without any pretension of extending civilisation or doing good to the native. The same may be said of the British and French Mercantile systems of the 17th and the 18th centuries. Where the imperialism of the 19th and 20th centuries differs from its predecessors is this. The earlier conquerors had merely established colonies where the native

* We may for the purpose of this essay leave out of consideration the imperial policy of Rome and Carthage.

population was utterly uncivilised as in America and in some parts of Africa. There the ambition of the conquerors was to establish colonies for their own subjects either after exterminating the aboriginies if such a procedure was possible or by clearing them from those places which came under direct European occupation. In India the problem was very different. It was impossible either to exterminate the natives or to exclude them from political or economic life. The conquest of civilised countries, of which India was the first example, brought with it therefore a different problem for imperialism.

The colonial rivalry between France and England had ended in 1763 to the complete destruction of French ambition both in India and in America; and after the Napoleonic wars when France was again at peace with the world it was found that the Empire of the East was lost to her for good. But the 19th century opened up many new extra-European problems. The revolution in transport by the invention of steam power and the consequent development of ocean-going traffic made the

most distant countries near enough for European rivalry. The utter decadence of Turkey and the powerlessness of China to resist European aggression and the general weakness of Asiatic states like Persia, Burma and Siam raised the question of world power for European Nations on a scale unimagined by Philip II and Napoleon Bonaparte. In Europe also great and tremendous changes altered the traditional state-system and the historic balance of power. Russia extended from the Baltic to the Pacific. By a policy of blood and iron, Bismarck united Germany. The intense vision of Mazzini, the romantic prowess of Garibaldi and the practical statesmanship of Cavour aided by the military power of France consummated the desire of ages in uniting Italy into one strong nation. The rise of a new and powerful republic on the other side of the Atlantic brought further complication into both European and Asiatic politics.

It was Turkey that first felt the change in European political life. France, foiled of her continental ambitions, turned once again

to a policy of colonial expansion and the Orleans' monarchy in spite of its inglorious foreign policy laid the foundation of a firmer French Empire than the *roi soleil* was able to do. The conquest of Algiers (1830) was on the feeble pretext of an insult to a consul of France. Algiers was a province of the Turkish Empire. It was inhabited by a population which had inherited from the Saracens a great and noble culture. It was impossible either to displace or to exterminate the natives. Hence colonisation in the real sense was not possible as the Arab population, being vigorous, intelligent and cultured, was bound sooner or later to assert itself.

The weakness of China had also become evident during the middle of the 19th century, and hence the rivalry for the control of the Far Eastern market soon became a constant factor in the policy of European Nations. The opening of the Suez Canal, bringing as it did not only Egypt but the whole of Asia into the immediate vortex of European diplomacy and politics, may be said to be the birth date of our modern imperialism.

From that time the movement has been rapid. China was compelled to open her doors to European exploitation. Burma was seized by the British, and to balance it, Annam and Tonkin were occupied by the French. Africa was divided up, and an unholy race began between the Great Powers to occupy positions of advantage against each other at the expense of weaker states. Persia became the theatre of a diplomatic war between England and Russia. China drifted into anarchy as a result of the commercial predatorism of the European Nations. Siam became a powerless buffer state divided into French and English spheres of influence. Japan, which had with marvellous rapidity imbibed the principles and practice of imperialism, vied with other Powers in establishing protectorates and spheres of influence.

The extraordinary rapidity with which European Nations parcelled up Asia and Africa calls for an explanation. The most obvious is that the weakness of Asiatic States invited foreign intervention and made them an easy prey for adventurous imperialism.

The revolution caused by the development of oceanic transport made all world neighbours and increased the possibility of effective control even of distant states. But it may still be considered puzzling why states such as Italy and Spain to whom their African colonies are more a cause of weakness than a source of strength should have been as anxious to get their share of the spoil as the imperialist states of France and England. The reason is plain. The occupation of African regions by them was not so much of an acquisition; it is more of a prevention against a possible enemy occupying it. England or France occupying Tripoli would be holding a pistol at the breast of Italy. Such occupation is merely a move in the chessboard of international diplomacy. The German seizure of Kiochow finds its counter move in the British occupation of Wei hei wai. The British occupation of Cyprus is compensated by a French occupation of Tunis.

This division of Asiatic States among European Powers has resulted in a universal

feeling of Imperial sentiment among European Nations. By an old and historic superstition the extent of a state is supposed to be synonymous with its glory. People seem to consider that some additional glory belongs to Charles V., Philip II and Napoleon as a result of the vastness of their dominions. Droysen has even gone to the extent of asserting that the conquest of Hellas by Macedonia was a blessing to Greek civilisation. But this is merely a widely prevalent but fallacious sentiment. However, it is a fact which we have got to recognise that a patriotic citizen of every state considers it a part of his duty to enlarge the extent of his state or if he cannot do that, to consider those who do it for him as heroes and demigods. Thus the dishonest Clive who forged documents becomes a hero : Kitchener who dug out the corpse of his enemy to inflict inhuman indignities becomes a model citizen.

This sentiment has become part of the common stock of European political feeling. It is justified in as far as it concerns the conquered people by many and various

arguments. Imperialism is interpreted as a sort of political altruism. This doctrine has two entirely different aspects. In the first place the Imperialist nation has conquered a piece of new territory merely for the benefit of the inhabitants of the place. They have to be civilised, taught the art of self-government. The country is held merely in trust for them till they are able to defend it from the encroachments of other Powers. It is to their benefit to be associated in citizenship with a civilised European Nation. They can share the blessings of Christianity if they so wish.

Secondly, the occupation is for the benefit of humanity. It is a part of the white-man's burden. The white man owes it to himself and to the world that no part of the globe should be left uncivilised. Even if the people concerned do not like it, it is necessary for human progress that they should be brought into line with the rest of the world. On the one hand, the imperialist nation is merely holding the country 'in trust' for its aboriginal inhabitants ; on the other hand

imperialism is the instrument of God for the propagation of European culture.

There is another group of theorists—and this chiefly among the educated classes of the British public—which considers imperialism as a union of nationalities for common defence of liberty. Their argument is that just as individual liberty can best be realised only through the state, which is a collection of individuals bound together for the common purpose of ensuring that liberty, in a like manner national freedom can best be realised only through a common-wealth of states (commonly called Empire) which is artificially and at least by implication contractually constructed for the purpose of mutual defence. This theory which is associated with the "Round Table" group, which sees in the British Empire a super-national organisation which, while allowing the free development of special characteristics and distinctive civilisations, reconciles national animosities and establishes internal peace over a great part of the world. Unfortunately, this reading of history is wholly and profoundly untrue. Great Britain,

whatever may be its policy with regard to its daughter communities, certainly does not stand for freedom and national life for the great majority of non-European people. The British Empire as far as its subject populations are concerned does not stand for representative government. What it stands for is a white oligarchy exploiting coloured nations. It is in fact a British Empire Co. (Ltd.), which like all other trade interests is concerned only in giving maximum profit for its shareholders. Take the case of South Africa. The grant of self-government to South Africa is supposed to constitute the proof positive of England's championship of liberty and freedom. But what is the fact? It is often forgotten that self-government in South Africa means merely the right of one and a half million European settlers to oppress and exploit and if necessary to shoot down the six million coloured people—Indians and Natives. Self-government does not interest them. Mr. Winston Churchill as Under Secretary for Colonies stated in Parliament in reply to a question by Mr. Healy that the white settlers

of South Africa may do whatever they please to their coloured subjects and that "Great Britain has only the responsibility of friendly advice."

