

# **Stony Brook University**



OFFICIAL COPY

**The official electronic file of this thesis or dissertation is maintained by the University Libraries on behalf of The Graduate School at Stony Brook University.**

**© All Rights Reserved by Author.**

**Slaves, Trains, and Missionaries: British Moral Imperialism and the Development of  
Precolonial East Africa, 1873-1901**

A Dissertation Presented

By

**Daniel Seth Woulfin**

To

The Graduate School

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

**History**

Stony Brook University

**December 2011**

**Stony Brook University**

The Graduate School

Daniel Seth Woulfin

We, the dissertation committee for the above candidate for the  
Doctorate of Philosophy degree, hereby recommend  
acceptance of this dissertation.

**Wolf Schafer – Dissertation Advisor**

Professor of History

**John Williams – Chairperson of Defense**

Associate Professor Emeritus of History

**Jennifer Anderson**

Assistant Professor of History

**William Arens**

Professor of Anthropology – Stony Brook University

This dissertation is accepted by the Graduate School

**Lawrence Martin**

Dean of the Graduate School

Abstract of the Dissertation

**Slaves, Trains, and Missionaries: British Moral Imperialism and the Development of  
Precolonial East Africa, 1873-1901**

by  
**Daniel Seth Woulfin**  
**Doctorate of Philosophy**  
in  
**History**

Stony Brook University  
**2011**

This dissertation explores the role of moral imperialism in the late nineteenth century expansion of the British Empire using East Africa as a case study. Moral imperialism, the ideology that argued that the British had a moral duty to “civilize,” “Christianize,” “uplift,” and economically “develop” non-Europeans and their territories, has not been taken as seriously by historians as other factors for British expansion, namely economic arguments and strategic geopolitics by British officials. By applying Alan Lester’s model of three categories of colonial discourse in nineteenth century South Africa: governmentality, humanitarianism, and settler capitalism to East Africa between 1873 and 1901, I isolate moral imperialism (humanitarianism) as a contributing factor of imperialism, which is possible because the region had limited economic and geopolitical significance to the British Empire. Missionary, religious, civic, and anti-slavery organizations formed a moral lobby that actively interacted with and pressured government officials to increase Britain’s activities and influence in Zanzibar, East Africa, and Central Africa thereby moving these areas from the informal empire to the formal empire. By analyzing how these moral imperialists, mainly upper and middle class men from the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, Church Missionary Society, Universities’ Mission to Central Africa, and the Imperial British East Africa Company communicated their positions on East African slavery, the slave trade, and other moral imperial issues to their members, their supporters, the general public, and the decision makers within the British government this dissertation analyzes moral imperialism’s efforts to change the racial and labor dynamics as well as the transportation system of East Africa into something that was controllable by Europeans. This process, which took a generation, began with a series of treaties focused on combating the slave trade throughout the Indian Ocean, accelerated during the Partition of Africa and the jingoistic 1890s, and ended with the building of the Uganda Railroad and the birth of a white settler society in British East Africa at the turn of the twentieth century.

*For my grandfathers, Albert Korn and Samuel Woulfin*

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....	vii
<b>I. Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Humanitarian Efforts and the State in Zanzibar Before 1873.....	7
Historiography.....	18
Conclusion.....	30
<b>II. Missionaries and Statesmen: Moral Imperialism, Indian Ocean Geopolitics, and the Repercussions of Sir Bartle Frere’s Mission to East Africa, 1873-1883 .....</b>	<b>35</b>
Policymaking, British Committees, and the East African and Indian Ocean Slave Trade, 1870-1871.....	40
Moral Imperial Statesmanship: The Geopolitics of the Indian Ocean and the 1873 Anti-Slave Treaty.....	51
Foreign Office and Moral Imperial Symbiosis: Housing the Liberated Slaves and the Building of Freretown, 1874-1875 .....	63
Fugitive Slaves and the End of the Foreign Office and Moral Imperial Partnership, 1875-1880.....	76
Conclusion: The Moral Imperial Expansion into Central Africa Before the Partition, 1876-1885.....	84
<b>III. In the Midst of the Scramble: Moral Imperialism During the Partition of East Africa, 1884-1890.....</b>	<b>90</b>
British Missionaries During the Partition: New Borders and New Critiques, 1885 – 1888.....	97
Missionaries in the Middle: Chartered Companies, the Universities’ Mission to Central Africa, and the Church Missionary Society During Bushiri’s Uprising, 1888.....	104
Finishing the Scramble: A Blockade, Moral Imperial Division, and the End of Bushiri’s Uprising, 1889-1890.....	120
Conclusion: The 1890 Anti-Slavery Conference of the Powers at Brussels.....	134
<b>IV. Removing a Stain on the British Flag: The Campaign Against Slavery in East Africa, 1890-1897.....</b>	<b>140</b>
Uganda, the Imperial British East Africa Company, and Caravan Controversies, 1891-1894.....	147

The Anti-Slavery Society, the Foreign Office, and the Case Against Gradual Abolition, 1893-1895.....	160
Meetings and Mobilizations: The Final Push in the Campaign to Abolish the Status of Slavery in East Africa, 1895-1896.....	177
Conclusion: The Sultan’s Decree Abolishing the Legal Status of Slavery, 1897.....	186
<b>V. “Civilizing” East Africa: Moral Imperialists and the Building of the Uganda Railroad, 1890-1901.....</b>	<b>192</b>
An Unlikely Alliance: The Imperial British East Africa Company, Lord Salisbury’s Foreign Office, and the Moral Imperial Argument for a Railroad, 1890-1892.....	196
Macdonald’s Survey from Mombasa to Lake Victoria, 1891-1892.....	208
The New Liberal Government, the End of the Imperial British East Africa Company, and the Mombasa Railway, 1892-1895.....	222
Conclusion: Building the Railway, 1896-1901.....	238
<b>VI. Conclusion: Unintended Consequences: The Introduction of Settler Capitalism and the fall of Moral Imperial Influence in East Africa, 1902-1906.....</b>	<b>246</b>
White Settlers, Government Regulations, and the Criminalization of the African.....	250
Unwanted Neighbors: The White Settler Response to Jewish Immigration and Indian Landownership.....	258
The “Desirable” Immigrant: South Africans Arrive in East Africa.....	265
The New East African Dynamic: The Colonists Association, Indians, and the Colonial Office.....	272
<b>Bibliography.....</b>	<b>280</b>

## Acknowledgments

This dissertation would not have been possible without the support of many people, both inside and outside academia.

First and foremost, I'd like to thank my committee members, Wolf Schäfer, John Williams, Jennifer Anderson, and Bill Arens. Without their help, especially John William's guidance, insight, and patience, this project would not have come to fruition. Jennifer Anderson's useful commentary and advice on writing were also crucial to the completion of this dissertation. In addition to my committee, I'd also like to thank Gary Marker for leading the prospectus class where this project was originally formed and Gene Lebovics for leading some of the most thought provoking and interesting courses I took at Stony Brook. I'd also like to thank Donna Sammis from the Interlibrary Loan Office of Stony Brook University's Melville Library. Her tireless efforts not only made hard to find sources accessible, but also serves as an amazing resource for everyone at the university.

Friends provided companionship and support through this process. My colleagues in the History Department, especially Luke Feder, Kraig Larkin, Bridget Chesterton, and Melixa Abad-Izquierdo, were always supportive and willing to read drafts, give advice, and made classes worthwhile and enjoyable. Most importantly, I'd like to thank my fellow Africanists, Mwangi Njagi, and Tim Nicholson, for providing a sympathetic ear when I was working through problems and an even more useful and critical eye when reading drafts.

Outside of Stony Brook's History Department, I would like to thank a number of friends. Jen Iacona from the Charles B. Wang Center was the best Coordinator I could ever ask for, especially because she put up with me during the worst moments of the research and writing



process. Bonnie De Witt's support throughout the research and writing process, including sharing her hospitality at her apartment in Harlem while I was doing research at the Burke Theological Seminary at Columbia University was invaluable. Some of my best memories of Stony Brook occurred while working with Andrei Antonenko in the Graduate Student Organization, Victor Rosado in the Graduate Student Employees Union, and Isobel Breheny-Schafer from WUSB 90.1 FM. Running Stony Brooklyn, a 21+ concert series, with Bill Wenzel made the last years of grad school bearable and enjoyable. I would also like to thank Deena Levy, a classmate from Rutgers University who also went on to get a Ph.D., for her advice and encouragement as we both went through graduate school. Finally, this dissertation would never have been completed without the intervention and support of Noelle Damico and Jeff Geary.

Much of this project was written, edited, rewritten, mulled over, and rewritten again at The Country Corner in East Setauket, NY. Sahak and Christine Saraydarian allowed me to make their establishment my second home and let me take the best lit table. Their son, Ben Saraydarian, continued to make me feel welcome along with the staff, Dan Marcus, Dana De Viva, and James Darby. Without these late night work sessions this dissertation would never have been finished.

Finally, I cannot forget the support and tolerance of my family as I went through a process that they didn't understand. I would like to thank my parents, Gerald and Debra Woulfin, brother, Andrew Woulfin, and extended family; my aunts and uncles - Carol and Mark Heyderman, Arnold and Susan Woulfin, and Richard Korn - and my cousins - Alysia, Tim, Zack, and Ben Miller, Janice, Michael, Aaron, and Sarah Wagman, Tracy Heyderman, David, Mia, Ezekial, and Nikolai Woulfin, and Jeff and Sarah Woulfin. I especially would like to thank Sarah Woulfin, a Ph.D. candidate in Berkeley who sent me encouraging comments throughout the researching and writing process and the members of my second family, Sarah Marchesano, her girlfriend Regina Lynch, and their daughter Elisabeth Wilson, for brightening my life in ways I can never fully express.

## Introduction

As the British Empire spread throughout the globe, it carried imperial doctrines that shaped its expansions. As one of these doctrines, moral imperialism injected a sense of moral responsibility for indigenous peoples based on racial superiority. It argued that Britain had a moral duty to uplift non-European regions by converting them to Christianity, promoting economic development and free trade, abolishing slavery and introducing free labor, and other tactics that Europeans viewed as civilizing. These were the conditions under which East Africa was colonized by the British. This dissertation investigates the role that moral imperialism, namely abolitionist, missionary, and philanthropic organizations, had in the incorporation of precolonial Zanzibar and East Africa into Britain's formal empire. Beginning with the 1873 anti-slave trade treaty and ending with the completion of the Uganda railroad in 1901, an intricate imperial process, in which humanitarian causes and political campaigns interacted with geopolitical need and perceived British national interest, increased British control and influence over Zanzibar and the East Africa.<sup>1</sup>

In order to isolate 1873-1901 as a period where British moral imperialism had an impact in East Africa, I turn to Alan Lester's book *Imperial Networks*, which identified three categories of colonial discourse in nineteenth century South Africa: governmentality, humanitarianism, and settler capitalism. Lester said:

---

<sup>1</sup> This effort followed a similar effort on Africa's west coast. See: Kingsley Kenneth Dyke Nworah, *Humanitarian Pressure Groups and British Attitudes to West Africa, 1895-1915* (Ph.D. Dissertation: University of London, 1966).

These discourses were created initially as a result of competing ‘projects’, devised by differentially situated British interests to be carried out in a variety of colonial spaces. It was the incompatibility between the Colonial Office and its governors’ agendas for producing order at minimal cost, philanthropic and evangelical humanitarians’ schemes of proselytisation among ‘aborigines’ and their eventual assimilation, and settlers’ more targeted visions of capital accumulation and security that brought these discourses into being and into collision with one another.<sup>2</sup>

These ideologies formed different worldviews that sought to control colonial development.

Imperialism was not the result of a cohesive plan but rather competing ideologies. By applying this model to East Africa, the dual arrival of British governmentality and humanitarianism or moral imperialism arrived the signing of the 1873 anti-slavery treaty between Britain and Sultan Barghash of Zanzibar. The last form of Lester’s colonial discourses, settler capitalism, was absent from the region until settlers arrived after the Uganda Railroad was finished in 1901. The rhetorical coexistence of governmentality and humanitarianism in East Africa as well as the region’s geopolitical importance as the western trading center for both legitimate trade and the slave trade in the Indian Ocean make the last years of precolonial East Africa a valuable case study on the mechanics of moral imperialism in the expansion of the British Empire.

Although recognized by the British as the main political entity in East Africa, Zanzibar, as a premodern proto-state, lacked governmentality. In a lecture at the Collège de France in the 1977-78 academic year during a course titled “Security, Territory, and Population,” Michel Foucault analyzed the writings of sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth century thinkers who laid the groundwork for the replacement of a sovereign state with the nation state and its population control tools by writing about the role of government to define governmentality. Specifically, Foucault called governmentality, “The ensemble formed by the institutions, procedures, analyses, and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this

---

<sup>2</sup> Alan Lester, *Imperial Networks: Creating Identities in Nineteenth-Century South Africa and Britain* (London: Routledge, 2001), 4.

very specific albeit complex form of power, which has as its target population, as its principal form of knowledge political economy, and as its essential technical means apparatuses of security."<sup>3</sup> Zanzibar's position as the center of a loose East African network based on its economic strength and ties to the Indian merchant class meant that it lacked political cohesion and did not have the population controls of a modern state, such as institutions and bureaucracies that built roads, regulated trade, created police forces, oversaw custom agents, ran a military, tracked its population, and other forms of state organization. The creation of these government structures in late nineteenth century East Africa correlated to anti-slavery, missionary, and other humanitarian campaigns. Moral imperial crises led to political and military interventions by the British in the region, resulting in new regulations, transportation structures, policies, and laws passed first by the Sultan of Zanzibar and then in his name by British administrators.

Zanzibar slowly fell under Britain's influence in the early and mid-nineteenth century as the empire stopped expanding in the Americas after the American Revolution and began looking to India and their informal empire in Asia to replace the income it lost. To secure Asia, Britain engaged in a century long conflict with France in Egypt and the Indian Ocean, eventually securing an alliance with the Sultan of Oman and Zanzibar. Zanzibar's position on the route to key British imperial spaces, especially India via Egypt and the Suez Canal, made it imperative that Britain have influence over the Sultan. According to historian D.A. Low, by the late nineteenth century the Zanzibar Sultanate depended on Britain for stability and for security.<sup>4</sup> Low specifically noted that "during the British period [beginning in 1890 but with precedents going back to the 1870s], the government of the island [of Zanzibar] was conducted in the name

---

<sup>3</sup> Michel Foucault, "Governmentality," in James D. Faubion (ed), *Power, Volume 3* (New York: The New Press, 1994), 219-220.

<sup>4</sup> D.A. Low, *Lion Rampant: Essays in the Study of British Imperialism* (London: Frank Cass, 1973), 9.

of His Highness the Sultan," however, "the Sultan's Government was composed entirely of British officials."<sup>5</sup> The Sultan remained the head of state, but his continued political survival was dependent on British goodwill. Over time, this dependency grew and was quickened by intense efforts on the part of moral imperialists to insure the British acted on what they described as the humanitarian needs of the region.

The inclusion of Zanzibar and East Africa into Britain's informal and then formal empire was advocated for by moral imperialists, middle and upper class men who belonged to abolitionist, missionary, and philanthropic organizations. My definition of who is or is not a moral imperialist is heavily indebted to the insights of J. A. Hobson in his 1903 book *Imperialism*. Hobson argued that there were two kinds of imperialists motivated by "moral and sentimental factors." The first category was "a considerable though not a large proportion of the British nation" who have "a genuine desire to spread Christianity among the heathen, to diminish the cruelty and sufferings which they believe exist in countries less fortunate than their own, and to do good work about the world in the case of humanity." Hobson went on to say that "most of the churches contain a small body of men and women deeply, even passionately, interested in such work, and a much larger number whose sympathy, though weaker, is quite genuine."<sup>6</sup> These moral imperialists existed throughout Britain and were the core of moral imperialism. Their dedication drove the ideology and maintained its power in British politics by funding and staffing abolitionist organizations, missionary activities, and corporations focused on Africa. The second category of moral imperialists were the "politicians, soldiers, or company directors" who

---

<sup>5</sup> D.A. Low, *Lion Rampant: Essays in the Study of British Imperialism* (London: Frank Cass, 1973), 13. To prove this point Low cited: L. W. Hollingsworth, *Zanzibar Under the Foreign Office, 1890-1913* (London: Macmillan, 1953).

<sup>6</sup> J.A. Hobson, *Imperialism: A Study* (London: James Nisbet & Co., Limited, 1902), 208.

“instinctively attach to themselves any strong genuine elevated feeling [like humanitarianism] which is of service, fan it and feed it until it assumes fervor, and utilize it for their ends.”<sup>7</sup> While they may have used moral imperial rhetoric, moral imperialism was rarely the main motive for their actions. Moral imperial sentiment was a tool that was used for their own political ends. This dissertation is primarily focused on the first kind of moral imperialist but, the second kind of moral imperialist will also be analyzed because of the key role that government officials played in the colonization of East Africa.

The moral imperialists that this study is primarily focused on belonged to one or more of four organizations, the Church Missionary Society (CMS), British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, Universities’ Mission to Central Africa, and the Imperial British East Africa Company. These organizations formed the foundation for a moral imperial network that maintained consistent pressure on the British government to increase its activities and power into East Africa. While the first three organizations fit within the moral imperial model as either a missionary or anti-slavery organization, the Imperial British East Africa Company was a royally chartered company that administered the Sultan’s northern territories (the coast of modern day Kenya) from 1889-1894. However, sections of this company’s charter and the humanitarian inclinations of its shareholders and Board of Directors categorized it as a moral imperial as well as a commercial enterprise. In many cases, men belonged to more than one of these organizations – for example, Reverend Horace Waller belonged to both the Anti-Slavery Society and the University’s Mission to Central Africa. They formed the foundation of a network that included other voluntary societies within Britain, including geographic societies, chambers of

---

<sup>7</sup> J.A. Hobson, *Imperialism: A Study* (London: James Nisbet & Co., Limited, 1902), 208.

commerce, and other civic organizations and religious orders. They maintained moral imperial influence in British society and politics.

The rhetoric of these organizations mirrored the “new journalism” that was transforming British newspapers starting in the 1870s. “New journalism” favored shorter, well written stories filled with emotionally charged language over articles containing word for word reproductions of speeches by politicians, business, and civic leaders.<sup>8</sup> William L. Langer called this a shift to “a sensationalist newspaper press” and “a literature of brutality”/“literature of action” that was dependent on books and narratives that highlighted adventure stories of Europeans interacting with uncivilized non-Europeans.<sup>9</sup> This transformation of the press spread rhetoric that fed moral imperial campaigns. Africa became the “dark continent” and as Patrick Brantlinger insightfully explained that during this period, “the British tended to see Africa as a center of evil, a part of the world possessed by a ‘demonic’ darkness or barbarism, represented above all by slavery and cannibalism, which it was their duty to exorcise.”<sup>10</sup> Supported by Social Darwinism and the new discipline of anthropology, the constant repetition of these tropes solidified a racial hierarchy with Europeans at the top (although the English were the superior European), Asians in the middle, and Africans at the bottom.<sup>11</sup> This premise of racial superiority formed the foundation

---

<sup>8</sup> For an overview of the history and effect of new journalism on British newspapers see: Harold Herd, “The New Journalism,” *The March of Journalism: The Story of the British Press from 1622 to the Present Day* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1952), 222-251.

<sup>9</sup> William L. Langer, *The Diplomacy of Imperialism* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956), 81, 84. Literature of action was mentioned on page 84.