The Round Table enthusiasts who speak of the Empire as the great instrument of God for the civilisation of humanity themselves, think only in terms of "white" supremacy. The main thesis of the "Commonwealth of Nations" is that the 'mechanism of the Imperial Government ought to be so revised and enlarged as to let the dominions share in all matters of Imperial policy. As regards India itself, the Round Table group has changed its opinion, and it now advocates the full attainment of dominion status by India though in gradual stages. But with regard to the other coloured communities of the Empire the idea of racial supremacy as the basis of the "Commonwealth of Nations" is held as vigorously as before.

Whatever may be the principles on which imperialism is based and the doctrines by which it is justified, it is unquestionable that the capital fact in the world's history of

to-day is the dominion of Europe over the greatest portion of the globe. Out of the 53 million square miles of land surface the dominion of Europe extends over more than 51. Out of the rest the only portion that is effectively outside the control of European Nations is the Empire of Japan. China, though nominally independent, has been despoiled of many of her provinces and is herself under European tutelage. The once mighty empire of the Osmanli has now been completely partitioned.

The phenomenon is one of the most notable in history and deserves to be thoroughly examined and studied. The attempt up till now has been to discuss it mainly from the point of view of European politics and trade. A dispassionate examination however recognises that it is not only the point of view of Europe, which looks upon the present stage as the culmination of history, that is important, but equally that of the people who have been brought under Europe's influence.

THE BASIS AND METHODS OF IMPERIAL EXPANSION

The explanation of this marvellous expansion of European power over Asia and Africa, lies in two groups of facts, one the economic and the other military. A clear comprehension of these facts is essential for the right understanding of the problem of imperialism.

The great Industrial Revolution which took place first in England and then spread over the rest of Europe altered the very basis of life in those countries. The use of steam power revolutionised both production and transport. The main result of this, as far as it affects the problem of imperialism, is that European society came to depend for its very life not upon production for use but on production for sale. That is to say industrialised Nations, chiefly England and later on

France, Germany and America, became in popular phraseology the workshops of the world. This necessitated two things : first that there should be a regular un-interrupted supply of cheap raw materials for production and secondly that the rest of the world should buy the articles so produced. This became so vital a problem that the main factor of European struggles during the last half a century has been the rivalry of the big Powers for the control of raw materials and markets. In this matter, Great Britain which had acquired possession of India and with it the market of the East, was at a great advantage. Hence other European Powers began to look about for places in the sun.

The possession of vast areas in Asia and Africa thus came to be considered a matter of economic necessity by the Powers. The full realisation of this came only after the establishment of the European state system as we know it now, after the re-foundation of the German Empire in 1871. France again turned her ambitions from Europe to Asia and Africa, and others followed suit. Within 10 years

from 1880 more than 8 million square miles of African or Asiatic territory came to be occupied by European powers. England occupied Burma and Egypt. France occupied Annam and Tonkin, Tunis and Madagascar, and unlimited areas in the heart of Africa. Belgium, Portugal, Germany and Spain came in for their share. To ensure raw products and to control markets Africa was divided up, and Asia was controlled.

The second aspect of this economic problem lies in the necessity for controlling the chief commercial routes. The revolution in oceanic transport made it imperative for states to establish their authority in certain important strategic points. Aden, Singapore and Panama thus gained importance in the eyes of European powers. The recent controversy with regard to the little island of 'Yap' in the middle of the Pacific shows how powerful a factor this is in the policy of the great states. This tiny speck of land is a controlling station for Pacific cables and wireless. Its acquisition by Japan gives her a unique position in the command of the

Eastern Ocean, and in case of war between her and U. S. A. it gives her a first class base for operations against the trade of the enemy. No wonder that President Wilson protested strongly against the allotment of this all-important place to Japan.

The military basis of imperial expansion also resolves itself ultimately to the rivalry of Powers. The geographical position of states makes the control of certain areas militarily necessary. Thus it is essential for England's safety that Ireland should under no conditions be an advance post for the enemy. For the Mediterranean countries the establishment of authority on both sides of that sea has come to be considered a matter of the most imperative importance. Tripoli in the hands of England would make Italy an English dependency. Algiers as long as it was in the hands of an impotent Dey may be ignored from the point of view of European policy, but it was a question as to how long it would take for England to establish her ascendancy there. With Gibraltar and Malta in English hands the French hold on

Western Mediterranean was precarious enough; but her position as a first class European Power would have certainly become untenable if England had entrenched herself firmly in Algiers. The same military argument together with the desire for economic expansion led Japan to occupy Korea and establish herself firmly there. The sinister activities of Czarist Russia in the Far East gave some colour to the Japanese view that unless she was established firmly on the mainland the European powers would render her powerless in the long run by an effective continental blockade. The occupation of Egypt by England was also primarily with this motive of safeguarding the line of communications with India.

It was the late Marquess of Salisbury who said that the British Empire will have one day to annex the moon in order to safeguard itself from an attack by Mars. This is in fact the principle of expansion as followed by imperialist states. The policy first began in India. In order to safeguard Bengal from an attack of the Mahrattas, Oudh was brought

under a defensive scheme which finally led to its annexation. The necessity for defending Oudh led to an extension of that policy and thus in a progressive way the whole of India came to be under the British rule. To safeguard India it is now necessary to neutralise Afganistan and Tibet. To safeguard Afganistan it is necessary to have a Central Asian policy, involving the control of the Persian Gulf and the establishment of British influence in the land of the sun and the lion. The same process is now repeated by Japan. For defending home dominions, Korea had to be annexed. To defend Korea it is necessary to annex Manchuria, and so on as long as her arms could reach her.

The annexation of Burma is also a case of interest instancing the same principle of predatory ambition of military empires. It also shows how trade and high politics move together. The Bombay and Burma Trading Company felt that it would be much better for them if Burma became a British Province and their intrigue finding the support of the Viceroy soon materialised in an attack on the

independence of that kingdom on the feeble pretext that King Theebah had concluded a commercial treaty with France. When once established in Burma the policy had naturally to be continued in the direction of Siam but the annexation of Annam and Tonkin by France necessitated the establishment of a buffer state and thus saved the kingdom of the white elephant from immediate partition.

Of recent years the desire for utilising the man-power of Asia and Africa for military purpose has also become a serious factor. England had long utilised Indian soldiers for the furtherance of her imperial ambitions. It was Indian soldiers who conquered the innocent Burmans. Indian soldiers were sent under Abercromby to the eastern Mediterranean during the time of Napoleonic activity in that region. The Indian army has been the instrument by which British trade was extended and British prestige maintained in the Far East. That lesson has now been learnt by France. In the war of 1870 her 'Turcos' fought desperately against the Germans and established a great reputa-

tion for themselves. Since her home population has been stationary while that of Germany was steadily increasing, the 'man-power' of their African Colonies has been of special use in the maintenance of her European position. In the Great European War, the African soldiers of France played a prominent part. It was with the Zouaves that Marshal Foch threatened to occupy the Ruhr Valley. The report of the Esher committee tells the same tale. European Nations have begun to arm their subjects to fight their masters' battle.

These are the reasons which have led to the scramble for territory in Asia and Africa by European Nations. The methods by which these annexations were made and the noble burden of the white man was undertaken are not less illuminating. They are common to all European Nations though in origin it bears the trade mark of the Carthaginian mind of England.

Four different methods all converging to the same objective seem to have been employed to suit the conditions of different places.

In the case of civilised but militarily weak nations like Algiers, China, Persia and Korea, one of the following three methods is open to an imperialist nation. It may interfere to exact reparation in the nature of political and trade consideration for alleged diplomatic incidents. France invaded Algiers and conquered it on the pretext of a diplomatic insult offered by the Dey of that country to a vice-consul of France. Germany exacted heavy territorial and commercial concessions from the Celestial Empire for the alleged murder of two missionaries in China. After all any pretext is good enough when an imperialist nation makes up its mind to despoil its weak neighbour.

Secondly there is the securer and more inevitable method of financial strangulation. The classic examples of this policy are Egypt and Morocco. Here also it is the experience of India that furnished the imperialist armoury with its weapons. That loans either by private individuals or by banking agencies can be utilised as sure methods of imperial expansion was first discovered in the case of

Nawab Mahommed Ali of Arcot, whose sole claim to greatness is due to the enormous amount of his debts. He was the forerunner and prototype of the Ismails and Aziz's of modern European diplomacy. The money that European financiers advanced to the extravagant Khedive Ismail brought upon Egypt an especially sinister form of international control, known as the mixed commission. From that regime it was certainly an escape for that unfortunate country to have come under the veiled protectorate of England. The case of Morocco is similar. By a secret agreement the Empire of the Sheriffs was assigned by England to France but other European powers especially Italy and Germany had some interests in that country to ignore which would have caused an immediate European war. The subtle net of diplomacy had first to be spread. The foolish Sultan Abdul Aziz was encouraged in his vices and extravagance and when the treasury became empty, the French financiers volunteered their services in the shape of a loan. The customs of the country were

pledged as a security for the regular payment of interest on the personal debt of the Sultan. On the failure of regular payments the French Government seized the customs and administered them nominally in cooperation with the Sherifian authorities. This was the beginning of the end. A pretext was soon found for military intervention, and Morocco finally disappeared from history as an independent state.

The sinister influence of big financial and industrial houses in the policy of imperial expansion cannot be too much emphasised. Trade follows the flag is not so true as its converse. It is the flag that has followed the trade. It is Rhodes and his greed that caused the South African War, and cost the Boer republics their independence. The influence of Bombay Burma Trading Corporation in causing the annexation of the Burmese Kingdom has already been noticed. It is the trade interests that dominate the policy of Imperialist nations.

The third method of expansion is political. The unsettled condition of a state is

supposed to necessitate armed intervention on the side of the Powers that have a stake in the country. It should be remembered in this connection that more often than not the so-called unsettled condition is in itself a direct result of European meddling. However that be, it affords a useful pretext for establishing securely the influence of some imperialist nation in that Court which may if circumstances favour lead to direct annexation in some future time. The unsettled condition of Egypt as a result of the Arabi revolt was the pretext of the occupation of that country by Britain. Korea was asked by Japan to accept certain 'reforms' as the Government was in an unsatisfactory condition, and on refusal the new imperialist nation established a protectorate in the orthodox style which has led direct to a military annexation. The weak and unsettled condition of Russia demanded some solution which was easy if Russia and England could agree to partition that country, which they effectively did by the Anglo-Russian agreement of 1908. Here also it should be remembered that it is India that

supplied the precedent. The unsettled condition of Oudh was intolerable as there was no security of person and property in that dominion and hence it had to be annexed. After the death of Ranjit Singh, the Punjab was in an unsettled condition threatening thereby the safety and tranquillity of the British dominions,

A form, more approved in international ethics, is expansion by compensation. We know that Tunis went to France as a result of the timely discovery of the 'deal' which Disraeli, made with Turkey about Cyprus. It is well known that England handed Morocco over to France as compensation for the British occupation of Egypt. In China the occupation of Kia Chow by Germany was countered by the occupation by Britain of Wei Hei Wai and by Russia of Port Arthur. For acknowledging the French Protectorates of Morocco, the independence and integrity of which had been guaranteed by the Powers by the act of Algeciris. Germany had to be compensated in French Congo and Kamerun.

This method of expansion by compen-

sation is best illustrated by the recent settlement of the Near Eastern Problem by the allotment of mandates to European Nations of which we shall have to speak more later on. Here it is enough for us to see the working of this principle of compensation in the unholy way in which the inheritance of the Osmanli was partitioned by the imperialist nations since Mesopotamia fell to the portion of England the Balance of Power in the Levant would be kept only handing over Syria and Cilicia to France and proportionately compensating Italy in Asia Minor.

In the uncivilised parts of Africa the powers have more often annexed huge areas without any show of rhyme or reason on the principle of "pegging out claims for posterity". Concessions involving thousands of square miles, and millions of people were bought from kings or chiefs in exchange of barrels of gin or beer. The might of the imperialist nations was behind any adventurous individual who went out to deal with African Chiefs. The dirtier work of obtaining concessions by fraud and force expro-

priating the rightful owners and enslaving the natives, was often entrusted to chartered companies modelled of course on the Hon'ble East India Company Bahadur which acquired the Empire of India for Britain. It was by this simple process that King Leopold of Belgium acquired the huge territory of Congo as a personal estate and committed those atrocities which shocked the moral sense of the world a few years ago. The British South African Company, of which Cecil Rhodes—the incarnation of economic imperialism—was the moving spirit, was founded in 1889. The history of this enterprise is illustrative of the part which private enterprise under the direct patronage of the Government has played in imperial expansion. The object of this company was to acquire and work in Mashona and Matabile land. The former area was occupied by the agents of Rhodes with an armed force. Two years afterwards the company raised an army to conquer Matabile land. Every soldier who took part in the expedition was promised nine square miles of territory and a *share in the loot*. The

acquisition of Nigria by England was accompanied by the same process. The Royal Niger Company negotiated and occupied forcibly the whole of that country.

It should be clearly understood that the so-called Chiefs and Rulers have in no way any claim on the thousands of square miles which they so easily signed away for a few bottles of gin. In tribal communities generally the property is held in common. Hence their treaties and agreements with chiefs are merely fraudulent documents by which ignorant natives are cheated out of their rights. It is interesting to remember that the same thing was done by the English conquerors of Ireland in acquiring land in that country.

By these different methods the expansion of Europe over the whole of Africa and a great portion of Asia has been accomplished. Now let us see what the results of this achievement have been in relation to the people who have been brought under the imperial sway of Powers.

III

IMPERIALISM AND THE SUBJECT PEOPLES

In considering the influence of European expansion on the life and civilisation of peoples brought under its sway it is important to keep in mind a few basic considerations. Primarily it is necessary to make differentiation among the subject peoples themselves between the civilised subject peoples and the uncivilised ones. This is the most remarkable fact with regard to the Empires of France and England. The population of the Berber states of North Africa, Egypt, India and the colonies of Further India cannot by any stretch of imagination be placed in the same level of culture as the inhabitants of Mattheba or Buchuana land. The subject peoples of European Nations fall easily into two groups :

the first like the Egyptians and the Burmese possessing a culture different but not necessarily inferior to that of the Europeans : and the second like the Hottentots and other tribes of Africa low in the grade of civilisation. The influence of European civilisation on these two groups has necessarily followed different lines.

It should also be recognised that wherever the European has effectively established himself, he has transported the machinery of modern civilisation. Postal arrangements, telegraphs, railways, quick methods of transport and such other of the outward symbols of civilisation as are of immediate use to him he has established wherever he has gone and it may freely be admitted that in these lines he has quickened the march of civilisation.

(a) *Influence on the Backward peoples.*

We have already seen that the European went to the Tropics mainly for economic purposes. It was his ambition to mobilise the resources of these uncultivated areas for the purpose of furthering the trade and indus-

try of his country. He found that the whole continent of Africa except the northern littoral, though rich in natural wealth was only sparsely populated, also that the population was in a very low stage of culture. The extreme heat of the climate did not however permit any large migration of European settlers, and thus the very satisfactory method of annihilating the native population, which was found so successful in Australia and other places, was found impossible. For purposes of exploitation, however, this was no impediment, because black native labour was infinitely cheaper and the humanitarian labour laws that curbed the power of the employers over their 'hands' in European countries were of course not operative in African colonies and protectorates. Whole populations can be enslaved and made to work under inhuman conditions in order to swell the profits of the white man. There is nobody to question: anything may be done in the wilds of Africa. It was the re-establishment of slavery without even the feeling of proprietary interest which the slave owner felt

in his human chattels. The Putmayo atrocities and the horrors of Belgian Congo are only two of the most striking instances of a complete atavistic relapse into primitive barbarism made more cruel by the demon of financial greed.