<sup>10</sup> Patrick Brantlinger, “Victorians and Africans: The Genealogy of the Myth of the Dark Continent,” *Critical Inquiry* Vol. 12, No. 1 (August 1985), 175. Ironically, Kenyans reversed the trope of cannibalism, specifically vampirism and blood drinking, in the twentieth century with stories of European blood drinkers and their African accomplices. See: Luise White, *Speaking With Vampires: Rumor and History in Colonial Africa* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).

<sup>11</sup> For analyses of Social Darwinism and anthropological thought in Britain during the Victorian era see: Greta Jones, *Social Darwinism and English Thought: The Interaction Between Biological and Social Theory* (Sussex:

moral imperial arguments and rhetoric about Britain's responsibility to civilize and uplift non-Europeans, changing their social-economic systems.

It was within this new public environment that moral imperialists intensified their campaigns regarding Zanzibar and East Africa from the 1870s through the end of the century. This period also marked a drastic increase in imperial rivalry within Europe, coinciding with the birth of new imperial powers in Germany and Italy in the 1870s that increased the competition for territory and influence in the 1880s and sparked a jingoistic period in Britain in the 1890s. Beginning with the 1873 treaty that abolished the slave trade and formed a community of liberated slaves at the Church Missionary Society station of Freretown, Britain began a gradual increase in its military and administrative presence to support the Zanzibar Sultanate. By the end of the nineteenth century, Britain saw East Africa partitioned between itself and Germany after the Berlin Treaty in 1885, declared protectorates over Uganda and East Africa in 1894 and 1895 respectively, transformed African transportation and labor systems, and combated slavery and the slave trade. During this historical process, moral imperialism and its ability to mobilize public opinion was a crucial motivator in the spread of Britain's informal and formal empire into East Africa.

### **Humanitarian Efforts and the State in Zanzibar Before 1873**

It is impossible to comprehend the role and tactics of moral imperialism as it increased its influence in East Africa in the late nineteenth century without understanding the history between Britain and Zanzibar in the context of Britain's abolitionist and missionary activities prior to the

---

Harvester Press, 1980). George W. Stocking, Jr. *Victorian Anthropology* (New York: The Free Press, 1987). Adam Kuper, *The Invention of Primitive Society: Transformations of an Illusion* (London: Routledge, 1988).

For an overview of this racial hierarchy see: J. M. Blaght, *The Colonizer's Model of the World: Geographical Diffusionism and Eurocentric History* (New York: The Guilford Press, 1993).



1873 treaty. Claimed by the Imam of Oman following the defeat of the Portuguese in 1740, Zanzibar and the East African coast were run by independent Walis (the mayors of Mombasa, Bagamoyo, Kilwa, Pangani, Dar es Salaam, and other towns) until the nineteenth century. Their populations consisted of Omani Arabs, Swahili, Africans from the surrounding countryside, and Indian merchants belonging to firms headquartered in Zanzibar who were responsible for trading activities and the Sultan's customs houses.<sup>12</sup> During the first half of the nineteenth century, the Sultan of Oman and Zanzibar began to claim his control over the region, caused regular revolts against his rule in the coastal cities. Zanzibar emerged as the primary center for foreign trade for the East African coast tying it into the Indian Ocean world, which was under the dominance of the British Empire. Maintaining economic hegemony over the region throughout the nineteenth century, Zanzibar never consolidated its power and control into a single political entity like a European nation state.

The wars between Britain and France in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century had severe repercussions in the Indian Ocean from Oman to Zanzibar. Beginning in 1793 and ending in 1815, lasting through the French Revolutionary Wars and the Napoleonic Wars, Britain and France maneuvered and fought throughout the Indian Ocean for control. For the British, these battles in the Indian Ocean were crucial because they were depending on their Asian colonies, especially India, to replace the financial income they lost with the loss of their North American colonies. Pirates based out of the French colony, the Île de France (modern day Mauritius), attacked British trade ships going to and from India eventually drawing in other regional powers into the conflict, including Muscat and Oman. These imperial conflicts set the

---

<sup>12</sup> Robert Gregory, *India and East Africa: A History of Race Relations Within the British Empire, 1830-1939* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971). Kauleshwar Rai, *Indians and British Colonialism in East Africa, 1883-1939* (Patna, India: Associated Book Agency 1979).

stage for British dominance over the Indian Ocean. After the successful invasion of the Île de France and defeat of the French by the British in 1810, Britain gained naval hegemony in the Indian Ocean and with it the loyalty of Sultan Said, the new Sultan of Muscat and Oman.<sup>13</sup> Throughout the rest of the nineteenth century Britain's geopolitical strategy was to maintain their control of the ocean against their imperial rivals and non-European powers like the Ottoman Empire.

Following Britain's victory against France, the island of Zanzibar began to increase its economic importance in the Indian Ocean. In the 1810s, Saleh bin Haramil al Abry introduced cloves to Zanzibar and the nearby island of Pemba. This transformed these islands into an agricultural production zone, which became the world's leading producers of the spice and enriched the Omani plantation owners. But growing this labor intensive crop required the landowners to continuously import large numbers of African slaves to the island, increasing their ties to the caravans run by Swahili on the coast, the Nyamwezi in the southern hinterland and the Akamba in the northern hinterland.<sup>14</sup> The success of the clove industry and the concurrent slave trade disturbed the British who reacted by negotiating and signing a series of treaties with Zanzibar against the slave trade. This led to the Moresby Treaty in 1822, which marked the shift among anti-slavery advocates from the west coast of Africa and the western hemisphere to the East coast of Africa and Asia. The treaty had an added benefit for Sultan Said because it

---

<sup>13</sup> See: Reginald Coupland, *East Africa and Its Invaders: From the Earliest Times to the Death of Seyyid Said in 1856* (New York, Russell & Russell Inc., 1965), 74-108. Stephen Taylor, *Storm and Conquest: The Battle for the Indian Ocean, 1808-10* (London : Faber and Faber, 2007).

<sup>14</sup> For a history of plantation agriculture and slavery in East Africa see: Frederick Cooper, *Plantation Slavery on the East Coast of Africa* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977).

For the importance of the Nyamwezi as caravan porters see: Stephen J. Rockel, *Carriers of Culture: Labor on the Road in Nineteenth-Century East Africa* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2006). For the Akamba see: Robert J. Cummings, *Aspects of Human Porterage with Special Reference to the Akamba of Kenya: Towards an Economic History, 1820-1920* (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California – Los Angeles, 1975).

strengthened the island's diplomatic ties to Britain. To fulfill the treaty he moved to take more complete control over Oman's East Africa claims, which had been independent in all but name since the eighteenth century. Attacking and annexing Mombasa in 1837, Sultan Said cemented Oman's claims to Zanzibar and the East African coast. Three years later, he moved his capital from Muscat to the now prosperous island of Zanzibar, ruling both Oman and Zanzibar from the African island. Following his death in 1856, his sultanate was split in two with one son, Sultan Thuwaini, ruling Oman and the other, Sultan Majid, ruling Zanzibar.<sup>15</sup>

Anti-slavery campaigns were at their strongest when Moresby Treaty was signed. Erupting as a reform movement in the late eighteenth century and allied with evangelicals, abolitionism moved from victory to victory.<sup>16</sup> Abolitionists, mainly male middle and upper class evangelicals, philanthropists, and politicians, like William Wilberforce and Thomas Clarkson, campaigned to dismantle the slave trade throughout the British Empire in 1807. Fifteen years later these same men formed the *Society for the Mitigation and Gradual Abolition of Slavery Throughout the British Dominions* to work for the abolishment of slavery throughout the British Empire, which happened in 1833. In 1839, with the slave trade and slavery abolished throughout Britain's territories the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society was formed to work on abolition outside Britain's formal empire.<sup>17</sup> Their constitution outlined their overall philosophy, arguing "that the extinction of Slavery and the Slave-trade will be attained most effectually by

---

<sup>15</sup> Norman R. Bennett, "The Rise of Zanzibar," *A History of the Arab State of Zanzibar* (London: Methuen & Co, 1978), 14-59. For a detailed history of the life of the towns, see: Jonathon Glassman, *Feasts and Riot: Revelry, Rebellion, and Popular Consciousness on the Swahili Coast, 1856-1888* (London: James Currey, 1995).

<sup>16</sup> J. F. Maclear, "The Evangelical Alliance and the Anti-Slavery Crusade," *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 42, No. 2 (Spring 1979), 141-164.

<sup>17</sup> On the birth of the British anti-slavery movement see: Christopher Leslie Brown, *Moral Capital: Foundations of British Abolitionism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006). David Turley, *The Culture of English Anti-Slavery, 1780-1860* (London: Routledge, 1991),

the employment of those means which are of a *moral, religious, and pacific character*.” This meant that Anti-Slavery Society tactics were limited to collecting and spreading information about slavery and slave trade conditions while promoting free labor, opposing the purchase of slave-grown produce in favor of free-grown produce, and promoting regulations and economic development that make free labor more profitable than slave labor.<sup>18</sup> Because the last tactic directly affected regions other than Britain it meant that the Anti-Slavery Society supported imperial interventions. By the mid-nineteenth century, anti-slavery efforts had become a coordinated international effort of middle class reformers, especially among Anglo-Americans, holding the first World Anti-Slavery Convention in 1840 in London, which was followed by other international efforts.<sup>19</sup>

The Anti-Slavery Society was aided by political changes in the United Kingdom in the nineteenth century. Electoral reforms empowered more people with the right to vote, thereby increasing the influence of the mass media and public outcry on political processes. Starting with the Reform Act of 1832, more British men were incorporated into the voting process although property requirements remained. Following this first step, the Chartist movement called for universal male suffrage for men over twenty one years old, an end to property requirements to hold office, a salary for members of parliament, equal electoral districts, and annual elections in 1837. Although the movement sputtered out after 1848, two decades later the 1867 Reform Act

---

<sup>18</sup> “Constitution of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society,” found within the “Anti-Slavery Reporter” Microfilm Collection, 1890.

<sup>19</sup> Thomas F. Harwood, “British Evangelical Abolitionism and American Churches in the 1830s,” *The Journal of Southern History*, Vol. 28, No. 3 (August 1962), 287-306. Christine Bolt and Seymour Drescher (ed.), *Anti-Slavery, Religion, and Reform: Essays in Memory of Roger Anstey* (Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1980).

Douglas Maynard, “Reform and the Origins of the International Organization Movement,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 107, No. 3 (June 1963), 220-231. Douglas H. Maynard, “The World’s Anti-Slavery Convention of 1840,” *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 47, No. 3 (December 1960), 452-471. On the anti-slavery movement in Brazil, see: Leslie Bethell, *The Abolition of the Brazilian Slave Trade: Britain, Brazil and the Slave Trade Question, 1807-1869* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970).

gave all men in the United Kingdom the right to vote. These reforms changed the dynamics of the political environment of the country, increasing the power of Parliament and making politician's decisions more accountable to public opinion.<sup>20</sup> Abolitionists were particularly adept at raising public awareness about slavery issues in East Africa and throughout the world by calling on a sense of Britain's moral responsibility. This tactic increased the Anti-Slavery Society and other abolitionists organizations' power to pressure Parliament and other parts of the British government on humanitarian issues.

The newly empowered abolitionist organizations had an effect on British policy towards Sultan Said. Under heavy moral imperial lobbying, the Foreign Office pressured Sultan Said to sign a treaty against the slave trade in 1845 that set the stage for a greater missionary presence in East Africa three decades later. The Hamerton Treaty, which took effect in 1847, made it illegal to transport slaves anywhere but from the coast to Zanzibar and allowed the British navy to patrol and liberate slaves on Omani and Zanzibari ships in the Indian Ocean destined to be sold in west Asia.<sup>21</sup> Britain's influence and presence throughout the Indian Ocean and East Africa was increased in order to enforce the new treaty. There was also a moral imperial component. Most of these liberated slaves were brought to Mauritius and the Seychelle Islands but a small minority (a few hundred) was brought to India where some received a western education in the "Indo-British Institution" in Bombay, a government school under the supervision of the CMS.

---

<sup>20</sup> Maurice Cowling, *1867: Disraeli, Gladstone and Revolution: The Passing of the Second Reform Bill* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1967). Arno J. Mayer, *The Persistence of the Old Regime: Europe to the Great War* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1981). Eric J. Evans, *The Great Reform Act of 1832* (London: Methuen, 1983). Dorothy Thompson, *The Chartists: Popular Politics in the Industrial Revolution* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984). T. A. Jenkins, *Parliament, Party and Politics in Victorian Britain* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996). Malcolm Chase, *Chartism: A New History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).

<sup>21</sup> Moses D. E. Nwulla, "The Role of Missionaries in the Emancipation of Slaves in Zanzibar," *The Journal of Negro History* Vol. 60, No. 2 (April 1975), 272-273. Moses D. E. Nwulia, *Britain and Slavery in East Africa* (Washington D.C.: Three Continents Press, 1975), 60.

These Africans were later moved to the CMS mission center at Nassick, India (outside Bombay) where they continued their education until they were called back to East Africa to form the foundation of Freretown, the Church Missionary Society's liberated slave community outside Mombasa in the 1870s.<sup>22</sup>

The CMS was relatively unsuccessful in converting the local East African populations in the nineteenth century but were catalysts for exploration in East Africa. Johannes Krapf, a peer of one of the Nassik missionaries, Rev. Charles Isenberg, in Abyssinia, founded the CMS's mission of Kisoludini, near Rabai in East Africa in 1844 and was joined by Johannes Rebmann two years later.<sup>23</sup> Repeating stories from caravan porters and traders, Krapf and Rebmann were the first Europeans to write about the existence of Mount Kilimanjaro and Mount Kenya in 1848 and 1849. This revived Ptolemy's classical map of Africa and with it the theory that the source of the Nile River was below the Equator. The missionaries' claims sparked the interest of the Royal Geographic Society. James MacQueen read a paper to the Society in 1850 outlining what was known about the geography of Central Africa. Within this summary, he depended heavily on "the interesting communications of Messrs. Rebmann and Krapf, numerous Arabic, Portuguese, and other authorities" when examining "the parts W. of Mombas, to the Great Lake in the interior, about 500 geographical miles distant, and the countries and rivers S. of Kaffa to the Bay

---

<sup>22</sup> Colin Reed, "India: Bombay, Nasik," *Pastors, Partners and Paternalists: African Church Leaders and Western Missionaries in the Anglican Church in Kenya, 1850-1900* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997), 17-29. Robert Strayer, "Bombay Africans and Freed Slaves: A Missionary Prelude to Colonial Rule, 1875-1900," *The Making of Mission Communities in East Africa: Anglicans and Africans in Colonial Kenya, 1875-1935* (London: Heinemann, 1978), 14-29.

<sup>23</sup> *The Mombasa Mission of the Church Missionary Society Containing Letters from Bishop Royston of Mauritius, Mr J. R. Streeter, &c* (London: Church Missionary House, 1879), 1. See also: Robert W. Strayer, *The Making of Mission Communities in East Africa: Anglicans and Africans in Colonial Kenya, 1875-1935* (London: Heinemann, 1978), 3.

of Formosa and Melinda.”<sup>24</sup> Geographers did not accept the word of missionaries, who in many cases did not journey to see the geographic features themselves but rather depended on the stories of porters and others who traveled to Central Africa, and began to send explorers to the region to prove or disprove the missionaries claims.

The next decade the Royal Geographic Society sent explorers to East Africa to search for the source of the Nile River in Central Africa, confirming Krapf and Rebmann’s reports, opening up new potential lands for missionizing, and future conflicts between European powers. The mid-nineteenth century, which saw explorers like Richard Burton, John Hanning Speke, and David Livingstone, was according to Felix Driver, the period where “the explorer was the foot-soldier of geography’s empire; a pioneer of Geography Militant.”<sup>25</sup> Unlike the armchair explorations and reporting of the missionaries this new kind of explorer physically traveled to the regions they were investigating. Richard Burton and John Hanning Speke “discovered” Lake Tanganyika and Lake Victoria during several expeditions in the 1860s.<sup>26</sup> Following Speke’s second expedition which provided further evidence and arguments for Lake Victoria as the source of the Nile River, the CMS fought back against the Geographic Society’s earlier critique. They pointed out that “Our Missionaries [Krapf and Rebmann] first directed attention to the mountains Kilimanjaro and Kenia, the outlying spurs of the great mountain chains which are massed around these lakes, and more especially to the north of the Tanganyika and west of the Nyanza. They were treated with incredulity, as witnesses not to be relied upon, and their

---

<sup>24</sup> James MacQueen, Esq., “Notes on the Present State of the Geography of some Parts of Africa,” *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society of London* Vol. 20 (1850), 245-252.

<sup>25</sup> Felix Driver, *Cultures of Exploration and Empire* (Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers, 2001), 3.

<sup>26</sup> J.N.L. Baker, “Sir Richard Burton and the Nile Sources,” *The English Historical Review* Vol. 59 No. 233 (Jan. 1944), 50. J.N.L. Baker, “John Hanning Speke,” *The Geographical Journal* Vol 128, No. 4 (Dec. 1962), 385-388.

statements denounced as fabulous.”<sup>27</sup> While seemingly bitter at the rejection of the geographers, the CMS also saw Speke’s discovery, as well as the discoveries of his contemporaries as an opportunity for them to expand further into East Africa.

Although the explorations of Burton and Speke were important for the CMS, David Livingstone had an even larger influence on moral imperialists focused on East Africa, inspiring more missionizing and anti-slavery activities. Livingstone began his career as a medical missionary in South Africa in the 1840s. Within a decade, Livingstone began several failed journeys into the interior. After reaching and naming the Victoria Falls in 1855, he wrote his first book, *Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa* (1857) and called for university students to explore and missionize in Central Africa, starting the process that founded the Universities’ Mission to Central Africa. The initial expedition of this new organization was viewed as a failure due, in part, to the many deaths among the party from malaria, including the Bishop and founder of the Universities’ Mission to Central Africa.<sup>28</sup> Over the next generation, the Universities’ Mission became an active force in East and Central African missionizing, creating stations in Uganda and throughout the interior. During Livingstone’s next trip, a government funded expedition exploring the Zambesi River, he was horrified when he spotted a “slave party, a long line of manacled men, women, and children, [that] came wending their way round the hill and into the valley.”<sup>29</sup> His observations of the state of these slaves originated and

---

<sup>27</sup> “The Nile-Past and Present,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer: A Monthly Journal of Missionary Information* Vol 14 (June 1863), 135.

<sup>28</sup> In 1864 the Universities’ Mission to Central Africa changed strategy and stayed close to populated areas on the coast, founding their headquarters in Zanzibar.

Landeg White, *Magomero: Portrait of an African Village* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 3-70. Dorothy O. Helly, *Livingstone’s Legacy: Horace Waller and Victorian Mythmaking* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1987), 12-13.

<sup>29</sup> David and Charles Livingstone, *Narrative of an Expedition to the Zambesi and its Tributaries; and of the Discovery of the Lakes Shirwa and Nyazza. 1858-1864* (London: J. Murray, 1865), 337. Reverend Waller’s account



popularized the abolitionist trope that linked slavery and caravans in East Africa. Livingstone's last trip, a search for the source of the Nile River, beginning in 1866 went disastrously leading to rumors of his death. He was found alive in 1871 by Henry Morton Stanley. This public resurrection transformed Livingstone into a hero for moral imperialists.