In social relations the influence of European civilisation on African society has been disastrous with the impact of a more vigorous type of civilisation. The customs and rites that bound together the primitive society of those undeveloped areas completely broke down. Tribal life lost its sanctity. Secred things lost their *mana*. Liquor shops became ubiquitous and everywhere. African society started on its downward path. Often, the European traders, anxious to get possession of tribal areas have consciously hastened this process of disintegration. The following extract from the life of James Paton, Missionary, will be found illustrative of the methods by which the white man's burden has been undertaken and carried on.

“One morning three or four vessels

entered our harbour and cast anchor in Port Resolution. The captains called on me, and one of them, with manifest delight exclaimed: "We know how to bring down your proud Tancrese now. We will humble them before you."

I answered: "surely you don't mean to attack and destroy these poor people?"

He answered not abashed, but rejoicing, "we have sent the Measles to humble them. That kills them by the score! Four young men have been landed at different ports, ill with Measles and these will soon thin their ranks."

"Shocked above measure, I solemnly protested and denounced their conduct and spirit: but my remonstrances only called forth the shameless declaration. "Our watchword is, sweep these creatures away and let white men occupy the soil".

The sale of intoxicants, opium, fire arms and ammunition by the Traders among the New Hebrideans has become a terrible and intolerable evil."

The reaction of uncivilised society to

the impact of western civilisation has not been favourable or wholesome. The better features of European civilisation being the product of centuries of social tradition cannot be grafted on to the stem of a primitive society. More than this, the average European who goes out to spend his life in Africa is not a high type of western civilisation. Any way, the result has often been disastrous. Prostitution becomes rampant. Syphilis makes its appearance; and liquor traffic finally takes out the little resistance that traditions and customs have created. A French Senagalese soldier once told a famous Anthropologist "*Je suis civilise*": *Je bois d' abisen*the. This is really the spirit that western culture has imparted into the African native. No wonder that his social life has completely broken down.

(b) *In the case of civilised peoples.*

The reactions of the older civilisations to the impact of European culture has been very different from what has been described above. In none of the civilised states has social order broken down as a result of contact with

a more vigorous culture. On the other hand despite an occasional movement in favour of European culture, the civilisations of these subject peoples have shown an extraordinary power of resistance and adjustment and maintained their own ground against the tide of Europeanism. The attack of European culture instead of weakening their position has only led to a consolidation of their forces. Especially is this the case in India. When India came to be effectively occupied by Englishmen during the earlier half of the 19th century, it was confidently expected that under a system of English education the social fabric of Hinduism will disappear like a house of cards. Eclectic movements like the Brahma Samaj gave some colour to this view. But what is the position to-day? The hold of Hinduism is as strong, if not stronger, on the vast millions of India at the present time than it ever was after the time of Sankara. The lost ground has quickly been reoccupied.

It is well known and generally recognised that Islam both as a social order and a reli-

gious system is as militant as Christianity. Hence, the influence of European Mahomedan countries has been very slight. Neither in Egypt nor in Algeria has European civilisation met with any success. The same has been the case in Buddhist countries.

Apart from this cultural resistance, the civilised subject nations have also shown an increased physical resistance to the claims of European Nations. In fact, the greatest menace that imperialism has today is the growing revolt of civilised peoples from their imperialist rulers. During the 100 years that have passed from the time of the establishment of the British Empire in India in 1818, to the enactment of the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms in 1919, everyday, the resistance to European domination has grown greater in the country. Today, perhaps, there is no Indian who is an advocate of Imperial connection, except on the basis of absolute equality. In fact, British statesmen have now recognised that political control of civilised countries like Egypt and India is a source of weakness rather than of strength to their Empire.

The influence of European expansion on the civilised peoples has been on the whole beneficial to the extent they have been able to organise resistance to the cultural and imperial pretensions of the expanding power. The organisation of this political resistance was often preceded by great political and social upheaval. In Ireland and India especially, it has given rise to great movements in literature, religion, and art, which in their massive effect as in their varied forms fairly entitle them to be considered great historical movements. Collectively, this movement among the subject peoples can be called the awakening of the spirit of nationality. Its exponents have been as different in spirit as Gandhi and Zaghlul, Jayatilaka and Raisul, Tilak and de Valera. But its main feature has everywhere been the assertion of the spirit of one civilisation against another.

In this revolt against the spirit of imperialism, the subject nation has often been taxed with gross ingratitude for the great work of regeneration done by the imperialist power. In most countries where European nations

have been in effectual occupation, material prosperity of a kind has been visible. India, which has often been pointed to as the model of Imperial administration, has, though incidentally, benefitted to some extent by the British occupation. Extensive irrigation works have been undertaken: railways intersect the country: gross inequalities have disappeared: famines have been fought and conquered. No doubt, there is also a more important and darker side to the picture: but it could not be gainsaid that something has been done in the way of effective civilised Government in India. The same thing may be said about Egypt. Lord Cromer in his farewell speech at Alexandria claimed as much with justice. The French in Algiers, Annan and Tonkin can certainly claim to their credit the same achievements of civilisation. But let us not forget that every conqueror has put forward this claim. Napoleon, after he had conquered Spain, issued a decree at Madrid which, curiously enough, anticipates the claims of Imperial States. Tippu after conquering Malabar issued a proclama-

tion saying that he had established law and order and brought Islam to the very door. But alas ! human mind is ungrateful. Neither the Indian nor the Egyptian, is any more willing than the Spaniard to sell his soul for a mess of pottage. National independence is a much greater thing than material prosperity.

On the whole, with regard to the civilised subject states this much can be said that the sway of the Imperialist States has helped in the great work of speeding up their rate of evolution, and the beneficial results have been in proportion to the resistance it has generated in the older societies.

IV

IMPERIALISM AS IT AFFECTS INDIA.

The policy of imperial expansion as it affects India is a question of surpassing interest. It is in India, as we have seen, that the lessons of modern imperialism were first learnt. It is in India that the principles of imperialism have been pushed to their farthest extent. In its results, imperial administration has undoubtedly been most successful in India. To imperialists of all nations India has been the model. M. Joseph Chailley came all the way from France to study the working of British imperialism in this country. Many German professors have been known to express their profound admiration for British policy as pursued in India before the war. It is necessary there-

fore for the student of imperial policy to study it rather closely.

The Government of India, whatever Lord Reading may say now, is based entirely on the principle of racial superiority. Every part of the administration bears testimony to this. Indeed until the Montford report, this was the official view. Englishmen in India have peculiar privileges. Justice is administered differently to them. They alone enjoy free speech. Their commercial interests are specially protected. Until very recent times, to the great majority of Englishmen in India, this appeared to be the most natural state of things. Even Anglo-Indians with no special claim for consideration were favoured openly for their connection with the dominant race. They were educated separately. Certain highly paid services like the Railways and the Telegraphs were practically reserved for them. They are allowed to enlist as volunteers. In the face of these facts, it would hardly hold water to say that the Empire in India is not based on racial superiority. In fact the assertion of that superi-

ority is of the very essence of British rule in India.

The effects of the policy of imperial expansion on India have been very complex. Primarily and beyond all other considerations India is the great market for British goods and the unfailing producer of her raw materials. She is also a peculiarly favourable field for British capital. Indian currency and exchange are always at the disposal of England to manipulate for her own benefit. More than all this, until recent times, Indian policy was directly subordinated to financial interests in England. The classic example of Excise duty on Indian cotton goods shows how far England was prepared to sacrifice Indian industries in the interests of Lancashire. The recent sale of Reverse Councils and the manipulation of the Exchange show that this sinister influence is still strong in the policy of the British Government.

India, however, is in a unique position with regard to imperialism. She is not only a victim but also the chief instrument of the policy of expansion. It is with her armies

that the infamous Burma expedition was undertaken, and the Burmans deprived of their independence. It is the Indian soldiers that fought against the Chinese in 1899. In Persia the potent instrument of Imperial designs is the Indian mercenary. The Arabs of Mesopotamia were deprived of their independence so that England may get her oil by soldiers mainly recruited from India. Palestine was conquered by Indian soldiers so that the Jews may have a national home. During the war Egypt was held by an Indian army. Could there be a more shameful catalogue for a nation? It should not be forgotten that the Indian soldiers who fought in these distant lands in order to further the cause of Imperialism, were mere mercenaries. But the fact remains that it is with slave labour, with the blood of her subjects from India, that England has built up her Empire in the East.

That the Indian Army is even now considered primarily not as a defence force, but as an instrument of imperial expansion may be seen from the report of the Esher committee on which the great Michael O'dwyer

himself served. This Report recommended that the Indian army should be put under the control of the Imperial General Staff which amounted to a declaration that more than ever before, the Indian army was to be the arm of British imperialism. The storm of public protest which this shamefaced recommendation aroused in India is in itself an index of the feeling of disgust with which educated Indian opinion looks upon the prostitution of Indian manhood for British ends.

The story of India's relationship with British imperialism does not end here. India has not only been the main instrument of Britain's military predatorism but in a special sense she has been the agency of her economic exploitation of undeveloped lands. India is the sole supplier of cheap labour on which English economic imperialism in the Tropics depends. It is the Indian labourer that has developed Natal, East Africa, Tanganika territory, Kenya colony and Mauritius. The rubber plantations of Malaya States depend for their profits on Indian labour. The Sugar industry of Fiji islands has been built

up by indentured Indian labour. In the West Indies also, the case is the same. In fact Britain's economic prosperity in the Tropics depend upon the supply of cheap labour from India.

The conditions of semi-slavery, under which the Indian labourer was forced to build up the economic edifice of the British empire are well-known. The infamous system of indentured labour has now been abolished. But the idea that the Empire is to be developed by slave labour for it is hardly more than that—persists even to-day. Aristotle said long ago that democracies can exist only on the labour of slaves. The followers of Jefferson Davies maintained the same principle when they fought for slavery against Abraham Lincoln and the North. The dangers of free labour, Aristotle pointed out long ago, as lying in a tendency for the labourers to claim political power. This was in the fact the main reason which prompted British capitalists to use Indian slave labour for the development of the Tropics. But fortunately the moral code of the 19th century

did not permit an absolute ownership of slaves and the result is that with their gradual emancipation from indenture, Indian labourers became aspirants for political power and economic domination.

To-day there are Indian inhabitants in all the Tropical Colonies of Great Britain. They form important and prosperous communities in the Union, Rhodesia and other African Colonies. In Fiji they form a majority of the population. In Trinidad, British Guiana and other West Indian possessions their economic position is prosperous, if not preponderating. But everywhere the Indian is treated as a social inferior with no claim to citizenship. In South Africa he labours under many humiliating disabilities. He is treated as an outcaste. He cannot own real property in certain places. He is considered an undesirable. In Kenya and British East Africa, the problem has of late become acute. In Kenya there are 30,000 Indians 6,000 Europeans. The history of this emigration is in itself interesting. Indian labour was found to be necessary for the purpose of building the

Uganda Railway in 1895. When the country was opened up by Indian labour a steady flow of emigration started from India. The emigration fee for a European was Rs. 375, while for the Indian it was only 50. The authorities encouraged it who in 1900 thought that Indians will claim equality with Englishmen!! The Indian community thrived and prospered; and this the White settlers did not want. As long as the Indian was prepared to work for the Sahib he was welcome. But when he became a serious economic rival the European settler was not slow to use his political power to keep him. The Government of the Colony is in the hands of the 6,000 Europeans. The Indian has no franchise. He cannot rise in Government service. Attempts are now being made to exclude him from owning property in certain areas and segregating him in reservations.

The way in which the Indian is exploited for the development of Tropical Colonies and then turned out as an undesirable is well illustrated in the case of Fiji. The deliberate

fraud by which the ignorant villagers are recruited and sent to work under a system of semi-slavery for years, has been one of the greatest blots in the annals of economic imperialism. For the benefit of such huge economic concerns as the Colonial Sugar Refining Company, the British Imperial authorities refused for a long time to abolish this degrading and inhuman system. The conditions under which these labourers were made to live in the 'lines' with an extraordinary proportion of men over women are now well-known through the humane and selfless efforts of Mr. C. F. Andrews. But even in Fiji the free Indian is not wanted. There are roughly 50,000 free Indians in the Islands. They have practically no voice in the Government. Everywhere the case is the same.

Another set of conditions which puts the bar sinister on the Imperial Citizenship of India is seen in the treatment meted out to Indians in Australia, New Zealand and Canada. From all these self governing dominions the Indian is practically excluded on various pretexts. No Indian may enter the Pacific

Coasts of Canada unless he makes a continuous journey from India to that country, a provision that practically disqualifies Indians at the present time, as there is no direct line of shipping between India and Canada. Australia excludes Indian settlers unless they are able to undergo a rigorous language test. The ridiculous part of it is, that the language in which the Indian emigrant is tested may be any European dialect including Basque and Gaelic. It is as preposterous a method as can be imagined.

What are the main arguments which the advocates of this differentiation bring forward to support their claims? In Australia the whole of the northern portion of the continent is unoccupied and undeveloped. The few million colonists who live in Southern and Eastern Australia cannot claim for themselves the right of excluding all except Europeans from settling down and developing those parts. There are two arguments put forward for this claim. One is that the opening up of Northern Australia to Indian and other tropical settlers would

pollute the "white" civilisation of that country. The Europeans want to keep it as a preserve for themselves. But climatic conditions effectively preclude them from developing Northern Australia by White labour. The morality of an act by which a vast area of God's earth is walled off without occupation or development for the mere fear that in some future date that the "White" civilisation of the South will be polluted, will appear reprehensible in the uttermost to all who are not Jingo imperialists. The question whether one nation has a right to keep out others from its territory has often been raised by China, Japan and Tibet during the last century to be answered emphatically in the negative by European powers. The advent of Commodore Perry on the Japanese Coast in 1853 may be said to have settled that problem. European nations did not then recognise Japan's claim of exclusion.

It is undeniable that the policy of Australia in letting vast areas lie waste, rather than allow it to be developed by Indian or

Chinese labour is dictated merely by economic selfishness. Australia has merely pegged out a claim for posterity. Monopolistic possession is the basic idea of this policy. In this the British Empire does not differ in essence from the Empire of Philip II. It is indeed worse than that. The Spanish Empire did not shut any portion out from its own subjects. In short, British policy in Australia can be mildly described only as that of the dog in the manger.

The other argument which is often brought forward to justify the exclusion of Indians and others is that the admission of cheap labour would bring down the wage level of the colony and thereby to reduce the standard of living. This is an essentially false argument. In economic life the Indian and the European are practically non-competing groups. More than this the Indian certainly has no interest in keeping the wages down. The tendency of all labour, Indian or European, is to secure maximum wages. Even if the opposite were true it would not any way justify the exclusion of Indians from areas where there

is no European settlement at all, and hence no European labourer to compete with.