Livingstone's public resurrection and then real death three years later made him a symbol for humanitarian efforts in East and Central Africa and inspired many of his old companions to work anti-slavery issues. The publicity that followed the story of his miraculous reappearance cemented Livingstone's celebrity status in Britain despite many failed and disastrous expeditions he had led or inspired. Sir John Kirk, Livingstone's doctor on his Zambesi expedition, became a key government official in several moral imperial campaigns from the 1870s through the 1890s. He served as Consul General of Zanzibar, a director of the British East Africa Company, and a committee member of the Uganda Railway Committee. Another of Livingstone's companions Rev. Horace Waller was active in East African anti-slavery campaigns in Britain. A member of both the Universities' Mission to Central Africa and the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, Waller had been one of the first volunteers for the Universities' Mission to Central Africa and was a member the organization's first expedition in 1860 to Lake Nyassa (today known as Lake Malawi), where he met David Livingstone at the mouth of the Zambesi River in 1861. After Livingstone's death Waller used his position as the posthumous editor of Livingstone's journals to promote an anti-slavery campaign for East Africa.<sup>30</sup> He selectively included and interpreted events and stories from Livingstone's life to mythologize the missionary

---

of the encounter with the slave caravan appears in: Landeg White, *Magomera: Portrait of an African Village* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 16-17.

<sup>30</sup> Dorothy O. Helly, *Livingstone's Legacy: Horace Waller and Victorian Mythmaking* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1987).

as an abolitionist hero. This furthered Waller's own goals and helped transition abolitionist and missionary energies from the west coast of Africa and in the Americas to the east coast of Africa.

31

As abolitionists' focus transitioned for the west coast to the east coast of Africa, they were in the midst of a number of anti-slavery campaigns. Starting in the 1860s and going into the early 1870s slavery was abolished in Cuba, the United States of America after the Civil War, all Dutch colonies, Brazil, and Puerto Rico. In addition, India illegalized indentured servitude in 1860 and Russia abolished serfdom in 1861. There were also moral imperial failures such as the Morant Bay Rebellion in Jamaica, the Indian Mutiny, and others throughout Africa, Asia and the western hemisphere. However, with their victories, anti-slavery advocates' focus shifted to areas that still practiced slavery, especially Islamic regions. This included anti-slavery efforts and treaties with Egypt, Zanzibar, various entities within Arabia, and the Ottoman Empire in the 1870s as the region became more significant to British Empire after the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869.<sup>32</sup> The new canal between the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean greatly shortened the sea route to India, the crown jewel of the British Empire and Zanzibar, changing Britain's geopolitical strategy and making the region a target of the moral imperialists for the

---

<sup>31</sup> Sir Reginald Coupland outlines the traditional narrative of the transition from British to international anti-slavery efforts as well as the transition from West African to East African anti-slavery efforts in: Sir Reginald Coupland, *The British Anti-Slavery Movement, Second Edition* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc, 1964: 1933), 151-218.

For more on Livingstone's life and effect on British society see; Clare Pettitt, *Dr. Livingstone, I Presume? Missionaries, Journalists, Explorers and Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007). Timothy Holmes, *Journey to Livingstone: Exploration of an Imperial Myth* (Edinburgh, UK: Canongate Press Ltd, 1993).

<sup>32</sup> For a history of the abolition movement in Egypt and the Ottoman Empire during this time period see: Diane Liga Robinson-Dunn, *Imperial Identities: Anglo-Muslim Relations and Politics of Orientalism in British-occupied Egypt and Victorian England, 1870-1900* (Ph.D. Dissertation, State University of New York at Stony Brook, 1999). Diane Liga Robinson-Dunn, *The harem, slavery and British imperial culture: Anglo-Muslim relations in the late nineteenth century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006). Y. Hakan Erdem, *Slavery in the Ottoman Empire and its Demise, 1800-1909* (London: Macmillan Press, 1996).

next generation. While Britain's geopolitical strategy and economic interests has been addressed by historians, the question of the effectiveness of British moral imperialism has not.

### **Historiography**

Historians have used many explanations to explain the creation and expansion of the British Empire throughout the world, including into East Africa. Imperialism was a complex, multi-phased process that has spawned multiple explanations over the last hundred years. East African historiography began in the early twentieth century as a narrative format focused on the "great men" of British imperial history and the anti-slavery movement. It was heavily nationalist. Since then imperial historians have used multiple methodologies to try to find causal factors for imperialism, including Marxism, political theory, metropole-periphery, world-systems theory, nationalist histories from the colonies, and the incorporation of post-colonial and cultural theory in new imperial history. These explanations have mirrored the historiography of the British Empire and Africa. However, moral imperialism has never been put at the center. It has been deemed inconsequential or disregarded as ideology within historiography.

Sir Reginald Coupland and the other early twentieth century historians of East Africa focused on explorers, colonial officials, and abolitionists, such as David Livingstone, Sir John Kirk, Sultan Barghash bin Said, William Wilberforce, Granville Sharp, and others. Many of these men were regarded highly by moral imperialists.<sup>33</sup> Regarding the initial British anti-slavery

---

<sup>33</sup> Sir Reginald Coupland, *The British Anti-Slavery Movement* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1964: 1933). Besides Coupland see: Frank J. Klingberg, *The Anti-Slavery Movement in England: A Study in English Humanitarianism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1926). Edward Charles Ponsoyby, *Granville Sharp and the Freedom of Slaves in England* (London: Oxford University Press, 1928). John H. Harris, *A Century of Emancipation* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1933).

Ponsoyby's book is a good example of the connection between hero worship and moral imperialism in these early histories.

movement in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, Coupland elaborated on “the ‘positive policy’ of the Abolitionists, a policy woven from its earliest conception of three distinct but interrelated threads – Christianity, commerce, colonization.”<sup>34</sup> Coupland’s explanation mirrored the language of his sources, creating histories that mimicked the hero worship of the late nineteenth century. In East Africa, he pointed to a single British explorer as the inspiration for East African anti-slavery campaigns in Britain: “Most of the facts about the Arab Slave Trade were revealed to the British public by the explorers’ accounts of their travels and particularly by their books, letters and speeches of [David] Livingstone.”<sup>35</sup> Besides Livingstone, Coupland only credited two other men for the anti-slave trade treaty signed in 1873, John Kirk, the British Consul-General, and Sultan Barghash. While he pointed out that these individuals did not act alone and had considerable backing among the British public, his histories do not reflect this, focusing instead on the leaders and public officials involved in the anti-slavery campaigns rather than the middle and upper class men and women who populated humanitarian organizations who led moral imperial campaigns.<sup>36</sup>

Caribbean historian and the future Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago, Eric Williams set a dramatic counterpoint to Coupland in his 1944 book *Capitalism and Slavery*. A dedicated vulgar Marxist, Williams rejected any analysis of the superstructure in favor of the economic base. His book was “an economic study of the role of Negro slavery and the slave trade in

---

<sup>34</sup> Sir Reginald Coupland, *The British Anti-Slavery Movement* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1964: 1933), 85.

<sup>35</sup> Sir Reginald Coupland, *The Exploitation of East Africa 1856-1890: The Slave Trade and the Scramble* (Northwestern University Press, 1967), 147.

<sup>36</sup> Coupland said “It would be a narrow view, however, that regarded the abolition of the Arab Slave Trade as an achievement of individuals. ‘It is the will of the people of England that dictates the line of action.’ Livingstone evoked and Kirk responded to a revival of the British humanitarian tradition.” Sir Reginald Coupland, *The Exploitation of East Africa 1856-1890: The Slave Trade and the Scramble* (Northwestern University Press, 1967), 233.

providing the capital which financed the Industrial Revolution in England and of mature industrial capitalism in destroying the slave system...It is not a study of the institution of slavery but of the contribution of slavery to the development of British capitalism.”<sup>37</sup> The search for underlining economic causes for imperial expansion was a direct rejection of Coupland’s narrative format. Williams specifically criticized Coupland for idolizing the anti-slavery campaigners and making them heroes of the empire, when he said that the anti-slavery advocates’ “importance has been seriously misunderstood and grossly exaggerated by men who have sacrificed scholarship to sentimentality and, like the scholastics of old, placed faith before reason and evidence.”<sup>38</sup> In this direct attack on traditional imperial history. Williams also removed moral imperialism as a point from which historical analysis can be based on when he concluded, “Politics and morals in the abstract make no sense. We find the British statesmen and publicists defending slavery today, abusing slavery tomorrow, defending slavery the day after.”<sup>39</sup> In his model politics and moral sentiment were part of a superficial superstructure on top of an economic base.

By the 1960s, moral imperialism as a social/political factor had been virtually erased within nationalist historiography. A joint project of the “Governments of Tanganyika and Uganda and of the Colonial Social Science Research Council,” the three volume *History of East Africa* made little or no mention of the role of missionary or anti-slavery activity during the initial period of imperialism in East Africa. The first volume only mentioned missionaries as

---

<sup>37</sup> Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1944), vii-viii.

<sup>38</sup> Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1944), 178. In the conclusion of the book Williams condemns Coupland for “hav[ing] no excuse for continuing to wrap the real interests in confusion,” 211.

<sup>39</sup> Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1944), 211.

“Another indication of the growing connexions between Zanzibar and Europe” and dedicated a measly four pages to the topic for the years 1840 through 1884.<sup>40</sup> During the time period between 1884 and 1894, the riots in Mombasa in 1888 were directly tied to “the sultan’s concession to the British company and against the near-by mission stations” and the fugitive slave crisis in the CMS mission station of Freretown outside of Mombasa that same year was explained by “the arrival in Mombasa of George Mackenzie, the [Imperial British East Africa] company’s administrator” rather than over a decade of conflict between the missionaries and Mombasa residents over fugitive slaves and other issues.<sup>41</sup> Moral imperialism was not a causal factor for expansion at this time in imperial history. Volume II did not mention missionaries or abolitionists in East Africa between 1895 and 1912 despite the success of several moral imperial campaigns, such as ending the legal status of slavery and building the Uganda Railway through British East Africa, although missionaries were mentioned in regards to Uganda.<sup>42</sup> Their activities and voices were missing on the East African coast.

During the 1960s, Ronald Robinson and John Gallagher also began to counter the exclusion of moral ideology from British imperial history in *Africa and the Victorians: The Official Mind of Imperialism*. Specifically, these two historians downplayed the role of economics in imperial history in favor of calculated policymaking (what I call geopolitical strategy) based on crises in the periphery. This argument brought new notice to the peripheries of

---

<sup>40</sup> Sir John Gray, “Zanzibar and the Coastal Belt, 1840-84,” in Roland Oliver and Gervase Matthew (ed.), *History of East Africa, Volume I* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), 242.

<sup>41</sup> Marie de Kiewiet Hemphill, “The British Sphere, 1884-94,” in Roland Oliver and Gervase Matthew (ed.), *History of East Africa, Volume I* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), 394.

<sup>42</sup> See: D. A. Low, “British East Africa: The Establishment of British Rule, 1895-1912,” in Vincent Harlow and E. M. Chilver (ed.), *History of East Africa, Volume II* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), 1-56. D. A. Low, “Uganda: The Establishment of the Protectorate, 1894-1919,” in Vincent Harlow and E. M. Chilver (ed.), *History of East Africa, Volume II* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), 57-122.

European empires and incorporated informal empire into imperial histories. They did so by analyzing the partition of Africa from the view of British statesmen. For Robinson and Gallagher, “Policy-making was a flow of deliberation and argument, of calculation and mediation between differing impulses...Ministers in the private calculations used a complex political arithmetic to decide whether to advance or not.”<sup>43</sup> This calculus caused European nations to compete in order to expand their influence over their neighbors. Although, Robinson and Gallagher were writing against a solely economic interpretation of history, D. K. Fieldhouse later countered their thesis by arguing that economic considerations and crises were part of British official’s geopolitical calculations.<sup>44</sup>

Like their predecessors, Robinson and Gallagher’s focus on political officials caused them to disregard the actions of the moral imperialists and the public pressure they created. They did, however, recognize that an individual politician’s motivation was not coldly calculated but also included his personal morals and ideologies. “Statesmen did more than respond to pressures and calculate interests; their decisions were not mere mechanical choices of expedients. Judgements and actions in fact were heavily prejudiced by their beliefs about morals and politics, about the duties of government, the ordering of society and international relations.”<sup>45</sup> Moral imperialism became a minor causal factor in their argument. In one example, they credited Prime Minister Roseberry with mobilizing anti-slavery organizations to lobby for the creation of a protectorate in Uganda during the Uganda crisis in the early 1890s. Specifically they wrote,

---

<sup>43</sup> Ronald Robinson and John Gallagher, *African and the Victorians: The Official Mind of Imperialism* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1967: 1961), 19.

<sup>44</sup> D.K. Fieldhouse, *Economics and Empire, 1830-1914* (London, Macmillan, 1973, 1984), 63-68.

<sup>45</sup> Ronald Robinson and John Gallagher, *African and the Victorians: The Official Mind of Imperialism* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1967: 1961), 20.

“This was by no means a spontaneous outburst of imperialist enthusiasm. The campaign was sedulously manufactured with the scarcely veiled encouragement of Rosebery...A humanitarian appeal produced a humanitarian response, but it did not gain much purely political support”<sup>46</sup>

Although anti-slavery organizations were recognized as part of the imperial process by these scholars, the manufacturing of these campaigns by high level government statesmen in reaction to crises in the periphery which were solved by carefully crafted geopolitical strategy.

Geopolitics trumped all other factors in imperial decisions.

As Robinson and Gallagher were writing their classic history of the African Partition, decolonization had changed the political and historiographic landscape in Africa. Given the moniker of nationalist historians, scholars in Dar es Salaam in Tanzania challenged traditional imperial history with its focus on Europeans as the primary historical actors. Instead the Dar es Salaam scholars focused on the role of Africans and larger macro factors in African history, such as economics, labor, religion, nationalism and others. This placed Africa and Africans at the center of historical narratives. Terence Ranger, a historian at Dar es Salaam, identified an underlying theme of the group as the exploration of African agency in African history, largely absent in the prior historiography. He noted:

The first [emphasis] is that to stress African 'agency' is by no means to stress African heroism or efficiency; the second is that a common concern with what Africans did and how this affected their history can lead to a most un-common and varied set of conclusions. The inquiry into African 'agency' is not the resting point which defines a 'school', but the beginning point out of which all sorts of major differences of opinion will arise.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> Ronald Robinson and John Gallagher, *African and the Victorians: The Official Mind of Imperialism* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1967: 1961), 317.

<sup>47</sup> Terence Ranger, "The 'New Historiography' in Dar es Salaam: An Answer," *African Affairs* Vol. 70, No. 278 (January 1971), 59.



The inclusion of African agency directly challenged the role of Europeans in African history.

The historians in Dar es Salaam fundamentally changed the understanding of Africa in the world and national historiography by shifting attention to Africans and their political, social and economic systems.

Underdevelopment theorists created new analyses and research into Africa's economy, while demonizing European involvement in Africa as disruptive to indigenous economic and social systems. Starting with Walter Rodney's *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*, Williams' argument against humanitarianism reappeared. Like Williams, Walter Rodney calls the "moral justification for imperialism and colonialism," namely the British men whose "desire to colonize was largely based on their good intentions in wanting to put a stop to the slave trade," "superfluous and at worst calculated hypocrisy."<sup>48</sup> Specifically Rodney argued:

The British were the chief spokesmen for the view that the desire to colonize was largely based on their good intentions in wanting to put a stop to the slave trade... Many changes inside Britain had transformed the seventeenth-century necessity for slaves into the nineteenth-century necessity to clear the remnants of slaving from Africa so as to organize the local exploitation of land and labor. Therefore, slaving was rejected in so far as it had become a fetter on further capitalist development; and it was particularly true of East Africa, where Arab slaving persisted until late in the nineteenth century.<sup>49</sup>

Underdevelopment replaced the European "hero" and "civilizer" with the European as "oppressor," "interloper," and "destroyer" of African economic and social systems. Rodney's critique was a part of an alternative model to Euro-centric and African-centric histories and studies that concluded that worldwide economic development placed Africa at the periphery, a

---

<sup>48</sup> Walter Rodney, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa* (Washington D.C.: Howard University Press, 1982:1971), 137, 138.

<sup>49</sup> Walter Rodney, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa* (Washington D.C.: Howard University Press, 1982:1971), 137.

resource for the core that led to the destruction of African resources and stymied political/social development.

Working within the framework of economic longitudinal studies and underdevelopment theories, Edward Alpers and Abdul Sheriff built off Rodney and world systems theorist, Immanuel Wallerstein, to change the understanding of Zanzibar and East Africa's place in the world.<sup>50</sup> In his analysis of East Africa, mostly south of Zanzibar, Alpers found that international trade, specifically in ivory and slaves "was a decisive factor leading to their [East Africans] present underdevelopment. Far from producing healthy economic, social, and political development, this historical process contributed instead only to an increasingly divisive differentiation within and between the peoples of East Central Africa."<sup>51</sup> Although this was not a positive view of the East African economy, it was still a step forward in the historiography because it recognized the existence of indigenous economic processes. A decade later, Alpers' peer in Dar es Salaam, Abdul Sheriff, published *Slaves, Spices and Ivory in Zanzibar*.<sup>52</sup> This detailed study of Zanzibar and its integration into the world economy, primarily through Indian merchants with ties to the subcontinent and caravans from the Central and East Central African

---

<sup>50</sup> Immanuel Wallerstein used world-systems theory to propose this alternative model. theory. He said "The historiography of modern Africa has been a battleground of so-called Eurocentric versus so-called Afrocentric interpretations, and we have passed from early crude versions of each to a state of sophisticated and subtle arguments about analytical primacy. This intellectual battle of course reflects a wider social battle. But in the end both versions seem to me to be wrong. At a certain point in time, both Europe and Africa (or at least large zones of each) came to be incorporated into a single social system, a capitalist world-economy, whose fundamental dynamic largely controlled the actors located in both sectors of one united arena." Immanuel Wallerstein, "The Three Stages of African Involvement in the World-Economy," in Peter C.W. Gutkind and Immanuel Wallerstein (ed.), *The Political Economy of Contemporary Africa* (London: Sage Publications, 1976), 30. See also, Immanuel Wallerstein, "The Colonial Era in Africa: Changes in the Social Structure (1970)," in Immanuel Wallerstein, *Africa and the Modern World* (Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, Inc., 1986), 13-36.

<sup>51</sup> Edward A. Alpers, *Ivory and Slaves: Changing Pattern of International Trade in East Central Africa to the Later Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975), xviii.

<sup>52</sup> Alpers recognizes Sheriff's influence in his work in: Edward A. Alpers, *Ivory and Slaves: Changing Pattern of International Trade in East Central Africa to the Later Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975), xvii-xviii.

interior to the coast, focused on Zanzibar as a compradorial or commercial empire that acted as an “intermediary between the African interior and the capitalist industrializing West.”<sup>53</sup> Sheriff created a historical framework that deemphasized the role of colonization and Europeans in the development of East Africa in favor of economic forces and relationships between Zanzibar, the Arabia, the Indian subcontinent, and the rest of the world.

Social histories, otherwise known as history from the bottom up, were written concurrently with this new economic perspective in Dar es Salaam and became dominant in historiography throughout the 1970s and 1980s.<sup>54</sup> Important for this dissertation were the studies on African religious history/missionary history and labor history, both of which sought to reinsert African agency within their topics.<sup>55</sup> For missionary organizations this meant including them within the imperial project and localizing their impact. Missionary history began with Roland Oliver’s *The Missionary Factor in East Africa* in 1951. Researched and published during the last years of colonization, this book was a narrative history of missionary organizations similar to Coupland’s style but focused on missionaries, not state leaders and campaign

---

<sup>53</sup> Abdul Sheriff, *Slaves, Spices & Ivory in Zanzibar: Integration of an East African Commercial Empire into the World Economy, 1770-1873* (James Currey, London, 1987), 1.