The treatment of Indians in Canada differs in principle from this. Canada is a colony under effective occupation and no part of Canada is left undeveloped. The substantial justice of the Canadian claim to regulate emigration cannot be denied. But where imperialist professions differ from imperialist practice is when they differentiate against Indians on account of their nationality. There is no absolute prohibition of Japanese emigration. Even the Chinese get better treatment, while Indians, though British subjects, are excluded for no other reason than that they are Indians. It is hardly likely that there will be any great movement of Indians towards Canada. It is too cold for Indian inhabitation. A few thousands at the most settled here and there would no more affect the supremacy of White civilisation any more than the presence of a few thousand Indians in England at present does. Still the Government of the Dominion has considered it a matter of urgent public duty to exclude

Indians from Canada. Does anything bring out clearer the fact that the Empire is based primarily on racial supremacy than this outrageous policy.

Imperialism, in its effects on India, has certainly not justified any of the great and glorious pretensions which its advocates have put forward. It has never stood for human progress, never for racial equality: but by that subtle mental alchemy by which Englishmen transmute the copper of their economic selfishness into the pure gold of large-minded altruism, Imperialism has been proclaimed to the world as the great benefactor of India, and the wonder is how some among us, although they be few, have come to partake of this foolish sentiment so much as to declare openly their pride in being citizens of the *British Empire*.

V

CHRISTIANITY AS AN INSTRUMENT OF IMPERIALISM

In modern politics religion has come to play a subsidiary part, from being the chief motive force which it was in mediaeval times. Religion has become one of the many tools of politics. In the history of imperial expansion the part of religion has especially been that of a tool. The great claim that Russia put forward against Turkey was the right to protect the Christian subjects of the Sultan. The entire history of the relations between Russia and Turkey between the Treaty of Kainarji (1773) and the Treaty of Paris (1856) is epitomised in the championship by Russia of the cause of the Christian subjects of the sublime Port. It would be a

mistake to think that the Izar was interested any more than the Sultan in the political well-being of Christians as such. In fact the history of Poland during the same time proves the contrary. The imperialist claims of Russia and France in the Near East clashed and the pretext again was religion. The diplomatic question was the right of protectorate over the Christian subjects in the Ottoman Empire. It should be remembered that neither party had any valid claim. It was merely a basis on which to fight. There can be no doubt that Europe in her relations with Turkey found religion a very useful tool.

In India, though the Government has always professed neutrality in religious matters and refused official countenance to missionaries, the usefulness of Christian religion as a support for imperialism has not been forgotten. Indian Christians and Anglo-Indians have been encouraged by special patronage to feel themselves the props of the mighty and majestic British Empire. Lord Willingdon, the present Governor of Madras, recently visited Travancore and requested His High-

ness to show special favour to those who follow the creed of his eminent Lordship and his wife.

So long ago as the 17th century the Portuguese boasted that it was the policy of their state first to send missionaries to convert the natives of a country and next to send an army which with the help of the converts over-ran the country.* During the time of the Portuguese ascendancy on the West Coast of India this was their constant practice. In their relations with Native States they pretended extreme solicitude for the welfare of their co-religionists and in Cochin especially the Indian Christians were put under the special protection of the Portuguese Government.

Apart from its usefulness as an instrument of peaceful penetration the Christian Missions serve the purpose of deluding the eyes of the great mass of peaceful and religious citizens of the imperialist states. To the vast majority of people, who, though insular and narrow in their outlook, are in

* *Makers of Japan* p. 68.

a vague way for morality and righteousness, the Christian Missions seem to show that with Imperial Expansion civilisation and religion also follow. Governments have jostered this illusion. When it suits them, they say that the justification of Empires lies in these civilising and soul-saving agencies of France though officially without a religion is still the champion of orthodoxy outside the limits of Europe. The venerable shades of the Moslem and Christian Majesties are invoked to justify this extra-ordinary position. A recent example will illustrate the point. In 1917 the Republic of China wanted to establish diplomatic relations with the Vatican. But France objected on the ground that she was by treaty the protector of Christian interests in China though she herself had officially ceased to be Christian at all.

The relation between religion and imperialism has not passed unnoticed by Asiatic powers. Japan and Turkey both tried to utilise religion for the same purpose. Sultan Abdul Hamid, one of the ablest sovereigns that sat on the throne of Suleiman

the Magnificent, recognised in Islam a potent instrument against European nations. He first started the idea of a political Pan-Islam in which the fundamental tenet was that Musalmans wherever they be, owe spiritual, and in certain cases temporal, allegiance to the Sultan of Turkey as Emir-ul-Muenim or the Commander of the Faithful. The extra-territorial claims that he thus put forward, were merely the echo, firstly of the ultra-montane movement which was then at its height in Europe and which culminated in the Vatican Council and the *Kultur Kampf*, and secondly an imitation of the methods followed by European Nations, chiefly Russia, in their dealings with Turkey itself.

Japan has not allowed herself to be left far behind her European Allies in this prostitution of religion for imperialist ends. One of the famous twenty-one demands that Japan made on China in 1916, was that she should be allowed to establish Buddhist Missions in China presumably for converting the Chinese to that ancient creed. The inherent humour of this proposition will be

recognised when we remember that Japanese Buddhism is merely an offshoot of Chinese Buddhism and the idea of establishing Buddhist Missions in China is similar, let us say, to that of establishing Catholic Missions in Rome.

That the motive of Japan in requesting permission to establish religious missions is obvious. The missionary is an excellent spy as more than one imperialist nation found out long ago. It was well-known that the Kaiser used his Missionaries as advance agents of his Empire and the activities of many of those highly estimable gentlemen have been exposed during war time. No doubt Japan was quick to take a leaf from the Prussian book, but it is well to remember that it is not only Germans who have used religious missions for political purposes. In fact one of the most potent, if subtle and unobserved instruments of imperial expansion, has been the so-called religious missions of Europe.

VI

IMPERIAL ADMINISTRATION

We have up to now tried to understand how and by what methods the great empires of European nations in Asia and Africa have been brought into existence. It is now our purpose to study the methods by which these empires are administered and their internal and external safety secured. It has been remarked as a truly marvellous thing how with a few administrators, supported by a comparatively small army, the European nations are able to hold and govern for their own profit vast areas inhabited by civilised people in Asia and Africa. The achievement is certainly a great one and hence the methods utilised for the purpose is well worth close attention and study.

The ground work of the administrative edifice in these empires is a highly efficient civil service. The method of appointment is selective either by open competition or by drafting from the army. The training which candidates undergo is meant to bring out their highest intellectual capacities. Especially is this the case in Indian and Egyptian civil services. It is essentially a status education that the selected candidate receives. He is taught that the responsibility of maintaining a great empire rests on him and that he is a being superior to, and in every way different from, the people over whom he is sent to rule. The tradition of the civil service in all these countries is almost that of a *sacerdotal* class ministering to the needs of those below them. They move in an enchanted enclosure with the prestige of super-human beings.

In India and the other parts of the British Empire (excepting the self-governing dominions) higher administration is almost entirely in the hands of people sent over from England. Until this year the *I. C. S.*

competition was held only in London which ensured its practical monopoly by Englishmen. It has been more or less the settled policy of the British Government, to keep the agency of Imperial administration "all White", and even now in India only an agreed proportion of the service is to be Indianised. In the other big empires things are slightly different. Holland governs its dominions in the right Carthaginian spirit with the sole and simple motive of commercial exploitation. It has however evolved a different method of administration. The local rulers are maintained in their dignity, and in ordinary matters authority is divided between the Dutch Resident and the Native Chief. By this method administration is rendered in-expensive as the European agency is comparatively small. The French who tried a different system in Algiers have come to recognise the wisdom of this method, and in their Government of Annam and Tonkin Native agency has been used in preference to an expensive and elaborate Civil Service.

The Civil Service is however only the groundwork of successful administration. A handful of Europeans would hardly be able to run the show, but for the elaboration of some fixed principles based on a far-sighted policy. These fixed principles which are universally evident in the government of empires are nothing new having been discovered and explained at length by Nicolo Machiavelli four centuries ago.

The first and the most important of these is the creation of internal factions. This was recognised long ago by the Romans as the true principle of Imperial government, *divide et empera*, was their motto. The pseudo-Romans of modern times have not forgotten this essential principle. In India especially it has long been recognised that in the division between Hindus and Muhammadans lay the easiest method of perpetuating British rule. Differences were accentuated ; new seeds of hostility were sown ; little incidents were exaggerated, and for some time an open policy of partiality was pursued with some success.

In Ceylon the Singhalese were set against the Tamilians. In Egypt an attempt was made to turn the Copt against the Muslim. In places like Algiers where there is only one community, the imperialist nation has tried the method of plantation which was found so successful in Ireland. An increasing French population is that which stands in the way of Algerian independence. The same attempt is now being made by France and Spain in the Coastal tracts of Morocco.

The creation of vested interests bound to support the foreigner in his Government is another method which has received the blessings of Machiavelli. The British Indian Government which is the model of all imperialist states, is very careful on this point and carries it on in a number of ways. The vested interest that it has created extends from the biggest Indian Ruler to the most insignificant product of an English College. All the Indian rulers are maintained on their throne by the arms of the British. It is always in the interests of their potentates to support the Raj even at a personal sacrifice.

The same may be said of the landed gentry. The methods which the Government has invented to reconcile the Princes and bind them by hoops of iron to the policy of Britain, are in themselves interesting. They are chiefly two. By a tacit understanding the Government leaves the Native Rulers to do whatever they please in their dominions as long as they are loyal to the British throne. There is no doubt that an Indian chief has got more power over his subjects than the ex-German Kaiser ever had. With regard to the landed gentry, almost the same is the case. The Talukdars of Oudh and the Jenmis of Malabar are left free to oppress their tenants as long as their own loyalty is above suspicion. Secondly by awarding titles, distinctions or army ranks, the Government bribes princes and noblemen into loyalty and creates rivalry among themselves. Every Indian ruler is anxious to appear more loyal than the rest, in order that he may get some special distinction for himself, that he may be advanced in the matter of salutes or made a General in the army. Every ruler

that has newly ascended the Gadi has to prove his loyalty before he advances to the ultimate distinction of G. C. S. I. The Imperial Government knows well how to damn a disloyal ruler effectively by giving him a minor title. A ruler whose attitude towards the ruling race is not quite that of humble worship may one day find that he has been honoured with a K. C. I. E. The same is the case with landed magnates. The Zemindars and Raikes want to be Rajahs. Rajahs want to be Maharajahs. A Maharajah wants his title to be hereditary, and every one of them wants a knighthood. What better material can the Government have for the creation of faction?

The elaborate system of bribery which goes under the name of 'Honours' is the most effective instrument for demoralising opposition. Lord Minto was the first Viceroy to recognise the possibilities of this in 'rallying the moderates.' Since that time a knighthood or a C.S.I., has been the recognised reward for well-known deserters from the Nationalist Camp. *Sir Sankaran Nair, Sir Pheroze Shah Mehta Sir Dinshaw Wacha, Sir Surendra-*

nath Bannerjee ; could there be more convincing testimony of the efficacy of this system of veiled bribery ?

The policy of creating and then reconciling interests has gone to extra-ordinary lengths in India. It has invaded the public services, the High Court Bench, and the franchise. The Indian Christians for example are to be separately represented in the Legislative Council. The Sikhs are to have a separate electorate, of course the landholders must be represented by members of there own order. Machiavelli looking at the Government of India as it operates today would certainly be astonished at the thorough-going way in which his principles have been put into practice, and would no doubt have been delighted at the success they have achieved.

A no less important basis of British Rule in India is the maintenance of the doctrine of prestige with its corollary of racial supremacy. It is by their educational policy that the authorities maintain this cult. The extraordinary greatness of the English nation and the wonderful things that

the British race has achieved are the main things we are supposed to learn in schools. Until recent times Indian history and Indian culture had no place in the curricula of our universities. The social ideals that our education upholds are English ones. English is the language of culture and the medium of higher instruction. On a dispassionate study of the methods and ideals of Indian education, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that its purpose is to instil in the Indian mind a belief in its own inferiority.

All the methods known to psychology have been pressed into the service of this cult. By a process of suggestion we have been almost made to believe in our own incapacity for organisation and business. We are often told that industrial and technical ability belong specially to the English, though wherever there has been equal chance, the Indian is maintaining his ground. We are told that our mind is not scientific, and we are inclined to believe it, because our rulers have told us so. By a process of suggestion and constant assertion the Englishmen in India maintain-

ed their prestige for nearly 100 years now. In these days of newspaper press and collective mass-feeling, it is especially easy for any group in power to manufacture and maintain public opinion suited to its own purpose with the control of news agencies, educational institutions, and political authority. The English people in India did not find it difficult to develop this cult. Unsavoury facts could be suppressed, the semi-divine character and the absolute infallibility of the bureaucracy could always be upheld.

Lord Reading in a recent speech announced that prestige and racial differentiation have no place in the theory of British administration. But, alas, this has been said before in nobler words and in a more solemn way. It was no less a person than Queen Victoria herself who said: "We hold ourselves bound to the Natives of our Indian territories by the same obligation of duty which bind us to all our other subjects, and these obligations, by the blessings of the Almighty God, we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil. And yet it was in 1918 that the order

went forth in the Punjab that every Englishmen ought to be saluted in the streets and that in a certain lane of infamous memory every Indian ought to crawl on his stomach as a method of humiliation. We may be pardoned for a persistent scepticism of all this profession of equality by the ruling class. Hypocrisy, some one has defined, is the homage that vice pays to virtue, unrighteousness to right. The statute book recognises a ruling class with special privileges. It is notoriously impossible to get the law into action against Europeans. The value of life differs according to colour in Indian courts. Scarcely a month after Lord Reading made his famous speech on 'racial equality, a Calcutta jury consisting of eight Europeans and one Indian acquitted by the significant majority of 8 to 1 a European planter who was alleged to have demanded a girl for immoral purposes and shot the father of the girl for refusing the demand. Imagine the reverse of the case! What a storm it would have evoked in the European community in India if an Indian was alleged to have demanded a European girl for

immoral purposes and shot the father on his refusal to comply with the demand. Recently another incident which throws light on the comparative value of lives in India was brought prominently to the notice of the Indian public. A European woman was kidnapped from the frontiers by the tribesmen. The hue and cry was something tremendous, and the whole machinery of Government was set in motion to secure the release of the woman in question and to inflict the necessary punishment on the offending tribe. But everybody who knows anything about frontier conditions knows that the kidnapping of Indian girls (Hindu and Mahomedan) is by no means an uncommon event, and it was never known that the Government took any very vigorous action on it. Instances may be multiplied, but the fact of this differentiation between Europeans and Indians is so notorious, in spite of what Lord Reading might say in his dinner orations, that it does not require any special proof.

Another potent instrument by which the Empire is maintained in civilised depen-

dencies is what we may call the censorship of opinion. The Indian Criminal Procedure Code gives extraordinary powers to Magistrates for delaying with the expression of opinion. Free speech, of course, does not exist, but even a harmless speech, if it comes from a man whom the Government disapproves, can be finished by bringing it within the generous vagueness of creating ill-feeling between the different classes of His Majesty's subjects. Recently in Burma an editor was sent to prison for commenting on the Negro problem in America. The notorious Press Act is all-embracing in its operation. A vast C.I.D. organisation has been created for the purpose of watching the development of public opinion. The administration of India in the 20th century is a more or less up-to-date edition of the Mitlernichian regime in Germany and the Buest system in Hungary in the 19th century.