<sup>54</sup> Social histories focused on previously marginalized social and economic groups. By placing them at the center of narratives, they brought new perspectives into historiography. The classic example is E.P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (New York : Pantheon Books, 1964: 1963).

<sup>55</sup> For an overview of how this historical trend affected African and Asian history see: Michael Adas, “Social History and the Revolution in African and Asian Historiography,” *Journal of Social History* Vol. 19 No. 2 (Winter 1985), 335-348.

Besides missionary and labor history other social histories written in the 1970s that are helpful for this study include: Robert Gregory, *India and East Africa: A History of Race Relations Within the British Empire, 1830-1939* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971). Moses D.E. Nwulla, *Britain and Slavery in East Africa* (Washington D.C.: Three Continents Press, 1975). Donald Simpson, *Dark Companions: The African Contribution to the European Exploration of East Africa* (New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 1975). Norman R. Bennett, *A History of the Arab State of Zanzibar* (London: Methuen & Co., 1978). Kauleshwar Rai, *Indians and British Colonialism in East Africa, 1884-1939* (Patna, India: Associated Book Agency, 1979).

spokesmen.<sup>56</sup> This old style history laid the groundwork for more critical histories of missionizing. Historians at Dar es Salaam reevaluated missionaries as agents of European imperialism in Africa who faced a diverse and complex African socio-political-religious system.<sup>57</sup> Robert Strayer, for example, studied the relationships between missionaries and the Africans involved in their missions in East Africa. Contrasting himself from his predecessors who studied conflict between African religions and Christianity, Strayer focused on the relationships between European missionaries and their African parishioners and converts, looking at how Africans formed their own groups to pressure church leaders to gain a voice in the missionary communities.<sup>58</sup>

Historians from the Dar es Salaam school and their successors also focused on African labor, reanalyzing East African practices from the bottom up rather than the top down. Their work has been continuously revised in the historiography. In the 1970s, Robert Cummings study of the East and Central African trade routes found that the Akamba had a rich trading culture prior to contact with Zanzibar, an argument that Steven Rockel has recently expanded to the Nyamwezi caravan routes.<sup>59</sup> Analyzing the caravans of European explorers in Africa, Donald Simpson directly challenged the idea of the heroic explorer in his book *Dark Companions*, which argued that Europeans were dependent on Africans for guidance, translation, hunting, and other

---

<sup>56</sup> Roland Oliver, *The Missionary Factor in East Africa* (London: Longman Group Limited, 1970: 1951).

<sup>57</sup> For one example of this transition see: T. O. Ranger and John Weller (ed.), *Themes in the Christian History of Central Africa* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975).

<sup>58</sup> Robert Strayer, *The Making of Mission Communities in East Africa: Anglicans and Africans in Colonial Kenya, 1875-1935* (London: Heinemann, 1978).

<sup>59</sup> Robert J. Cummings, *Aspects of Human Portage with Special Reference to the Akamba of Kenya: Towards an Economic History, 1820-1920*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California Los Angeles, 1975. Robert J. Cummings, "A Note on the History of Caravan Porters in East Africa," *Kenya Historical Review*, Vol, 1, No 2 (1973), 119. Stephen Rockel, *Carriers of Culture: Labor on the Road in Nineteenth-Century East Africa* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2006).

tasks in their explorations and expeditions. Johannes Fabian reworked this theme, challenging the very basis of European explorers and travelers perceived superiority based on western rationality in *Out of Our Minds*.<sup>60</sup> While these histories challenged narratives of western superiority and rationality on the caravan trail, Frederick Cooper focused on rewriting the history of agricultural labor on the coast. His trilogy of books examined and incorporated the role of slaves and ex-slaves in the economic and social life of the East African coast from the nineteenth to the twentieth century.<sup>61</sup> This reinterpretation of African life, repositioned Africans as historical actors during the precolonial and colonial era ending anti-slavery advocates narratives of the hapless and abused slave.

New imperial history has sought to synthesize imperial history from the metropole with the historical and theoretical developments of post-colonial historians, like those of Dar es Salaam.<sup>62</sup> Starting in the 1980s with books like John M. Mackenzie's edited anthology *Imperialism and Popular Culture*, "new imperial" historians examined the effects of imperialism on the metropole and sought to end the fragmentation that was inherent in post-colonial and/or national methodologies, what David Fieldhouse called "'the area of interaction' between the

---

<sup>60</sup> Donald Simpson, *Dark Companions: The African contribution to the European Exploration of East Africa* (London: Paul Elek Limited, 1975). Johannes Fabian, *Out of Our Minds: Reason and Madness in the Exploration of Central Africa* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).

<sup>61</sup> Frederick Cooper, *Plantation Slavery on the East Coast of Africa* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977). Frederick Cooper, *From Slaves to Squatters: Plantation Labor and Agriculture in Zanzibar and Coastal Kenya, 1890-1925* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980). Frederick Cooper, *On the African Waterfront: Urban Disorder and the Transformation of Work in Colonial Mombasa* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987).

<sup>62</sup> Examples of the effect of cultural and postcolonial theory in new imperial history can be found in: Catharine Hall, *Civilizing Subjects: Colony and Metropole in the English Imagination, 1830-1867* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002). Kathleen Wilson (ed.), *A New Imperial History: Culture, Identity, and Modernity in Britain and the Empire, 1660-1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

component parts of imperial systems.”<sup>63</sup> This call to merge the histories of Europe and colonial histories, like the scholarship coming out from Dar es Salaam allowed for new insights into imperial history. The next decade, another anthology edited by African historian Frederick Cooper and anthropologist Ann Stoler, *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*, examined the impact of the cultural and social exchanges between the colonies and the cultural and social systems of European nations.<sup>64</sup> Critical to this dissertation, Cooper and Stoler stated that “The colonies...did more than reflect the bounded universality of metropolitan political culture: they constituted an imaginary and physical space in which the inclusions and exclusions built into the notions of citizenship, sovereignty, and participation were worked out.” The debates between moral imperialism and geopolitics were debates over what it meant to be British and the responsibilities of Britain to the world. For these scholars “Reformist politics in the colonies, as with British and French antislavery, were more than the hypocritical ruses of bourgeois rhetoric.”<sup>65</sup> Middle class imperial reformers mobilized public pressure on politicians and government officials, which helped create crises that formed arguments to expand the British Empire.

---

<sup>63</sup> Quote from: David Fieldhouse, “Can Humpty-Dumpty be put together again? Imperial History in the 1980s,” *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* Vol. 12, Iss. 2 (1984), 10. John M. MacKenzie (ed.), *Imperialism and Popular Culture* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986).

<sup>64</sup> Some historiographies and reviews of the new imperial history includes: Frederic Cooper and Ann Laura Stoler (ed.), *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997). John Darwin, “Imperialism and the Victorians: The Dynamics of Territorial Expansion,” *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 112, No. 447 (Jun., 1997), 614-642. A. G. Hopkins, “Back to the Future: From National History to Imperial History,” *Back to the Future: From National History to Imperial History*, *Past & Present*, No. 164 (Aug., 1999), 198-243. Douglas M. Peers, “Is Humpty Dumpty Back Together Again?: The Revival of Imperial History and the Oxford History of the British Empire,” *Journal of World History* Vol. 13, No. 2 (Fall 2002), 451-467. Alan Lester, “Imperial Circuits and Networks: Geographies of the British Empire,” *History Compass* Vol. 4, No. 1 (2006), 124-141. James Thompson, “Modern Britain and the New Imperial History,” *History Compass* Vol. 5, No. 2 (2007), 455-462.

<sup>65</sup> Ann Laura Stoler and Frederick Cooper, “Between Metropole and Colony: Rethinking a Research Agenda” in Frederic Cooper and Ann Laura Stoler (ed.), *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 3

New imperial history, especially as defined by Cooper and Stoler, creates an opening in historiography for my dissertation on the role of moral imperialists in the colonization of East Africa between 1873 and 1901. Taking these men and their organizations seriously as a historical factor along with political and economic considerations in the British imperial system fills a historiographic gap created by scholars such as Coupland, Williams, Robinson and Gallagher. While moral imperialists sometimes acted on the whims of political leaders as outlined by Coupland, Robinson, and Gallagher, they also lobbied political figures, funded missions, and founded and ran organizations, in order to shape British policies in a region thousands of miles away from them. By focusing on Britain's moral responsibilities in East Africa, humanitarians continuously created and maintained moral crises in Britain that required interventions in East Africa. These crises led to the eventual incorporation of Zanzibar, East Africa, and Uganda into the formal British Empire.

### **Conclusion**

The efforts of British humanitarians to enact their reforms in East Africa between 1873 and 1901 created the crises that caused Britain to expand its influence into East Africa. By enacting a series of campaigns that organized public awareness, missionaries, businessmen, political figures, abolitionists, and other who were the agents of moral imperialism formed a political movement that caused moral crises in Britain regarding the nation's responsibilities in East Africa. Unopposed until the 1890s when anti-imperialists disputed the need and cost of the Uganda Railroad moral imperialists were able to craft their messages and pressure officials Foreign Office. Because moral imperialism formed a political movement in a new environment of sensationalist press and mass politics, I have chosen to focus on the public communications

between moral imperialists, their members, the government (especially the Foreign Office), and the public. My sources reflect this perspective. Pamphlets, articles in specialist journals, letters to the editor in newspapers, public meetings, resolutions, memorandums, reports, and other communications were the public relations weapons that maintained the moral imperialists' viability in the new political landscape of late Victorian mass politics in Britain.

This dissertation is divided into four chapters. Chapter one will focus on the interactions between the Foreign Office and moral imperialists before, during, and after the 1873 anti-slave trade treaty with Zanzibar. This treaty, negotiated by Sir Bartle Frere, was one of many signed throughout the Indian Ocean, including in Muscat, the Red Sea and Arabian Peninsula, and signaled the beginning of a permanent British military presence in the region by strengthening previous treaties, closing the Zanzibar slave markets, and outlawing all sea-borne slave trading in the Indian Ocean. After the treaty, his analysis and recommendations the CMS formed Freretown to house liberated slaves freed on the Indian Ocean and initially populated it with former African slaves that had been educated in Nasik, India. Threatened multiple times between its founding in 1875 and Bushiri's Uprising in 1888, Freretown stood as a permanent reminder to Mombasa residents of British anti-slavery tendencies and goals, serving as a base for stations in the interior as well as a magnet for fugitive slaves.

Chapter two analyzes the role of moral imperialists during the Partition of Africa, the period between the Berlin Conference in 1884 and the Brussels Conference in 1890-91. During the Partition, Germany created German East Africa (what became Tanganyika) out of the southern territories claimed by Zanzibar. In response, Britain chartered a company led partially by moral imperialists, Sir Walter Mackinnon's, Imperial British East Africa Company, to administer the rest of the Sultan's territory. The Company was carefully inserted into the region



as the inhabitants of German's new territories violently rebelled and slaveowners in Mombasa threatened Freretown over the sheltering of fugitive slaves. The period ended with a German called for international blockade, which was opposed by missionaries but not by abolitionists fracturing the moral imperial voice. The Anti-Slavery Society focused its efforts on advocating for an international conference regarding the African slave trade, which occurred in Brussels in 1890-91.

The results of the Brussels Conference are the focuses of chapter three and chapter four. Chapter three follows the Anti-Slavery Society's campaign against East African slavery during the 1890s. This campaign centered on multiple issues that showed British officials as "morally" complacent with regards to the slave trade by using and regulating caravans, the primary transportation network of East Africa responsible for moving goods and people to and from the coast, the hinterland, and Central Africa. They were opposed by Foreign Office officials who believed that immediate abolition was against British interests because it was dangerous to the stability of the Sultan of Zanzibar and preferred more gradual steps. At the same time, civil wars in Uganda created consistent pressure on the Imperial British East Africa Company to expand into the region between the coast and Lake Victoria spreading British control into the hinterland and putting the company in an untenable financial situation. The Foreign Office's argument against immediate abolition fell apart when British ships bombarded and destroyed the Zanzibar Sultan's palace in 1896 after an unfriendly Sultan took office. They could no longer use the illusion of respecting an independent Sultan of Zanzibar as a reason to not take action against the slave trade and abolished the legal status of slavery the next year.

The Brussels Conference also called for building a modern transportation infrastructure in Africa as a method of spreading "civilization" Chapter four focuses on the results of this

clause in East Africa, the Uganda Railroad. The debates during this period set moral imperial and “civilizing” rhetoric against ideological anti-imperialists in the Liberal Party who opposed chartered companies and doubted moral rhetoric. After planning the survey with the Conservative party government, the Imperial British East Africa Company found itself in a dire economic state and unfriendly political position when a Liberal Party and Irish Nationalist coalition won the 1892. Unable to collect custom fees after a free trade zone was declared around Zanzibar, the Company’s reserves quickly depleted and they began to make entreaties to a unresponsive Liberal government for a solution, eventually leading to the dissolution of the Imperial British East Africa Company. By 1895, a new House of Commons run by a Conservative/Liberal Unionist majority approved funding for the railroad and construction, mostly by Indian laborers, started in 1896. The railroad reached Lake Victoria in 1901, permanently transforming the geopolitical reality of East Africa by easing the previously difficult route up to the highlands and beginning the process of shifting the center of power from Mombasa to a new capital in Nairobi.

A white settler community arose quickly around the Nyrobi Station ending the humanitarian/governmentality paradigm that had held sway in East Africa the previous thirty years by adding the third of Lester’s discourses, settler capitalism. These settlers organized themselves under the Farmers’ and Planters’ Association, later known as the Colonialist Association, and advocated a protectionist scheme to insure that land around Nairobi and the profits that came with it stayed in white hands in British East Africa. To protect their position in East Africa, these white settlers actively took steps to maintain their control over the Ukamba Province and insure control, challenging government regulations, opposing a British scheme to settle Zionists in the Protectorate, lobbying to limit Indians right to own land, and advocating for

immigration from South Africa to increase white settler numbers. Their presence and activities ended the moral imperial/geopolitical model of East African development replacing London organizations and the Foreign Office with locally organized social and political groups who lobbied and worked for and against the Colonial Office.

## Chapter 1

### **Missionaries and Statesmen: Moral Imperialism, Indian Ocean Geopolitics, and the Repercussions of Sir Bartle Frere's Mission to East Africa, 1873-1883**

Mixing geopolitical strategy, Foreign Office pragmatism, and anti-slavery sentiment, the 1873 anti-slave trade treaty signed by Sultan Barghash of Zanzibar began an era in East African history where moral imperialism had an exaggerated influence in British policy in East Africa and Zanzibar. Sir Bartle Frere, the former governor of Bombay and negotiator of the treaty, personified a symbiotic relationship between moral imperialists and the Foreign Office. By bridging moral imperialism and geopolitical need, Frere was able to successfully navigate committee hearings examining the slave trade in East Africa, the public meetings sponsored by the Anti-Slavery Society to promote the need for the treaty, the negotiations, and the creation of a mission station for liberated slaves by the Church Missionary Society (CMS).<sup>66</sup> The treaty was about more than combating slavery. It was also the beginning of Zanzibar and East Africa's complete inclusion into Britain's informal empire because the Sultan became fully dependent on the British for his continued survival. After the treaty was signed additional moral imperial demands and missionaries harboring fugitive slaves sundered the ties Frere had formed between moral imperialists and the Foreign Office.

The CMS started educating their members about the East African slave trade in the 1860s. Beginning with an article in 1866, the CMS began to inform their supporters on the

---

<sup>66</sup> R.J. Gavin, "The Bartle Frere Mission to Zanzibar, 1873," *The Historical Journal* Vol. 5, No. 2 (1962), 122-148.

geography, demographics, and commerce of Zanzibar, paying particular attention to the slave trade. The CMS found the trade “strange...when we have the port of Bombay, from whence our cruisers could command the traffic of the Arabian Sea.”<sup>67</sup> British military hegemony in the Indian Ocean made the empire liable for the trade emanating from Zanzibar. The missionaries described the East African island as a “regular emporium” of the slave trade, where “vast numbers of negro slaves are every season purchased or kidnapped here by the Soori and other northern Arabs, and sent to Muscat or the Gulf in dhows.”<sup>68</sup> The CMS’s analysis was bolstered by other Anglican leaders in the Indian Ocean. The Lord Bishop of Mauritius believed that “a very active traffic in slaves [is] going on, and that it is accompanied by fearful and widely spread acts of cruelty and oppression.”<sup>69</sup> These statements created a moral crisis for Britain occurring in a region where British hegemony reigned. The Lord Bishop offered a two pronged approach to combat the slave trade – action at the grassroots level and at a governmental level in London and Westminster Hall:

The remedy, my Lord, for such a state of things appears to me to be twofold. First, that the efforts of Christian charity should be directed to the employment of means on the Eastern Coast, similar to those which have been adopted with so much success at Sierra Leone on the Western Coast, for repairing as far as possible the wrong done to the thousands who are now hopelessly separated from their native land. Secondly, I would respectfully urge the adoption of the measures for bringing to the notice of Her Majesty’s Government the state of Eastern Africa, as regards the slave trade.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> “Zanzibar and Oman,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer: A Monthly Journal of Missionary Information* Vol. 2 (August 1866), 240.

<sup>68</sup> “Zanzibar and Oman,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer: A Monthly Journal of Missionary Information* Vol. 2 (August 1866), 240.

<sup>69</sup> “East African Slave Trade. Letter from the Lord Bishop of Mauritius to the Right Hon. The President of the Church Missionary Society,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer: A Monthly Journal of Missionary Information* Vol. 3 (August 1867), 237.

<sup>70</sup> “East African Slave Trade. Letter from the Lord Bishop of Mauritius to the Right Hon. The President of the Church Missionary Society,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer: A Monthly Journal of Missionary Information* Vol. 3 (August 1867), 240.

The Lord Bishop was calling on the CMS to engage in two kinds of action, to increase missionary and philanthropic work in East Africa and to actively lobby government officials to bring awareness to the issue.

The CMS followed the Lord Bishop's advice and sent a memorial to the Duke of Argyll, the Secretary of State for India, who oversaw British Consul General in Zanzibar in 1869 that used moral reasoning, imperial logic, and the complicity of British subjects in the slave trade to spur action on the issue. They constructed the argument that the previous treaties signed by the Sultan of Zanzibar have "aggravated the miseries of the slave, and increased the very great cruelties under which the trade is carried on, and those cruelties, and the loss of lives involved in the collection of slaves and their transit to the coast are shown from competent authority to be both horrible and enormous."<sup>71</sup> Targeting the previous treaties that the Sultan had signed with Britain emphasized that Britain had a responsibility to combat slavery in the region. There was also an imperial tone to the memorial. The CMS forcibly stated that the slave trade was harmful to British commerce, depopulating agricultural populations within East Africa that could be "a ready market" for "our English manufactures" "were it not for the insecurity and panic caused by the slave-trade." They were arguing that combating slavery was not only Britain's responsibility but it was also to Britain's benefit since the practice was impeding the expansion of Britain's commercial markets. To end the slave trade, the CMS called for "the prohibition to the transport of slaves coastwise, and the confining their importation to the actual requirements of the Island

---

<sup>71</sup> Quote from: "East African Slave-Trade," *Church Missionary Intelligencer: A Monthly Journal of Missionary Information* Vol. 5 (April 1869), 121-122.

The memorial also included excerpts from David Livingstone's book, *The Zambesi and its Tributaries*, as well as pamphlets, testimony from British officials, and correspondences that had been published in British Parliamentary White Papers. It ended on a note of British complicity in the slave trade: "[M]any of the slave-dealers in Zanzibar are British subjects from India, in whose pay are the Arab slavers, and up to a recent date, the Collector of Customs on slaves was, and may still be a British subject," 122. The theme of British Indian complicity will be repeated.

of Zanzibar.<sup>72</sup> By limiting the slave trade to only a single destination, Zanzibar, and limiting the number of slaves to the actual needs of the clove plantations on the island, the CMS was advocating for a drastic lessening of the trade while increasing British control over the region because it was regulating Zanzibar's internal policies.

By issuing this memorial, the CMS joined British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society's efforts against the East African slave trade. Fresh off victories against slavery and the slave trade in West Africa and the western hemisphere, the Anti-Slavery Society had issued memorials to the Foreign Office regarding the role of Zanzibar in the slave trade in 1866 and 1868.<sup>73</sup> Like the CMS, the Society claimed that "entire and vast districts are represented as having been wholly depopulated within a period of three or four years, the majority of the surviving victims having been imported into the dominions of the Sultan of Zanzibar, notwithstanding the treaty concluded between his late father the Imaum of Muscat and the British Government."<sup>74</sup> This claim was false. Abdul Sheriff has shown that there was no great increase in the East African slave trade that would cause this kind of depopulation.<sup>75</sup> But such an exaggeration served the purposes of the abolitionists because this kind of sensational rhetoric increased the need for intervention. The Anti-Slavery Society also argued that Britain was complicit in Zanzibar's slave trade because the current treaty was being used to justify the current slave trade system in East Africa. They "trust[ed] that Her Majesty's Government will see it right to take prompt steps to

---

<sup>72</sup> "East African Slave-Trade," *Church Missionary Intelligencer: A Monthly Journal of Missionary Information* Vol. 5 (April 1869), 122.

<sup>73</sup> This position is elaborated in: "The Slave-Trade on the East Coast of Africa," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (April 1868), 77-80.

<sup>74</sup> "The Slave-Trade on the East Coast of Africa. Address to Lord Stanley." *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (March 1868), 61.

<sup>75</sup> Abdul Sheriff, *Slaves, Spices & Ivory in Zanzibar: Integration of an East African Commercial Empire into the World Economy, 1770-1873* (London: James Currey, 1987), 224.

obtain such a modification of it as shall supply a remedy for so grave a deficit.”<sup>76</sup> As a signer of the treaty, Britain’s acquiescence to the current situation was morally repugnant to the moral imperialists.

After issuing the memorial to the Foreign Office, the Anti-Slavery Society began to directly pressure Sultan Majid of Zanzibar. With French and Spanish abolitionist societies, they issued a memorial to Zanzibar’s Sultan pointing to the failure of the treaties in combating the slave trade. They argued that the Sultan should take action because “the Koran condemns the institution of Slavery, by prohibiting the enslavement of Mussulmans by their co-religionists. If, therefore, it be wrong for one Mussulman to enslave another, it is equally wrong for a Mussulman to enslave any human being whomsoever and to sell him.”<sup>77</sup> This direct contact with Sultan Majid and the use of the Koran to make an argument was a sign that the Sultan was not fully integrated in and dependent on Britain’s informal empire. He was still independent. Future memorials to the Foreign Office and efforts at educating the public about East African slavery continued to be published in the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* through 1869 resulting in questions being put to the government in the House of Commons in 1870.<sup>78</sup> These efforts by the CMS, Anti-Slavery Society, and their allies forced the British government to start considering action on the issue of the Zanzibar and Indian Ocean slave trade.

---

<sup>76</sup> “The Slave-Trade on the East Coast of Africa. Address to Lord Stanley.” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (March 1868), 62.

<sup>77</sup> “The Sultan of Zanzibar,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (October to December 1868), 157-158.

<sup>78</sup> See: “East African Slave Trade. To the Earl of Clarendon,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (October 1869), 256-257. “Slave Trade on the East African Coast,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (December 1869), 282-285. “Zanzibar and the East Coast Slave Trade,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (March 1870), 13.



## **Policymaking, British Committees, and the East African and Indian Ocean Slave Trade, 1870-1871**

Two committees were formed within the British government to investigate an increasing slave trade in the Indian Ocean coming out of East Africa and Zanzibar and make recommendations for future British policy. The first committee, which gave its report in 1870, was formed within the Foreign Office, while the second committee was formed within Parliament in 1871. Couched in moral imperial terms, these committee reports marked a period of partnership between moral imperialism and geopolitical policymaking. However, as we will see the Foreign Office report was more conservative in its recommendations, dedicating itself to a philosophy of gradual abolition while the recommendations from Parliament were more radical. Both committees paid particular attention to Turkey, an emerging power in the Indian Ocean after the opening of the Suez Canal. Moral imperialists, namely missionaries from the CMS and Universities Mission to Central Africa (UMCA), actively participated in the committee process and were interviewed along with government and military officials. The CMS was particularly influential, consistently offering to care for slaves captured at sea by British cruisers. This was particularly important because it allowed the British government to minimize its economic investment and maintain a form of informal imperialism in Zanzibar. Meanwhile the Anti-Slavery Society held a series of public meetings, in which Frere and missionaries spoke, to support the parliamentary committees' recommendations.

Prior to the formation of these committees, the Foreign Office and Sultan of Zanzibar took piecemeal action to answer the memorials from the CMS and Anti-Slavery Society and other criticism in the 1860s. Sultan Majid and Consul General Henry Churchill reacted to the growing uproar over East African slave trading by limiting the slave trade and banning “northern

Arabs” from participating in the Zanzibar slave trade in 1868. Northern Arabs was a euphemism for Persians and Turks. The next year the Foreign Office attempted to address the complicity of British subjects in the slave trade. Consul-General Churchill banned all Indians in Zanzibar from participating in the slave trade and required that they register their slaves.<sup>79</sup> These limited actions fell far short of the comprehensive solution to the East African slave trade that the CMS and Anti-Slavery Society were calling for. Churchill was legally limited by the existing treaties between Zanzibar and Britain. He was only able to exert his influence over Indian merchants who were British subjects. A new treaty had to be signed for Britain to take more definitive and forceful action against the East Africa slave trade.

The 1870 Foreign Office Committee on the East African Slave Trade confirmed missionary reports and called for gradual steps to end the trade. Working on the assumption that “The African Slave Trade is...now almost exclusively confined to the East Coast of Africa, and chiefly to the territories of the Sultan of Zanzibar”<sup>80</sup> the committee tasked itself with stopping the trade. They concluded that based on “the misery and loss of life which result from the legal traffic alone, and the facilities which it affords for carrying on the illegal traffic, we think that the time has arrived when the Sultan should be pressed gradually to diminish the legal export of slaves from the mainland with a view to its ultimate total abolition.”<sup>81</sup> This argument paralleled the rhetoric and goals of the CMS’s and Anti-Slavery Society’s memorials. The tactics that the Foreign Office committee suggested included controlling and lessening the trade by exporting

---

<sup>79</sup> Norman R. Bennett, *A History of the Arab State of Zanzibar* (London: Methuen & Co., 1978), 73-76.

<sup>80</sup> *Report Addressed to the Earl of Clarendon by the Committee on the East African Slave Trade, Dated January 24, 1870* (C. 209, 1870), 1.

<sup>81</sup> *Report Addressed to the Earl of Clarendon by the Committee on the East African Slave Trade, Dated January 24, 1870* (C. 209, 1870), 3.

slaves from a single port on the mainland, limiting importation to three places on the island of Zanzibar, prohibiting trade entirely when “Northern Arab dhows are in Zanzibar waters,” “abolishing the open slave-markets” in Zanzibar town, limiting slave vessels to those registered with the Sultan, and severely punishing any breaking of the laws regarding the slave trade. This gradual process towards abolition closely resembled the actions taken by Sultan Majid and Consul-General Churchill but rejected calls to immediately abolish the trade. It was feared that such a radical act might reduce the Sultan’s revenue and power, making him unpopular with his subjects, threaten his rule (either by being overthrown or assassinated), and cause the British to lose an important ally in the Indian Ocean.

Enforcing the 1870 committee’s recommendations meant that the British navy would be responsible for patrolling the Indian Ocean and for any illegally transported slaves they found. The care of these liberated slaves was a crucial question for the committee for both practical and moral imperial reasons. They bluntly stated that “The slaves, when taken from the slave-dhows, are generally in a filthy state, and ripe for an outbreak of epidemic disease; it is therefore necessary that our cruizers should be relieved from their custody as quickly as possible.”<sup>82</sup> They needed depots in the Indian Ocean to take and care for the slaves caught by the navy. The CMS offered their services in this task. In the section “Disposal of Liberated Slaves” of the committee’s report, the CMS proposed the creation of mission schools for the freed slaves in the Seychelles islands, a pre-existing destination for freed slaves liberated in the Indian Ocean. The report stated that “the Society will find ample scope for their operations amongst the freed

---

<sup>82</sup> *Report Addressed to the Earl of Clarendon by the Committee on the East African Slave Trade, Dated January 24, 1870* (C. 209, 1870), 9.

slaves, numbering about 2,000, which are already in those islands.”<sup>83</sup> By offering to partner with the government as an entity experienced with caring and training liberated slaves the CMS removed a key obstacle in a potential new anti-slavery treaty. They also fulfilled their own mission by populating their missions with potential new converts.

The next year Parliament formed another committee to again look at the question of the East African slave trade. Consisting of fifteen men, the committee was formed to consider “the whole question of the Slave Trade on the East Coast of Africa, into the increased and increasing amount of that traffic, the particulars of existing Treaties and Agreements with the Sultan of Zanzibar upon the subject and the possibility of putting an end entirely to the traffic in slaves by sea.”<sup>84</sup> These goals were much more drastic than the gradual goals set by the Foreign Office committee. The committee interviewed missionaries from the CMS and the Universities’ Mission to Central Africa as well as government officials, including Hon. Crespigny Vivian, “senior clerk in charge of the slave trade department”<sup>85</sup> in the Foreign Office, Sir John William Kaye, “the Political and Secret Department of the Secretary of State for India,”<sup>86</sup> Mr. Henry Adrian Churchill, C.B. who served as the Political Agent and Consul in Zanzibar from 1867-1870, and Sir Bartle Frere. The inclusion of missionaries among these dignitaries showed the effectiveness of their previous memorandums and other tactics of the moral imperial lobby.

---

<sup>83</sup> *Report Addressed to the Earl of Clarendon by the Committee on the East African Slave Trade, Dated January 24, 1870* (C. 209, 1870), 10.

<sup>84</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Slave Trade (East Coast of Africa); Together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (420, 1871), ii.

<sup>85</sup> “Minutes of Evidence,” *Report from the Select Committee on Slave Trade (East Coast of Africa); Together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (420, 1871), 1.

<sup>86</sup> “Minutes of Evidence,” *Report from the Select Committee on Slave Trade (East Coast of Africa); Together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (420, 1871), 14.

Missionaries again emphasized an increasing slave trade in their testimony and offered to partner with the government to care for liberated slaves. Reverend Horace Waller, a former missionary to the East African coast between 1860 and 1864 and member of the Universities' Mission to Central Africa, supported claims by his hero Dr. David Livingstone about the horrors of the East African slave trade. Rev. Edward Steere, LL.D., of the Universities Mission of Central Africa spoke on the details of the slave trade within Zanzibar itself. These men's first hand accounts helped reinforce already existing beliefs about the horrors of the slave trade within the committee. Meanwhile Mr. Edward Hutchinson, the Secretary of the CMS, again promoted the society's efforts in founding and sustaining "depôt[s] for liberated slaves" where "instruction and civilization" occurred. Specifically Hutchinson spoke about the successes at the "depôts at Seychelles, Mauritius and in Nassick India and when asked if they were willing to take on more work he replied 'yes' and that the efforts at Nassick 'has been most satisfactory.'"<sup>87</sup> He was supported by a letter from the Bishop Vincent W. Ryan of Mauritius who said, "The beneficial results obtained by the labours of the Church Missionary Society on the western coasts [of Africa] supply the strongest encouragement for the application of the same benevolent principles and methods of action on the east."<sup>88</sup> The CMS was supporting its call to action by offering their services in East Africa and becoming a part of Britain's imperial project.

The committee concluded that the previously signed treaties with Zanzibar were completely inadequate and ineffective based on both moral imperial and geopolitical grounds in the Indian Ocean.

---

<sup>87</sup> "Minutes of Evidence," *Report from the Select Committee on Slave Trade (East Coast of Africa); Together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (420, 1871), 86-87.

<sup>88</sup> "Appendix, No. 6. Letter from the Vicar of *Bradford*, late Bishop of *Mauritius*, to the Chairman (handed in by the Chairman), dated 27 July 1871," *Report from the Select Committee on Slave Trade (East Coast of Africa); Together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (420, 1871), 111.

The result of the treaties, as far as the Sultan of Zanzibar is concerned is that not only are the slave traders enabled to rendezvous in great numbers at Zanzibar, but the dhows, often so laden that the deck is entirely covered with slaves, squatting side by side, and so closely packed that it is impossible for them to move, come up openly from Kilwa to Zanzibar, and then starting afresh, and provided with proper clearances for Lamoo, are enabled to make the first half of the journey north unmolested by British cruisers.<sup>89</sup>

The issue for the committee was that the current treaties allowed slave trading to occur unmolested and in the open in Zanzibar. They were outraged because they felt that a territory under British influence was openly supplying slaves throughout western Asia. However, “whether for the supply of the Sultan’s African dominions or the markets in Arabia and Persia, [the slave trade] is carried on by Arabs from Muscat and other ports on the Arabian coast [where the Ottomans were gaining sway]. They are not subjects of Zanzibar but chiefly belong to tribes of roving and predatory habits.”<sup>90</sup> These slaves were imported throughout the Arabian Coast including “Turkish ports in the Red Sea” and “even in the civilized port of Suez.”<sup>91</sup> This narrative of the East African slave trade supported the geopolitical concerns regarding the Ottoman Empire’s threat to Britain’s hegemony of the Indian Ocean. To protect British naval supremacy, it was clear to the committee that action against the slave trade throughout the Indian Ocean to rein in Turkish expansion.

The committee’s solution was to target Zanzibar as the source of the trade while strengthening slave trade treaties throughout Arabia. Zanzibar’s regional importance had grown along with its economy. The committee report stated that “The town of Zanzibar is rapidly

---

<sup>89</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Slave Trade (East Coast of Africa); Together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (420, 1871), 5.

<sup>90</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Slave Trade (East Coast of Africa); Together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (420, 1871), iv.

<sup>91</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Slave Trade (East Coast of Africa); Together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (420, 1871), 5.

growing in importance, as is evidenced by the progressive increase of imports at the custom house there from 245,981£ in 1861-62, to 433,693£ in 1867-68 of which trade about one-half is in the hands of British Indian subjects.”<sup>92</sup> The involvement of “British Indian subjects,” in this economy made them and Britain complicit in the slave trade. To end this situation, the committee recommended starting from scratch. They concluded that “it be notified to the Sultan of Zanzibar, that the existing treaty provisions having been systematically evaded, and having been found not only insufficient to protect the negro tribes in the interior of Africa from destruction, but rather to foster and encourage the foreign trade in slaves” and that a new stronger treaty needed to be signed.<sup>93</sup> This conclusion was significantly stronger than the one coming from the Foreign Office because it rewrote Britain’s legal relationship with Zanzibar and rejected a gradual solution.

The parliamentary committee’s recommendations for a treaty were more radical than the Foreign Office committee’s recommendations. They proposed that the importation of slaves from the mainland to Zanzibar be limited to a single port, Dar es Salaam. Slaves could only be exported from Zanzibar to Pemba and Mombasa. The numbers of slaves imported and exported was to be strictly limited. Any slave vessel transporting slaves for sale without a pass from the Sultan would be liable for capture and search. Zanzibar’s slave markets were to be closed. The Sultan would also be obligated to punish “any of his subjects who may be proved to be concerned, directly or indirectly, in the slave trade, and especially any attempt to molest or interfere with a liberated slave.” The treaty would increase British influence in Zanzibar and

---

<sup>92</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Slave Trade (East Coast of Africa); Together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (420, 1871), iii.

<sup>93</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Slave Trade (East Coast of Africa); Together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (420, 1871), 8.

force the Sultan to enforce the will of Britain. Another treaty clause stated that “the Kutchees, and other natives of Indian states under British protection, shall be forbidden, after a date to be fixed by the Government of India to possess slaves, and that in the meantime they shall be prevented from acquiring any fresh slaves.” This clause would end the complicity of British subjects in the trade and, at the same time, financially weaken the slave trade. Finally, that the treaty stipulated an end of the domestic slave trade and importation from the mainland to the Zanzibar in the future.<sup>94</sup> Costs for enforcing the new treaty, including administrative and naval costs, were to be shared by the Imperial and Indian governments.

Following the publication of the 1871 report, moral imperialists actively promoted the parliamentary committee’s findings to their members.<sup>95</sup> The Anti-Slavery Society believed that the report “had a conclusion which must prove useful, and may speedily lead to satisfactory results. This iniquity, the atrocities, the disgracefulness of this trade, were urged from both sides of the House, and endorsed by the Government.”<sup>96</sup> The stage was set for moral imperial and governmental collaboration in support of the treaty. Waller also published an article in the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* condemning the slave trade in the Indian Sea during the committee hearings. Incorporating the supremacy of the British navy on the Indian Sea, he said that “It is hard to bear

---

<sup>94</sup> *Report from the Select Committee on Slave Trade (East Coast of Africa); Together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (420, 1871), 6.

<sup>95</sup> The CMS publically stated that the organization was “thankful to report, that by the united efforts of friends the subject was brought before the House of Commons, last session” and published sections of the report for the readers of the *Church Missionary Intelligencer*. “East African Slave Trade,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer* (March 1872), 90-96. Quote from 91. “East African Slave Trade,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer* (April 1872), 123-128.

<sup>96</sup> Quote from “The East African Slave-Trade. Committee of Inquiry,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July 1871), 141. They also reprinted supportive articles from newspapers throughout Britain regarding the committee report as well as summarizing Waller’s testimony. See: “The East African Slave-Trade. Opinions of the Press,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July 1871), 143-144. “East Coast Slave-Trade,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (December 1871), 226-227.



that the fanatical ruffianism of the Arab slave-dealer should be allowed to blend with the cunning of the petty Eastern despot, to our sore discomfiture, in the seas where we have at all times a force more than five times sufficient to sweep the whole abomination away.”<sup>97</sup> The proposal of the use of military force showed that although the Anti-Slavery Society was a pacifist organization, they were not shy about using British military presence and power in the Indian Ocean to make their argument and increase the rhetorical pressure on British officials.

The Anti-Slavery Society was responsible for mobilizing public opinion in favor of the proposed treaty. They held public meetings where moral imperialists, missionaries, and elected politicians, including the Lord Mayor of London and eleven members of the House of Commons, promoted the committee’s findings. In 1872, the Anti-Slavery Society hosted a public meeting featuring Frere, Waller, and others at the Surrey Chapel meant to “consider what means could be taken to put a stop to this barbarous traffic in human beings on the east coast of Africa.”<sup>98</sup> This was a precursor to a large public meeting “in the Long Parlour of the Mansion House on Thursday, July 25 [1872], for the purpose of receiving information with regard to the slave-trade in East Africa, and also for the purpose of taking steps with a view to the suppression of the traffic.”<sup>99</sup> The combination of elected official, anti-slavery advocates, and missionaries represented an escalation by the Anti-Slavery Society in their campaign against the slave trade centered on Zanzibar.