It is no wonder that England holds India in her iron grips, in spite of whatever we may say and whatever we may feel. But the thing to remember is that

though the ultimate basis of British rule in India is merely superior military strength, the methods by which she tries to maintain her authority are not essentially military. In genius it is truly Machiavellian. It is by the creation of the great myth of English superiority, by the attempt at all costs to maintain the prestige which by the cultivation of this myth has come to be attached to the English race, by the creation of factions and parties in India, by a system of demoralising bribery known as titles, and lastly by the legal suppression of all liberties, that this Empire has been maintained in India. It is not only an Empire over this ancient land, but an Empire over our minds. There is no doubt that considerable alteration has now taken place. The Montford Reforms have altered greatly the structure of Anglo-Indian polity ; but fundamentally it remains more or less the same. Once this alteration has begun it is perhaps true that it will go far. The whole basis of English rule in India will be changed. I hope it will be soon ; but that is beside our point. When

such an alteration comes, there will no longer be British imperialism in India. Imperialism maintains itself by the above-mentioned methods. It is the policy everywhere else. France imitates England in her imperial policy. The ex-German imperial government went a step further, but logically its position was the same. And this much may be said to the benefit of the British Government that while others are persisting in this path of unrighteousness, Britain is making serious, though tardy, efforts to alter the basis of her rule and transform her dominions from an Empire into a commonwealth.

VII

THE FUTURE IMPERIALISM.

What is the future of this great movement? Is the expansion of the White people over Africa and their domination over Asia going to be a permanent factor in the world's history; or is it merely an incident in the long history of the world's growth?

It seems quite clear that the future of European civilisation and dominance is based on this expansion. It is universally recognised in Europe that if it is to live, the control of Asia and the possession of Africa are necessary and vital. Even the so-called anti-imperialists of Europe are opposed only to direct acceptance of responsible sovereignty and not to pacific control of Tropical areas. There is universal agreement on the point

that what is at issue in the struggle of subject nations against imperial expansion is not so much the power and greatness of this or that nation but the civilisation of Europe itself.

In discussing the future of imperialism it is necessary to keep in mind the primary distinction between the civilised and uncivilised races that have come under European control. The distinction for all practical purposes means the Asiatic and the North African people on the one hand and the rest of Africa on the other. Imperial policy follows a different course in these two divisions. The justice of imperialism seems also to be different in these areas.

The last decade witnessed the highwater mark of Imperial expression. All Asiatic countries except Japan have come within the orbit of Europe, and after the war under the *plea* of mandates. European nations have annexed for economic and strategic reasons, Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine and other countries. But this period has also witnessed the remarkable growth of existence

on the part of civilised peoples towards imperialism. No Ministry dare present to the Persian Majliss the Anglo-Persian agreement. Mustapha Kemal has set at nought the treaty of Sevres and fought the imperialist powers for the last two years. In China, the re-juvenation of national spirit has been remarkable. Egypt under the wise leadership of Zaghlul Pasha has achieved the greatest victory for nationalism since the time of Cavour. All the more remarkable because it has been practically bloodless. In India the growth of national spirit has compelled the British Parliament to grant a modified scheme of self-government. There is no doubt that the days of imperialism in Asia are numbered.

The real reasons for the success of this struggle have been the fact that in Asia, though the European Nations are politically predominant, they have not been able to found colonies in the proper sense of the word. The population of Asia is too civilised for complete subjection and too militant for complete annihilation. The result is that

the hold of Europe on Asia has always been precarious to a degree. With the growth of nationalism it has become almost untenable. Japan showed the world that the days when Europe could hold Asia by mere prestige are gone, that organised and trained Asiatics are not inferior to Europeans. The growth of Asiatic resistance is a matter of the very highest significance in history and portents a revolution of no small magnitude.

But the case is vastly different with regard to Africa. In certain places, as in South Africa, the Europeans have settled down and established political organisations and states. The resistance of indigenous people has been extremely weak, and in most colonies they have been segregated in separate areas. The attempt to exterminate them has not indeed been so successful as in the case of Australia, but the European colonists are careful enough to see that economically and socially the natives do not rise beyond a certain level. The result is that South Africa and the other European colonies in that continent are trying to create there a White-

man's country with a coloured population as labourers. Here it is that the future of imperialism lies in this century. What its ultimate future will be no one can say. America has herself to solve the problem of her twenty million Negroes. There is no question that in the long run the African native will be a serious menace to European domination but that future is distant and by that time the Europeans in Africa would have become a settled population able to fight their own battle unlike their countrymen in Asia.

The industrial civilisation of Europe necessitates the steady supply of raw produce and secure markets for manufactured products. It is on this basis that European civilisation exists. Asiatic rivalry in industrial life with which Europe will have to reckon in the near future is also an important factor in the situation. In Africa, however, both the raw product and the market are safe in the monopoly of European colonists. Often a farsighted Napoleon of industry like Lord Leverhume establishes in Africa a secure basis for raw material for his industry

in England. Germany before the war safeguarded her industries in the same way. In Africa, therefore, European supremacy as well as European exploitation has come to stay.

Here again the way for European supremacy is not quite so clear as it would appear at first sight. Side by side with European expansion, an Indian expansion has also been a marked feature of African colonisation in Natal, Tanganyika, Kenya, Rhodesia, Mauritius and Zanzibar. Great and prosperous Indian communities are in existence in most of them. The Indian communities far outnumber the European settlers. With the increased influence of India in the councils of the Empire, Indian settlers have begun to claim equal citizenship everywhere. The claim is far-reaching. The problem is whether Eastern Africa is to be Asiatic or European in the long run. What is probable is that parts of Africa will become little Indias modified however by the existence of a powerful minority of European residents. In the Union of South Africa itself, Indian influence is bound to be felt more and more. The capital

fact in the history of the British Empire during the last ten years has been the assertion of India's equality with others. The vast and profound implications of this will be felt mostly in Africa. If India is an independent and equal partner in the Empire, Indian citizens, apart from the question of free entry, which may or may not be granted, must be treated on a basis of equality when they have once settled down in a place. The recognition of this principle will greatly modify the character of the African Empire of Britain.

In any case a great portion of Africa has become European in the sense that Asia could never have become. Imperialism, which in its aggressive sense is doomed in Asia, will for a much longer time continue to thrive on the dark continent. But the dark continent will no longer be entirely dark. A European and Indian population would have to a great extent replaced its aboriginal inhabitants. This transformation of Africa will effect a permanent change in the history of the world, much in the same way as the Europeanisa-

tion of America. But here the 'White' policy would have to be completely modified by two facts; *viz.*, (1) the existence of the civilised buffer States of the North and secondly the influx of a numerous Indian population on the East Coast.

That imperialism has been a great force in history cannot be denied. Whether its effects have been towards the bettering of human life or the widening of the human mind, it is a more difficult question to answer. Destructive as it has been of primitive life in its working and sinister as it has been in its methods, there is no doubt that over a vast area the movement has supplied the outer necessities of civilisation and quickened the growth (and often the decay) of communities. In the case of more civilised people it has unconsciously arrested them in their process of decadence by making it necessary for them to organise, to adapt and to adjust their lives to new surroundings in order to be able to resist the encroachments of their enemies. It is imperialism that is the father of Indian Renaissance. It was the necessity of fight-

ing imperialism that brought Japan out from its mediæval feudalism. The struggles through which China is passing is because of the same reason. It is no small praise to give to a movement. It argues for the stupendous vitality of imperialism to say that the dynamic forces it has created against itself are so varied and so powerful. It was due to Napoleon's greatness that all Europe fought him. It is his glory that in having to fight him, he created the spirit of nationality in most European countries. The same heroic glory belongs to imperialism. It is something that has called forth the mighty spirit of Asia from its decaying cell. It is a great thing to have carried light and civilisation into half a continent. By what it has done in Africa, equally by what it has undoubtedly failed to do in Asia, imperialism will have a place in history. It will be considered by future historians as one of those great movements that have transformed the history of the world, movements like the rise of Buddhism, Christianity and Islam.