---

<sup>97</sup> Horace Waller, “The East African Slave-Trade,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (April 1871), 118.

<sup>98</sup> “The East African Slave-Trade. Meeting at Surrey Chapel,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (March 1872), 9. Waller also addressed the 1872 meeting of the Birmingham Ladies Negro’s Friend Society. See: “The Birmingham Ladies Negro’s Friend Society,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July 1872), 39.

<sup>99</sup> “Public Meeting on the East African Slave-Trade” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (October 1872), 61.

Chaired by the Lord Mayor of London, attendees unanimously passed three resolutions at the meeting in the Mansion House. The first resolution, moved by Frere, “respectfully urge[d] upon Her Majesty’s Government to take steps for the prompt abrogation of these treaties [that had been deemed ineffective], and to carry out in other respects the recommendations embodied in the report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons to secure the entire abolition of the slave-trade in Eastern Africa.”<sup>100</sup> Frere’s primary role in this motion showed that government officials were encouraging moral imperial support and action in support of the treaty.<sup>101</sup> The second resolution called on all attendees to support limited government spending to abolish the trade and the final resolution urged cooperation with Hamburg, which had commercial interests in East Africa, to spread “legitimate” commerce. This merged both governmental and Anti-Slavery Society concerns, maintaining costs and spreading free trade. This meeting and others reinforced an imperial ideology where moral imperialism was one of the factors that caused to Britain spread its influence throughout the world while limiting expenses. To show their support for this policy, the Anti-Slavery Society sent deputations to the Foreign Office, an address to the Senate of Hamburg following the meeting, and a memorial to the Kaiser Wilhelm I of Germany.<sup>102</sup>

This combination of moral imperialist pressure and geopolitical need succeeded. The government fully supported the more radical recommendations coming from the Parliamentary committee. Two months after Queen Victoria stated in an address to Parliament on August 10,

---

<sup>100</sup> “Public Meeting on the East African Slave-Trade” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (October 1872), 62.

<sup>101</sup> Frere’s involvement in creating these meetings is found in: R. J. Gavin, “The Bartle Frere Mission to Zanzibar, 1873,” *The Historical Journal* Vol. 5, No. 2 (1962), 122-148.

<sup>102</sup> “Deputation to Earl Granville on the Slave-Trade in East Africa,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (October 1872), 66. “Address of the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society to the Senate of Hamburg,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (October 1872), 67. “To his Imperial Majesty, William, Emperor of Germany,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (January 1873), 102.

1872 that “My government has taken steps indeed to prepare the way for dealing more effectually with the slave-trade on the East Coast of Africa.”<sup>103</sup> There was consensus within the British government that the East African slave trade had to be better regulated. Dr. John Kirk, who had traveled with Livingstone and was now Consul-General for Zanzibar, received a letter from Earl Granville, the Secretary of the Foreign Office stating that a diplomatic mission whose goal was “the negotiation of fresh and more stringent Treaties with the Rulers of Zanzibar and Muscat for the suppression of the Slave Trade” was leaving from Britain. Leading this mission was the former Governor of Bombay Sir Bartle Frere.<sup>104</sup> Frere, who had also spoken at the Anti-Slavery Society public meetings, carried with him letters from Granville to the Sultan of Zanzibar and the Sultan of Muscat introducing him and explaining that his purpose was “to make known to you the views of Her Majesty and Her Government on the question of the East African Slave Trade, and to invite your Highness to join with them in framing measures which shall have for their object the complete suppression of this cruel and destructive traffic.”<sup>105</sup> Geopolitical policy, in this case, was being stated in moral imperial terms.

Both the Anti-Slavery Society and missionaries approved of Frere’s selection to lead the diplomatic mission.<sup>106</sup> The CMS stated that “Sir Bartle Frere’s career as an Indian statesman, and his high position are guarantees that not only will a difficult question be handled with all the tact and skill of a finished diplomatist, but his recommendations will be respected and followed by

---

<sup>103</sup> “The Queen’s Speech on the East African Slave-Trade” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (October 1872), 68.

<sup>104</sup> “No. 1. Earl Granville to Dr. Kirk,” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 1.

<sup>105</sup> “No 2. Earl Granville to the Sultan of Zanzibar,” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 1. It was noted in a footnote on the same page that “A Similar letter was addressed to the Sultan of Muscat.”

<sup>106</sup> “Sir Bartle Frere and the Zanzibar Slave-Trade,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (October 1872), 61.

the Government that has entrusted to him the Mission.”<sup>107</sup> To prepare for their future role in East Africa, the Society instructed one of their missionaries to leave the Seychelles and visit Nassick in order “to become acquainted with some of the Africans, formerly slaves, in the hope that the time and opportunity may soon arise for his return to the East Coast with a band of these trained Christians to recommence his labours for the welfare of that unhappy land.”<sup>108</sup> But they had to wait just a little longer for a new set of treaties between Britain and the powers along the East African Coast, Persian Gulf and Red Sea banning the sea borne slave trade in the Indian Ocean to be signed before they could create a depot for liberated slaves.

### **Moral Imperial Statesmanship: The Geopolitics of the Indian Ocean and the 1873 Anti-Slave Treaty**

Frere’s mission was twofold, to curtail demand for slaves at the destination of the trade and attack the practice at its source. As a government official he had been an essential part of the two committees’ investigations and as a moral imperialist he acted as a participant in the Anti-Slavery Society’s public meetings to support the committee’s findings. Frere’s two roles, Foreign Office official and moral imperialist, worked in symbiosis during his mission. On his way to Zanzibar, Frere made several stops in the Levant and Arabia, including Egypt, where he examined slavery and the slave trade in the context of Britain’s geopolitical reaction to a new power in the Indian Ocean, the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman Empire was able to increase its

---

<sup>107</sup> “East African Slave Trade,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (December 1872), 353.

<sup>108</sup> Quote from “East African Slave Trade,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer* (March 1872), 90.

The CMS was particularly excited that their proposal for the government to enter into an arrangement with them to care for and educate the liberated slaves after the new treaty was signed was recommended by the Committee. *Report from the Select Committee on Slave Trade (East Coast of Africa); Together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index* (420, 1871), 9.

influence in the Red Sea and Indian Ocean after the opening of the Suez Canal. Frere's descriptions of and actions in Egypt and Zanzibar were filled with strong orientalist tones, stories of the horrors of the slave trade, and a consistent focus on British responsibility to end the trade and sign a new stronger anti-slavery treaty with Sultan Barghash of Zanzibar.

Frere's instructions from the Foreign Office were formed within the context of maintaining Britain's geopolitical dominance in the Indian Ocean. Earl Granville, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and leader of the Liberal Party, charged Frere with negotiating new treaties throughout the Indian Ocean. In these orders Granville noted that Great Britain already had "Treaty engagements with nearly every Arab Chief of importance in the Persian Gulf and on the coasts of Arabia, binding them to use their best endeavours to prevent the traffic in slaves by the people owning their sway; but it is feared that these Treaties have been allowed to become dead letters."<sup>109</sup> With the loss of these treaties went control of the Indian Ocean, an unallowable option for the British empire. Frere left for Zanzibar on November 21, 1873 accompanied by a staff of five men: Rev. G.P. Badger, his "Secretary and Confidential Advisor," Major C. B. Euan Smith as "Military Attaché to the Mission," Captain Fairfax, R.N. as "Naval Attaché to the Mission," and a secretary and attaché for the mission.<sup>110</sup>

While traveling to Zanzibar, Frere made stops in Birindi, Alexandria, Cairo, and Aden. Frere's stop in Cairo is particularly insightful because it shows how he combined his roles as a moral imperialist and British foreign diplomat and how he constructed geopolitical strategy through the image of the "Orient" and the slave trade. Egypt played a key role in Britain's

---

<sup>109</sup> "No 4. Earl Granville to Sir Bartle Frere," *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 3.

<sup>110</sup> "No 5. Earl Granville to Sir B. Frere," *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 8.

strategy to control the slave trade of the Indian Ocean. Frere described Egypt, along with the Red Sea, as a destination for slaves “exported from Eastern Africa.” He stated, “Probably the majority [of slaves] are intended ultimately for Jiddah and other ports of the Arabian coast; for Mecca and the ports of the Hedjaz appear to be the entrepôts whence slaves are carried by pilgrims returning to all quarters of the Muslim world. But it is alleged that there is a brisk slave traffic through Massowah, Suakin, and other ports on the Egyptian coast.”<sup>111</sup> Striking at the Zanzibar slave trade allowed Britain to claim more control over a key stop on the route to India and the Indian Ocean by attacking a practice that they deemed heinous and was occurring under their watch. Egypt, as the gateway between Asia and Africa as well as between Europe and the Indian Ocean, and Zanzibar, as the largest commercial zone with ties to India, the Arabian Peninsula, and Africa were too important for Britain to ignore.<sup>112</sup>

The question of Turkey also played a large role in Frere’s strategy to end the slave trade from East Africa and Zanzibar. Slavery was still legal in Turkey and the country’s growing power in the Persian Gulf and Red Sea made it a potential problem for abolishing the slave trade in the Indian Ocean.<sup>113</sup> Frere noted while in Aden that “The increased use of the Turkish flag to cover the Slave Trade is looked on as a matter of notoriety; and in this light it was spoken of by natives of the country of the highest respectability resident in Aden, and possessed of ample

---

<sup>111</sup> “No 12. Sir B. Frere to Earl Granville.—(Received January 6, 1873),” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 10.

<sup>112</sup> According to Antonia Lant, Egypt was a gateway region and “could not be held in place simply as an Other, for it served as the entry point to the East, the “Gateway to India” for Europe, and particularly for Britain; it signified a foothold, a staging point.” Antonia Lant, “The Curse of the Pharaoh, or How Cinema Contracted Egyptomania,” *October*, Vol. 59 (Winter 1992), 98.

<sup>113</sup> R.J. Gavin, “The Bartle Frere Mission to Zanzibar, 1873,” *The Historical Review* Vol. 5, No. 2 (1962), 127-129.

means of information.”<sup>114</sup> The Ottoman Empire’s strength in the Indian Ocean was growing and so it was becoming a threat to British hegemony on the Indian Ocean. Frere believed the only way to deal with this new threat was diplomatically:

without in any way dictating to the Porte, or attempting by moral lecturing go to regenerate its social morality, some impression might surely be made on the most callous and cynical Turkish upholder of things as they are, by pointing out how, in this matter, the present inaction of Turkey, and the want of good faith in redeeming promises so often repeated, must alienate from her the sympathy of the most conservative, as well as the most aggressive of surrounding nations.<sup>115</sup>

Frere’s avoidance of moral imperial rhetoric was a calculated response to the Islamic power’s size, influence and military strength. The Ottoman Empire was too large and powerful for Britain to impose its ideological will.

To combat the slave trade between East Africa, Egypt, and Turkey, Frere suggested increasing British presence in the region. He stated

In the absence of any English Consular Authorities at the Red Sea Ports, and of any means or authority for making inquiry on board the steamers or vessels under the Turkish flag, it is not easy to ascertain the truth regarding the trade by sea; and this seems to me one of the directions in which the means of ascertaining the truth and aiding the Viceroy in his endeavours to suppress the trade are within easy reach of Her Majesty’s Government by negotiations with Turkey for extended facilities of inquiry, and by an increase of Consular Agency at the ports of the Red Sea.<sup>116</sup>

This increase in consuls in the Red Sea would serve as a diplomatic and military counterpoint, because consuls had to be protected, to the Ottoman’s growing influence. Ottoman support of the slave trade was a direct threat to Britain. Frere feared that if steps were not taken “the Northern

---

<sup>114</sup> “No 17. Sir B. Frere to Earl Granville. – (Received February 17.),” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 23.

<sup>115</sup> “No 17. Sir B. Frere to Earl Granville. – (Received February 17.),” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 21.

<sup>116</sup> “No 12. Sir B. Frere to Earl Granville.–(Received January 6, 1873),” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 10.

Arabs [will] become acquainted with the immunities afforded by the Turkish flag, [and] it will be hoisted by every piratical dhow in the Persian Gulf, and along the Arabian and African coasts as a cover to slaving.”<sup>117</sup> Britain would be unable to control this trade and with it would lose their hegemony over the Indian Ocean putting their route to India at risk.

Frere arrived in a politically independent but vulnerable Zanzibar on January 12, 1873. An audience was scheduled with the Sultan for the afternoon after Frere arrived where he presented letters from Queen Victoria and the Governor of Bombay that outlined the conditions of the new treaty. Frere met Barghash surrounded by “forty-eight English and Americans, including Dr. Kirk and the members of the mission, and all were in full uniform.” The Sultan received the letters in a style that Frere characterized as “eastern.” “After the usual compliments and inquiries had passed on both sides, I presented the Royal letter. On receiving it His Highness rose, all present following his example, and according the eastern custom raised it to his head as a mark of veneration.”<sup>118</sup> This pageantry was covering up three recent setbacks to Zanzibar. Politically, there was a relatively new Sultan, Sultan Barghash who had been installed after the death of his brother Sultan Majid in 1870.<sup>119</sup> Militarily, Zanzibar’s fleet had been destroyed by a recent hurricane. This same hurricane disrupted the clove production of the island, economically crippling Sultan Barghash.

While waiting for the Sultan’s response to the new treaty, Frere took steps to end the complicity of British subjects, mainly Indian merchants, in the slave trade. A member of Frere’s

---

<sup>117</sup> “No 12. Sir B. Frere to Earl Granville.—(Received January 6, 1873),” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 11-12.

<sup>118</sup> “Sir B. Frere to Earl Granville.—(Received February 17.),” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 25.

<sup>119</sup> Seyyid Barghash succeeded Sayid Majid after the death of Majid in 1870. The *Anti-Slavery Reporter* reprinted an article from the *Pall Mall Gazette* that called Majid a “weakly prince, but ever true to the British power.” See: “Zanzibar. Death of the Sultan,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (December 1870), 101.



staff, Colonel Pelly, the Political Resident at Aden, was Viceroy of India's representative on Frere's mission and carried a Gugerathi Notification by Rao Pragmalji Bahadur, the Rao of Kutch. Kutch was a princely state in the western coast of the Indian subcontinent whose members had resisted British efforts to regulate their activities in the slave trade in the 1840s and 1850s, which was now under the protection of the British Empire.<sup>120</sup> The Rao wrote to his subjects at Zanzibar and Muscat because "a large majority of the Indian Banians on the African coast are birth subjects of His Highness the Rao of Kutch, and all are more or less connected with Kutch trading families."<sup>121</sup> The Rao noted that "it has been brought to our notice that you are engaged in buying and selling male and female slaves in Zanzibar. This is a horrible thing." The slave trade offered the perfect vehicle bring the Indians under British law and control. The Rao finished his proclamation with an ultimatum. "If you continue to carry it [the slave trade] on or be in any way concerned in it, the British Government will deal with you as with its own subjects and punish you severely, and furthermore, your property in Kutch will be confiscated by this Government. Know this to be certain."<sup>122</sup> This amounted to being legally and economically expelled from Kutch and whatever family they were supporting in Kutch being left destitute. In a public meeting, the Rao's subjects in Zanzibar agreed to abide by the Rao's decree.<sup>123</sup> They had

---

<sup>120</sup> Indian resistance to British regulations during this period can be found in Abdul Sheriff, *Slaves, Spices & Ivory in Zanzibar: Integration of an East African Commercial Empire into the World Economy, 1770-1873* (London: James Currey, 1987), 203-204.

<sup>121</sup> "No 15. Sir B. Frere to Earl Granville.-(Received February 17)," *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 18.

<sup>122</sup> "Inclosure in No. 15. Translation of a Gugerathi Notification issued by the Rao of Kurch, G.C.S.I., addressed to his Subjects residing at Zanzibar," *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 18-19. It was noted in the proclamation that "A similar Proclamation has been issued to the Kutch Subjects residing in Muscat," *Ibid*, 19.

<sup>123</sup> "Inclosure in No. 19. Address presented by the Bhatias, Khojas, and others, natives of India, residing at Zanzibar, to Sir B. Frere, at a Meeting held on the 15<sup>th</sup> January, 1874," *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 26.

no choice because of the legal and economic threats from the Rao, who had the military support of the British, was overwhelming.

Frere also investigated the Zanzibar slave market where his own personal beliefs against the slave trade and of British superiority were strengthened. The slave market, recently moved to a new site after Consul-General Kirk shut down the old market because the land was purchased by a British Indian subject, was, for Frere, comparable to a negative image from England's past that had been abolished. He said "[T]he process of sale was not more debasing to the Negro than were the statute-hiring fairs of recent English times to the servant class of England."<sup>124</sup> This comparison placed Zanzibari development behind Britain on a civilizational scale. However, unlike the now banned indentured worker hiring fairs in Britain, the Zanzibar market was described as very decadent, fitting within an orientalist motif. "About 5 o'clock the frequenters of the market, - the lounge of the true Zanzibarite, strolled quietly in, Arab and half-castes, Persians of the Guard in their long capes, and all armed with matchblock, sword, or dagger."<sup>125</sup> The slaves being examined and sold were mixed as far as age, health, and temperament exposing for Frere "the acusalional tales often written of these markets."<sup>126</sup> These, and other descriptions confirmed the sensational rhetoric being used by moral imperialists in Britain to describe East African slavery. Frere, like the moral imperialists, concluded by condemning the slave trade as "the curse of Africa," a curse that Britain had a moral obligation to abolish.

---

<sup>124</sup> "Inclosure in No. 20. Memorandum." *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 27.

<sup>125</sup> "Inclosure in No. 20. Memorandum." *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 27.

<sup>126</sup> "Inclosure in No. 20. Memorandum." *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 27.

His efforts to end that curse with a new slave treaty hit a roadblock after Sultan Barghash met with his chiefs and advisors and started to negotiate the treaty. New to rule, dependent on his advisors, and in a weak political, economic, and military position, it was not politically viable for Sultan Barghash to enact radical change in his territories by signing Britain's anti-slave trade treaty. Instead he questioned Frere and Kirk on the need for a new treaty and accused Frere of trying to ruin him and his supporters. By the end of January and after multiple meetings and letters between Frere, his translator Mr. Badger, Consul-General Kirk, and the Sultan's Wazir, Sultan Barghash rejected the proposed treaty. His stated reasons were the "ruined state of the island, owing to the late hurricane, and the necessity under which he labored of conforming to the wishes and watching the interests of all his Arab subjects."<sup>127</sup> Frere departed Zanzibar, leaving Kirk to continue communicating with the Sultan. Despite signs that Sultan Barghash was willing to sign a treaty if its implementation was significantly slowed, he again rejected the treaty on February 11 arguing that "we cannot sign it on account of the hardship which it involves to us; on account of dread of insurrection; and on account of the ruin which it would cause to the plantations of our subjects." Instead, the Sultan wanted a "less onerous" agreement that decreased the number of slaves imported, decreased the number of boats carrying slaves for trade, and closed the public slave markets.<sup>128</sup> At this point, Barghash did not have the political ability or will to challenge the foundation of the very basis of the Zanzibar economy by opposing the slave trade. His independence and insecure position among his own people meant that he would not voluntarily sign the treaty.

---

<sup>127</sup> For correspondence regarding these meetings and letters see: *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 48-70. "No. 26. Sir B. Frere to Earl Granville—(Received March 9), *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 37.

<sup>128</sup> "Inclosure 25 in No. 36. The Sultan of Zanzibar to Sir B. Frere." *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 70.

Frere had left Zanzibar to take a tour of East African mainland where he confirmed the compradorial nature and shallow control of the Sultan of Zanzibar in his southern ports. Calling the Sultan's hold on the coast "superficial" Frere noted that

I knew his authority did not extend far inland, but I was not prepared to find it so entirely confined to a few ports on the coasts, and that even at some of the more important of these ports his garrisons are hemmed in by the petty chiefs of neighbouring tribes. At one place, Lindy, which is his principal garrison to the south, and which is supposed to command the mouths of the Rovuma and all up to the Portuguese frontier, we found the town in nightly expectation of a plundering attack from some negro tribes who have never acknowledged the Sultan's authority.<sup>129</sup>

This tour convinced Frere of Barghash's did not control his claimed territory. He concluded that the Sultan was in a position of great vulnerability, based on the fact that "The power of the Sultan, which, even before the recent hurricane, was always most limited, has, since that event deprived him of his navy, become little more than nominal."<sup>130</sup> This was a geopolitical opening for Britain, as Sultan Barghash was not stable enough to protect himself from outside threats and could be pressured to accept the new treaty.

Most disturbing for Frere as a moral imperialist was the extent that British Indian subjects outside of Zanzibar controlled economic transactions, including the slave trade, which further proved British complicity in the Indian Ocean slave trade. He said "I will only state that it is hardly an exaggeration to say that all trade passes through Indian hands; African, Arab, and European, all use an Indian agent or Banian to manage the details of buying and selling, and without the intervention of an Indian, either as capitalist or petty trader, very little business is

---

<sup>129</sup> No. 31. Sir B. Frere to Earl Granville.-(Received)," *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 39.

<sup>130</sup> No. 32. Sir B. Frere to Earl Granville.-(Received)," *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 40.

done.”<sup>131</sup> East Africa was held together by an Indian trade monopoly rather than the Sultan’s power. For Frere this meant “that everything connected with African trade [including the slave trade] is at least as much an Indian as it is an English question [and] India, therefore must share with England the responsibility for what they do and the obligation to protect them in their lawful callings.”<sup>132</sup> This direct connection between the slave trade and Britain meant that Britain was more than complicit in the trade, its subjects were profiting from it. This blatant disregard for British law could not be allowed to continue.

Frere stopped at Zanzibar before leaving for Britain on April 1, 1873 where he was given a formal letter from Sultan Barghash rejecting the treaty. The letter was addressed to Queen Victoria, his Wazeers, the Governor-General of India, and the Governor of Bombay. Its circular nature caused Frere to call it a “discourtesy” when he relayed it to the Foreign Office. He was convinced “that the tone of Seyyid Barghash’s refusal to accept the proposed Treaty did not arise from a momentary fit of temper, but from a studied policy of disregard to the wishes of England.”<sup>133</sup> This rejection was an attack against British sway over the island and therefore the security of Britain’s informal empire in the Indian Ocean. Frere also wrote Sultan Barghash a final letter charging him for complicity in regards to the slave trade and with breaking the spirit of the 1845 treaty. He stated that “[T]he clear intention of the reservations provided in the Treaty are frustrated; and slaves, which could never have been intended by the framers of the Treaty of 1845 to be allowed to pass, are passed, and exported from Africa, in direct

---

<sup>131</sup> No. 31. Sir B. Frere to Earl Granville.-(Received),” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 38.

<sup>132</sup> No. 31. Sir B. Frere to Earl Granville.-(Received),” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 38-9.

<sup>133</sup> “No. 33. Sir B. Frere to Earl Granville.-(Received April 28),” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 74.

contravention of the objects of that Treaty.”<sup>134</sup> By not signing the treaty, Barghash had personally offended Frere’s moral imperial sensibilities forcing him to condemn the Sultan.

Frere’s reports from Zanzibar, especially his description of the crucial role that British Indian subjects played in the trade, the description of the slave market, and Sultan Barghash’s refusal of the treaty infuriated the Foreign Office. Following Frere and Pelly’s completion of anti-slave trade treaties with the powers throughout the Persian Gulf and Red Sea, including Muscat, Granville ordered Dr. Kirk on May 15, 1873, to “deal with British subjects engaged in, or being accessory to, the purchase or sale of slaves, or having slaves illegally in their possession...according to the powers vested in you by the Order in Council” in an effort to “relieve the British name from the scandal and disgrace which their [British subjects involved in the slave trade] unlawful practices bring upon it.”<sup>135</sup> They were willing to risk the loss of their ally in Zanzibar and attack the Indian monopoly to end this complicity.<sup>136</sup> In a separate letter, Granville forcefully rejected the Sultan’s refusal to sign the treaty, saying that Britain is not “prepared to acquiesce in this refusal, and I have accordingly to instruct you to inform the Sultan that Her Majesty’s Government require him to conclude the Treaty as presented to him by Sir Bartle Frere, with the insertion of a passage in the first Article, by which the Sultan will

---

<sup>134</sup> “No. 42. Sir B. Frere to the Sultan of Zanzibar,” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 83.

<sup>135</sup> Quote from: “No 45. Earl Granville to Dr. Kirk” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 87.

Copies of the treaties can be found in: *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 89-97. For other anti-slave trade treaties signed after Granville sent Kirk his orders see “No. 54. Sir B. Frere to Earl Granville. – (Received June 1.)” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 140. The *Anti-Slavery Society* reported on the treaty with Muscat in: “The Sultan of Muscat – Signed A New Slave-Trade Treaty,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July 1873), 157.

<sup>136</sup> Granville considered the crime “so serious a character, and the punishment to which persons convicted of it are amenable are so severe, that it may probably be desirable in the majority of cases to remit the parties accused for trial in the High Court at Bombay.” “No 45. Earl Granville to Dr. Kirk” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 88.

specifically engage to take effectual measures within all parts of his dominions to prevent and suppress the trade.”<sup>137</sup> He also sent British naval forces to Zanzibar with orders to either blockade the port or enforce the new treaty if it was signed. This was classic gunboat diplomacy.<sup>138</sup>

Without a fleet and in a crippled economic position Zanzibar could not ignore Britain’s threats. Kirk reported on June 6, 1873 that Sultan Barghash signed and ratified the treaty.<sup>139</sup> Zanzibar was now fully dependent on and included in Britain’s informal empire but remained, on paper, independent. The Sultan’s stability was dependent on the new presence of the British navy in the waters off East Africa to combat the slave trade. This shift was accompanied by a new hopeful environment for moral imperialists.<sup>140</sup> The *Church Missionary Intelligencer* stated

Sir Bartle Frere has concluded successful treaties with the Sultan of Muscat and the Sheikh of Makulla to the east of Aden. After some reluctant delay, these have been followed up by another with the Sultan of Zanzibar himself, not, however, until most significant orders had been communicated to our Admiral commanding in the Indian seas. While all bondsmen who may hereafter arrive in Oman are to be declared free. The slave-market in Zanzibar has been closed. It would be too sanguine to conclude that the slave-trade on the East Coast is at an end, but we trust a fatal blow has been dealt to it.<sup>141</sup>

---

<sup>137</sup> “No 46. Earl Granville to Dr. Kirk” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 88.

<sup>138</sup> Antony Preston and John Major defined gunboat diplomacy as “the use of warships in peacetime to further a nation’s diplomatic and political aims.” See: Antony Preston and John Major, *Send a Gunboat! A Study of the Gunboat and its Role in British Policy, 1854-1904* (London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1967), 3.

<sup>139</sup> “No. 57. Dr. Kirk to Earl Granville. – (Received June 29.),” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 153-155.

<sup>140</sup> The Anti-Slavery Society held a public meeting thanking Frere for his efforts in achieving the new treaty. “Public Anti-Slavery Meeting in Exeter Hall, July 8, 1873,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (October 1873), 183-186.

In the months after this article the CMS also reprinted Frere’s report and correspondences during his mission. “Mission of Sir Bartle Frere to the East Coast of Africa,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (October 1873), 296-306. “Mission of Sir Bartle Frere to the East Coast of Africa,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (November 1873), 333-344.

<sup>141</sup> “East-African Slave-Trade,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (July 1873), 220-221.

Frere's position within the diplomatic and moral imperial sphere created a new geopolitical environment in the Indian Ocean. After the signing of the treaty he continued to act as the link between moral imperialists and the government to solve the problem of housing and caring for the liberated slaves.

### **Foreign Office and Moral Imperial Symbiosis: Housing the Liberated Slaves and the Building of Freretown, 1874-1875**

The post-treaty years saw the symbiosis of Foreign Office policymaking and moral imperialism, exemplified by Frere, culminating in the building of Freretown. After the death of David Livingstone in 1873, the Foreign Office and CMS worked together to build a station for the liberated slaves.<sup>142</sup> Basing the new station on Frere's observations of the Sultan's northern ports and plans for industrial (secular) education at the new mission station, the CMS assigned Reverend William Price from Nassick to oversee the purchasing, building, and running of the new station. Frere believed that mission stations caring for liberated slaves in a post-treaty East Africa were essential because the "Government could not do the work so well or so cheaply as the missionary societies or private individuals."<sup>143</sup> Moral imperialism and moral imperial projects were clearly seen as partners with the British government in Britain's imperial project. Together, the Foreign Office, CMS, and their new ally, Sultan Barghash overcame strong local opposition in Mombasa to a new missionary station named Freretown that housed slaves captured by the British navy at sea.

---

<sup>142</sup> Livingstone's death was memorialized in the context of combating the East African slave trade and contemporary progress being made by the Church Missionary Society to organize their depot. See: "Dr. Livingstone and the East African Slave Trade," *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (April 1875), 102-112.

<sup>143</sup> "Inclosure in No 53. Memorandum on Disposal of Liberated Slaves," *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 125.



The founding of Freretown began with two stops Frere made on the East African coast when he was traveling back to Britain, one at Bagamoyo and the other at Mombasa.<sup>144</sup> Frere favored Mombasa as the site of the new mission station for several reasons. He described the location as “picturesque” with a “harbor, extending as it does with good anchorage of large ships almost round the Island, is one of the best and its position at the end of one of the numerous spurs of the Kilimandjaro range is one of the finest on the coast.” Because of its harbor and the route of the mail steamers coming close to Mombasa, Frere considered the town one of the few “sites along the coast which afford so good an opening for English colonization, with so fair a prospect of immediate success.”<sup>145</sup> Mombasa was easily accessible to British ships meaning that it was a convenient depot for slaves freed at sea by the British navy and easy for British ships to protect. Creating the depot here was the next step solidifying Britain’s informal empire in East Africa because of the independence of the coastal towns from the Sultan’s rule.

While in Mombasa, Frere’s stop at the CMS Mission at Kisoludini outlined a new direction for missionizing in East Africa. While Frere pointed out that the mission was only a “small colony of eight,” he admired Rebmann as “a scholar of the highest repute, who has devoted his life to the study of the languages of East Africa.”<sup>146</sup> Rebmann and his original partner, Johannes Krapf concentrated on linguistic work, including translating the Bible into

---

<sup>144</sup> For Frere’s visit to Bagamoyo see: “No. 43. Sir B. Frere to Earl Granville.—(Received April 28),” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 83-86.

<sup>145</sup> “No. 42. Sir B. Frere to Earl Granville.—(Received April 28),” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 84.

<sup>146</sup> “No. 42. Sir B. Frere to Earl Granville.—(Received April 28),” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 84.

indigenous languages for non-Europeans to understand.<sup>147</sup> The foundation of their missionizing was based on the premise that everyone, no matter their race, was capable of understanding the Bible and become Christians. Frere had a different vision for the CMS in East Africa though. He believed that Kisoludini could get “far greater results...if a larger industrial element were admitted into the establishments.”<sup>148</sup> For Frere, a missionary’s purpose was to spread Christianity and “civilization” in order to “civilize” the peoples they were overseeing through both secular (industrial) and religious education. The focus on industrial education rather than intellectual/classroom education as purported by Krapf and Rebmann was a significant shift in missionizing based on new ideas of race being purported by Social Darwinism where non – Europeans were intellectually inferior than Europeans and only suited for non-technical manual labor.<sup>149</sup>

After these visits, Frere optimistically outlined the role of missionaries in his plan to care for the liberated slaves to the Foreign Office. In his “Memorandum on Disposal of Liberated Slaves,” he argued that the creation of self-sufficient communities of liberated slaves would not be a burden on the British treasury. He set goals for a new mission, including insuring the “security and freedom of the liberated slaves,” making sure they have the opportunity to sustain

---

<sup>147</sup> For a general description of Krapf and Rebmann’s intellectual work and explorations of East Africa see: Eugene Stock, *The History of the Church Missionary Society: Its Environment, its Men, and its Work, Volume II* (London: Church Missionary Society, 1899), 124-136.

Krapf and Rebmann published a number of multilingual vocabularies and dictionaries. See: Johannes Ludwig Krapf, *Vocabulary of Six East-African Languages (Kisuáheli, Kinika, Kikámbe, Kipokómo, Kihíáú, Kigalla)* (Farnborough : Gregg, 1967, 1850). Johannes Ludwig Krapf, *A Dictionary of the Suahili Language* (New York, Negro Universities Press, 1969, 1882). Johannes Ludwig Krapf and Johannes Rebmann, *A Nika-English Dictionary* (London, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1887).

<sup>148</sup>“No. 42. Sir B. Frere to Earl Granville.–(Received April 28),” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 85.

<sup>149</sup> James R. Moore, *The Post-Darwinian Controversies: A Study of the Protestant Struggle to Come to Terms With Darwin in Great Britain and America, 1870-1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).

themselves “by their own labour without imposing any permanent burden on the public exchequer” in “proximity to their own country, or, at least, such similarity of climate as shall render it suitable in a sanitary sense,” and located at places where “the liberated slaves should be in a position to aid the formation of free, self-sustaining communities.”<sup>150</sup> These goals outline the parameters of a new depot that would be an extension of Britain’s informal empire, training future Christian free laborers under missionary supervision. It would be an industrial training center that cared for slaves freed at sea by the British navy and not be a burden on the British treasury. He suggested eight locations, however only four of these locations, Mombasa, Magila, Bagamoyo, and Dar-es-Salaam “are now occupied by mission stations, or the occupation of them is seriously contemplated.”<sup>151</sup> Working with an existing infrastructure was better than building a new one so these were prime locations for the new depot

However, the CMS was clearly favored as evidenced by Frere’s defense of Krapf and Rebmann’s missionary work in East Africa as well as their participation in the committee investigations. Frere sent letters to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the patron of the CMS, to get his support for the new mission station. These differed in tone from his correspondences with the Foreign Office because they were more concerned with moral imperialism and left out many of the geopolitical and policy issues that were in his correspondences to the Foreign Office. Mainly he was concerned with the structure and philosophy of the new station, namely “industrial training for all.” He justified his support of including non-religious teaching to the liberated slaves by referring to previous successful missions that had integrated lay teaching. Frere’s

---

<sup>150</sup> “Inclosure in No 53. Memorandum on Disposal of Liberated Slaves,” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 117-118.

<sup>151</sup> “Inclosure in No 53. Memorandum on Disposal of Liberated Slaves,” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 120.

model was based on the argument that “the earliest missionaries started with a band of fellow-labourers which, as nearly as possible, represented a completely organised Christian community, lay as well as clerical.” He continued to argue “that as long as the Church continued to be a zealously active missionary church it was the object of all missionaries among uncivilised people to teach not only religious dogma and morals, but all the arts of civilised life.”<sup>152</sup> He was arguing for a return to industrial education within missions using Christian texts and stories. This new missionizing methodology would fit into moral imperial and geopolitical goals by training a new free labor class, Christianizing and educating non-Europeans, and, from Frere’s perspective, uplifting East Africa.

Frere also used the success of the CMS work at Nassick as his model for industrial training in missions. Under Rev. William Price, this African mission station and orphanage cared for, educated and trained slave children liberated by the Indian Navy in the Indian Ocean. At the orphanage each child was “instructed in industry suited to their sex and capacity, all are taught in Maharathi [sic] (the language of the country [of western India]), the truths of Christianity, and a few of the aptest are also taught English.”<sup>153</sup> When the children were done with their religious schooling and secular training they lived in “Saharunpoor (the city of refuge), a flourishing Christian village just clear of the suburbs” of Bombay.<sup>154</sup> For Frere, implementing the Nassick model was appealing because Nassick Africans were already present in East Africa. Frere

---

<sup>152</sup> Bartle Frere, *Eastern Africa as a Field for Missionary Labour. Four Letters to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury* (London: John Murray, 1874), 71.

<sup>153</sup> Bartle Frere, *Eastern Africa as a Field for Missionary Labour. Four Letters to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury* (London: John Murray, 1874), 110-111.

<sup>154</sup> Bartle Frere, *Eastern Africa as a Field for Missionary Labour. Four Letters to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury* (London: John Murray, 1874), 109.

believed, based on conversations with George David, a catechist from Nassick, at Kisoludini that,

if placed under a Superintendent, who, like Mr. Price at Nassick, added to judicious missionary zeal great powers of organization, results might be secured far surpassing what I have witnessed at Nassick, for there is a total absence of the old fossilized superstitious caste prejudices and social difficulties which form so powerful an obstacle to the labours of the missionary in India.<sup>155</sup>

The Nassick model, which was deemed a success by the missionaries and Frere had greater potential in East Africa. Combined with industrial education, which George David believed would cause people to “flock to the mission,” the mission would allow the economic appeal and social control needed by missionaries to attract and train future converts.<sup>156</sup>

Rev. William Price’s relationship with Nassick Africans and his experiences overseeing liberated African slaves in India made him uniquely qualified to fulfill CMS promises to the Foreign Office and British government. Price was assigned to “establish a colony in the Wanika country, for which the utmost care will have to be exercised in choosing a suitable one.”<sup>157</sup>

Arriving in East Africa on November 15, 1874, Price met with Sultan Barghash and “was delighted to meet here Thomas Smith, one of my old Nasik boys, who, after, knocking about the world for several years, has at last settled down here as an overseer of workmen employed about the consulate” and employed Thomas as the chief engineer of *The Dove*, a ship owned by the CMS.<sup>158</sup> Price’s background and familiarity with Nassick Africans was already benefiting his mission. He then left Zanzibar for Kisoludini. During this trip he paid special attention to how

---

<sup>155</sup> “Inclosure in No 53. Memorandum on Disposal of Liberated Slaves,” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 123.

<sup>156</sup> “Inclosure in No 53. Memorandum on Disposal of Liberated Slaves,” *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1885), 123.

<sup>157</sup> “Dr. Livingstone and the East-African Slave Trade,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (April 1875), 112.

<sup>158</sup> “The East African Mission,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (May 1875), 147.

supplies were transferred in East Africa by human porters stating, “Every day troops of Wanika-men, women, and children-have been flocking in with our boxes, &c., and we have been occupied in stowing them away. There seems to be no lack of people willing to earn a trifling as carriers; but they have their own way of doing things, which is rather inconvenient and annoying to one who has not yet got used to it.”<sup>159</sup> His comment on how goods were transported in East Africa foreshadowed future issues that abolitionists had with the East African transportation and labor system in the 1890s.

At Kisoludini, Price’s improvements to the infrastructure and populating of the mission station began to attract attention. He successfully proposed

first, the opening of a school for Wanika children; second, the construction of a road from Kisulidini to the landing-place; third, I told them the rates I intended paying for Wanika labourers – men and women – and the hours for work; and lastly, I promised that one of my Christian men should set up a shop, so that they might purchase cloth, grain, and other necessaries, without having to go all the way to Mombasa.<sup>160</sup>

Aiding him were “Christian Africans from India” who arrived regularly to Kisoludini to help with building the mission.<sup>161</sup> This Nassick Africans who were already gone through industrial training and converted to Christianity formed the nucleus of the settlement, populating and expanding Kisoludini. This expansion attracted the notice of a community of runaway slaves in the area. One of their leaders, Abdullah asked Price to “find some employment for his men” and to join with “‘Mzunga’ meaning myself [Price]; and that they would gladly come and settle

---

<sup>159</sup> “The East African Mission,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (May 1875), 148.

<sup>160</sup> “The East African Mission,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (May 1875), 148.

<sup>161</sup> January 1875 saw fourteen “Christian Africans – men and women – who recently came from Bombay” come to Kisulidini while Price initially stayed there. Fifty more Nassick Africans arrived as he began negotiating the purchase of new land for the new mission station. See: “The East African Mission,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (May 1875), 152-159.

down under my protection, and work honestly for a living, etc.”<sup>162</sup> Price declined the offer because he did not want to ally himself with a group in direct conflict with Sultan Barghash. If he had accepted the fugitive slaves into the mission the relationship between the CMS, the Sultan and the Foreign Office was in danger of ending and with it the mission. As we will see in the next section his successors and peers in the CMS made different choices regarding fugitive slaves.

Once developments were progressing to Price’s satisfaction in Kisoludini, he traveled to Mombasa to purchase for land suitable for the new “industrial settlement” for the liberated slaves. There he faced resistance from Mombasa’s Wali and other local Muslim leaders. Price wrote back home that “Our prospects of obtaining land are not bright. There are many obstacles which our friends at home can scarcely realize. The authorities are very suspicious of our movements.”<sup>163</sup> This semi-independent town was not happy about their new potential neighbors. Finding two potential locations he wrote to Kirk requesting his help with the purchase. Price said

Perhaps it would be well to state clearly to the Sultan, once more, what our objects are—the industrial training of freed slaves, to explain to him that the existence of such an industrial settlement will be no loss but a gain to the country and to H.H.’s government – and to ask from him an official document under his sign and seal, giving me full permission to purchase land for the purpose required.<sup>164</sup>

Kirk suggested that Price follow the usual process for purchasing land, which was “to transmit to this office the Deed of Sale executed, if possible, in Arabic, and by one of the local Kathis for

---

<sup>162</sup> “The East African Mission,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (May 1875), 154.

<sup>163</sup> “The East African Mission,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (May 1875), 159.

<sup>164</sup> Quoted in P.J.L. Frankl, “An Arabic Deed of Sale from Swahili Mombasa Dated 1292/1875,” *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* Vol. 20, No. 1 (1993), 34. Original Quote from: Church Missionary Society Archives CA5/023/25, Price to Kirk, Mombasa 23:ii:1875.

registration after it has been countersigned by His Highness the Sultan.”<sup>165</sup> Kirk also assured Price that he had Sultan Barghash’s support. Price had “by treaty, full liberty to purchase land and settle.”<sup>166</sup> Although, Price was doing his best to work within the Sultan’s legal framework, as an outsider he faced greater challenges than a local.

In Britain, these difficulties caused CMS optimism about the creation of a depot for liberated slaves to wane, especially in comparison with its testimony in 1871. The *Church Missionary Intelligencer* stated that “Seldom in the annals of the Church Missionary Society has a more arduous undertaking been engaged in than the active prosecution of the Eastern African Mission. Climates as deadly have been faced, enemies as hostile have been encountered, ignorance as crass has been dispelled; but seldom has there been so complete a combination of unfavourable influences to be struggled against.”<sup>167</sup> Price’s difficulties in East Africa were clearly having an effect. Comparing East African slavery to the successful campaign against West African slavery, the *Intelligencer* noted that the East African case was more difficult because “it cannot be said that there has been that general feeling aroused throughout our land which so mightily sustained those who struggled against the slavery of Western Africa in a former generation.”<sup>168</sup> Rather than blaming local East African factors they rather looked towards a lessening of moral imperial sentiment in Britain for an explanation. This is a clear attempt by the CMS to mobilize their base and thereby increase their influence in Britain.

---

<sup>165</sup> Quoted in P.J.L. Frankl, “An Arabic Deed of Sale from Swahili Mombasa Dated 1292/1875,” *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* Vol. 20, No. 1 (1993), 34 ft 9. Original Quote from: Church Missionary Society Archives CA5/023/25, Kirk to Price, Zanzibar 22:iii:1875.

<sup>166</sup> “More News from East Africa,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (October 1875), 316.

<sup>167</sup> “The East African Mission,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (May 1875), 145-146.

<sup>168</sup> “The East African Mission,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (May 1875), 146.



Even in a lessened position in comparison to the anti-slavery victories in the previous generation, anti-slavery advocates did not sit idle but changed their tactics. The great victories of the anti-slavery campaigns of the early nineteenth century were replaced by a constant campaign focused on publicizing the failure of the contemporary situation and complicity of the Foreign Office and British government in the slave trade as signers and enforcers a treaty deemed inadequate. Within the year, the Anti-Slavery Society had deemed Frere's treaties ineffective because a new slave trade route had opened overland in East Africa, avoiding Zanzibar's control.<sup>169</sup> Local inhabitants were adapting their economy and trade to the new social-political geography of a new East Africa by bypassing the now British-supported Sultan of Zanzibar. The Anti-Slavery Society's argument that Frere's treaty was insufficient was bolstered by CMS missionaries within East Africa. Specifically, Rev. Charles New, wrote in August 1874 that "the effect [of the treaty] is such that, after you have admitted our late action to be a step in the right direction—a decided expression of English feeling against slavery— and even for a while a staggering blow to the slave-traders, every impartial observer must admit that an awful state of things remains."<sup>170</sup> The steps taken were not enough to end the slave trade and its continued existence, under the British signed treaty, meant that Britain was still complicit in it. He ended his letter "express[ing] the hope that the Society will relax none of its efforts *for the suppression*

---

<sup>169</sup> "The East African Slave-Trade Not Destroyed," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (January 1874), 2-3. An address was also sent to candidates for the House of Commons: "Address to the Electors of Representatives in the House of Commons," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (April 1874), 26-27. They looked to Parliamentary White Papers to prove that "though the trade by *sea* to and from Zanzibar has been materially checked, "the transport of slaves by land is carried on to an unprecedented extent."" "The East African Slave-Trade," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July 1874), 52-54. Quote on page 52. Doubts were also laid on the effectiveness of the navy in suppressing the slave trade: "Sir Leopold Heath on the Inefficiency of the Naval Force to Suppress the Slave Trade," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July 1874), 61. The Anti-Slavery Society's argument was bolstered by investigations by the Foreign Office: "Lieut. Cameron's Report on the East African Slave-Trade in the Interior," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (October 1874), 99-101.

<sup>170</sup> "The Slave-Trade in East Africa. Letter from Rev. C. New," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (January 1875), 113.

of slavery, remembering that the demon is rampant here still.”<sup>171</sup> Moral imperial campaigns were now based on the tactic of consistent pressure and arguments of British complicity as long as slavery and the slave trade existed.

Back in East Africa, the two landowners interested in selling land to Price and the CMS were stopped by Mombasa’s Wali, Sultan Barghash’s official overseeing the town. The Wali slowed down the sale by demanding tougher requirements for the CMS buyers than others. He “warned them [Mombasa’s residents] not to sell without express sanction from Said Barghash.” Price responded to these requirements by stating that “The treaty and the letter of the Consul seems to count for nothing in his [the Wali’s] eyes.”<sup>172</sup> This bureaucratic hurdle emphasized the resistance of the coastal inhabitants to the existence of a new mission station and Britain’s influence. They were not willing to accept the new political environment. Price was outraged by this turn of events, writing “Oh! what duplicity, lying, and distrust one has to consider in such a simple transaction.”<sup>173</sup> He wrote another letter to Kirk causing the Consul-General to intercede with Sultan Barghash. In response, Barghash sent a proclamation to the Mombasa Wali telling him that Price had “full permission to purchases houses or land, &c.” and also sent a private letter to the Wali where, according to Price, Barghash “severely ‘wigged’ [on the Wali] for having obstructed me in obtaining land, and strictly charged to render me all assistance for the

---

<sup>171</sup> “The Slave-Trade in East Africa. Letter from Rev. C. New,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (January 1875), 115. Emphasis in original. New elaborated on his observations of the post-treaty East African slave trade in: Charles New, *Life, Labours, and Wanderings in Eastern Africa. With an Account of the First Successful Ascent of the Equatorial Snow Mountain, Kilima Njaro; and Remarks Upon East African Slavery* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1874), 489-508. New’s books was used as a reference in a Letter to the Editor of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* to point out that “our blockade by sea is merely turning the trade into far more deadly channels.” See: Robert Shaw, “The Slave-Trade on the East Coast of Africa. Suppression by Physical Force. *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (June 1875), 173.

<sup>172</sup> “More News from East Africa,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (October 1875), 317.

<sup>173</sup> “More News from East Africa,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (October 1875), 317.

future.”<sup>174</sup> After receiving this letter, the Wali ended his opposition and Price finished negotiating the sale. Inhabitants of Mombasa then unsuccessfully attempted to annul the sale of the land by arguing that the landowners broke local custom by selling undeveloped land rather than developed land. Price blamed Mombasa’s inhabitant’s opposition on the fact that “the “Msunga” has become possessed of the most eligible site in harbour of Mombasa, and, more than all, that it is on the direct line of route by which slaves are smuggled in and out of Mombasa.”<sup>175</sup> This moral imperial explanation, that they opposed the end of the slave trade in their town ignores the independent nature of Mombasa and other coastal inhabitants. Price and his mission station signaled an end to that independence because it meant a British presence.

Both Price and the CMS were exuberant at the news of the sale. Price exclaimed on May 8, 1875, “The first and a very important step has now been taken towards the creation of a Freed Slave Colony near Mombasa. The land is purchased, the deeds are signed by the Governor, and I, as representative of the C.M.S., am in lawful possession of the property.”<sup>176</sup> The CMS updated their members in Britain on the purchase of the land

[T]he Mission is now located on a station on the mainland, nearer to Mombasa than Kisulidini; it has been selected as exposed to the sea breezes, and devoid as far as possible of malarious influences, and in a position calculated to interfere with the Arab slave traffic. To this property, which has been purchased from the Arab residents of Mombasa, the name of “Frere Town” has been given.<sup>177</sup>

The description of the location, and its relation to the slave trade, insured that there would be conflict between slaveowners in Mombasa and the mission station. Price and the Nassick

---

<sup>174</sup> “More News from East Africa,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (November 1875), 349.

<sup>175</sup> “More News from East Africa,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (November 1875), 352.

<sup>176</sup> “More News from East Africa,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (November 1875), 350.

<sup>177</sup> “More News from East Africa,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (October 1875), 312.

Africans continued to work on the site while waiting for the British consul to deliver liberated slaves caught on slave trading vessels.<sup>178</sup> Moral imperialists had gained their first official foothold in East Africa with the help of the British government and Sultan Barghash.

July 1875 saw the first visits from officials from Consul-General Kirk's office to Freretown in order to examine its accommodations for the liberated slaves. By this point Price wrote that the new station "had greatly altered in appearance" and "there are about it signs of life and development which I think must be cheering to new-comers."<sup>179</sup> He was right and two months later, the first liberated slaves were delivered to Freretown. On September 4th, "eighteen men and eleven women of various ages, and two nice little girls of about seven years old" were dropped off at Freretown by the British navy. Price wrote that "they are nearly all covered with itch, and two or three are emaciated and otherwise suffering. Cleanliness and better food will soon improve their condition."<sup>180</sup> Five days later the *H.M.S. Thetis* brought in 239 slaves for the new mission station<sup>181</sup> Ward wrote a private letter to the Anti-Slavery Society about the drop-off from his perspective. He wrote that "the slaves, none of whom speak any language known to any of the missionary party, were enough to overwhelm a very plucky superintendent, yet Mr. Price never hesitated for an instant in his determination to receive them all."<sup>182</sup> These initial two hundred seventy one liberated slaves provided the foundation for the first community of freed

---

<sup>178</sup> Price along with "about a hundred people, under the direction of Thomas Smith, a most energetic overseer, were engaged in clearing away grass and jungle for building sites, making the road, &c." "More News from East Africa," *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (November 1875), 351.

<sup>179</sup> "More News from East Africa," *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (December 1875), 369.

<sup>180</sup> "More News from East Africa," *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (December 1875), 373.

<sup>181</sup> "More News from East Africa," *Church Missionary Intelligencer* (December 1875), 374.

<sup>182</sup> "The Freed Slaves of Mombasa. A Refuge for Freed Slaves on the East Coast of Africa," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (April 1875), 54. Captain Ward's letter were also published in: "The Freed Slaves at Mombasa – Letter From the Captain of the "Thetis," *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (January 1876), 51-53.

slaves in East Africa, fulfilling CMS promises to the Foreign Office and parliament. However, this station became a catalyst for conflict between missionaries and their neighbors for the next decade and a half.

### **Fugitive Slaves and the End of the Foreign Office and Moral Imperial Partnership, 1875-1880**

After the initial delivery of liberated slaves, Freretown's presence in East Africa soon became a point of contention between the missionaries, their Moslem neighbors in Mombasa, and Foreign Office officials. As the visible face of British moral imperialism in East Africa, Freretown faced a number of challenges over the issue of slavery, being threatened with destruction when Sultan Barghash issued new decrees against the slave trade in 1876 and existing in a permanent state of conflict with its Muslim neighbors in Mombasa over the issue of harboring fugitive slaves at mission stations. Although Price refused to accept fugitive slaves at CMS missions, his peers and successors did not. This led to conflicts between the missions and the Foreign Office. Mombasa residents' opposition to the existence of Freretown and other missions escalated as more slave trade regulation was enacted in Zanzibar in response to pressure from Britain and the Anti-Slavery Society. The delicate relationship between moral imperialism and geopolitical policymaking that was formed during the campaign for the 1873 slave trade treaty was sundered after the treaty was signed and Freretown was formed.

Anti-Slavery Society efforts in London continued against the Zanzibar slave trade with a new ally, the Sultan of Zanzibar. The Society met Sultan Barghash in 1875 while he was visiting London to address the issue of continued overland slave trading from caravans equipped at Zanzibar. The Sultan replied that "you must be aware, a traffic of very long standing, having

ramifications through a vast extent of country, cannot be eradicated at once, and we feel assured that your society and the generous British people will appreciate the great difficulties which we have to contend with in this matter, and the loss which has accrued to our islands through the same.”<sup>183</sup> His voice though was not enough to convince or overcome the moral imperial voices in Britain. Over the next year, the Anti-Slavery Society’s campaign for more action was bolstered by letters from the Universities’ Mission to Central Africa.<sup>184</sup> The pressure ended when new anti-slave trade measures were pronounced by Sultan Barghash. The decree stated:

Whereas, in disobedience of our order, and in violation of the terms of our Treaties with Great Britain, slaves are being constantly conveyed by land from Kilwa, for the purpose of being taken to the island of Pemba. Be it known that we have determined to stop, and by this order do prohibit, all conveyances of slaves by land under any conditions; and we have instructed our governors on the coast to seize and imprison those disobeying this order, and confiscate the slaves.<sup>185</sup>

Despite his personal opposition, the Sultan was now dependent on Britain to maintain his rule and the Foreign Office could not ignore the moral imperial pressure for more stringent anti-slavery standards. The Anti-Slavery Society applauded Barghash, stating that “The Seyyid is risking all in his endeavour to put an end to the coast traffic” and that they “cannot but admire the boldness in taking this step, in spite of the opposition of the vast vested interests of slavery and the slave-trade in Zanzibar.”<sup>186</sup> The Sultan, as a part of Britain’s informal empire, was now seen by moral imperialists as an ally.

---

<sup>183</sup> “The Seyyid of Zanzibar,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (September 1875), 193.

<sup>184</sup> “Universities Mission to Central Africa,” *The Times* (November 18, 1875), 5. “News from the East Coast of Africa and Zanzibar,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (January 1876), 7-8. “Bishop Steere on the Slave Trade in Central Africa,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (May 1876), 62-63.

<sup>185</sup> “Text of the Proclamation Against the *Export* of Slaves, by the Seyyid of Zanzibar, based upon the last Treaty with Great Britain,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July 1876), 89.

<sup>186</sup> “Text of the Proclamation Against the *Export* of Slaves, by the Seyyid of Zanzibar, based upon the last Treaty with Great Britain,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July 1876), 89. “Dr. Kirk on the Suppression of the Land Slave Traffic in the Dominions of the Sultan of Zanzibar,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (September 1875), 129.

The Sultan's new decree was not well received by the inhabitants of the coast, especially in Mombasa. After the proclamation, Price wrote that "word was brought to me that a mob of 400 Swahilis was assembled in the old town, and threatened to make an attack upon us at Freretown, in consequence of our giving protection to their runaway slaves." Price went to the Mombasa Wali to organize a meeting with these residents to defuse the situation. Price assured them that "on all occasions when slaves had come to me for protection, I had always delivered them up to the Wali, whenever their masters put in a claim for them." His assurances did not sway Mombasa's residents. Three or four hundred men threatened to attack Freretown the next day based on the rumor that Price had imprisoned four men who had come to collect their fugitive slaves. The Mombasa Wali sent a hundred soldiers to disperse the crowd and over the next few days arrested the ringleaders ending the immediate threat to Freretown. Price's willingness to work within the local social and political system of Mombasa and refusal to accept fugitive slaves saved the new mission.

The next year the Anti-Slavery Society published a letter emphasizing a revival of the slave trade in East Africa from an anonymous correspondent writing from Magila, Usambara. After the treaty the slave trade moved from a seaborne slave trade coming out of Zanzibar to overland routes to other ports. According to the correspondent, the second decree was ineffective:

The Coast Arabs have told me that they do not care one bit for the proclamation. Seyyid Barghash has no power to enforce it; and if it were not for the English support he has, they would soon turn him out, and get rid of the infidels altogether. His power is only nominal, and he is only obeyed as far as his people choose to obey him. The slave-trade is as rampant as ever now.<sup>187</sup>

---

<sup>187</sup> "Revival of the Slave-Trade on the East Coast of Africa," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (May 1877), 232.

Barghash's power was limited and ineffectual and so were his decrees, which his Walis and officials ignored when not being closely watched by Britain or the Sultan. To fix this situation, the correspondent called for a larger and more present presence by British officials and ships. These statements emphasized weaknesses of Barghash, recently anointed as a moral imperial ally, emphasizing his limitations and Barghash's weak claims to having authority on the coast.

Under Price's leadership, Freretown was able to grow in this hostile and unstable political environment. The missionaries had transformed the station into a freed slave community with a core of a small staff of Europeans who were responsible for the liberated slave's education and care. In 1878, the staff included:

Commander Russell, the Lay Superintendent; the Rev. J.A. Lamb; and Mr. Handford, the schoolteacher. The Rev. H. K. Binns has come home on sick leave, and also Mr. Praeger, the young surgeon. Mr. Streeter, the Industrial Agent, has just come to England with his littler motherless children (referred to in our November number). On the other hand, Mr. Harris, a lay agent who worked for some time under Mr. Price, has lately returned to East Africa.<sup>188</sup>

The CMS focused on two aspects of Freretown's development, the school and agricultural/industrial development. Russel called the school "our strong point" and he boasted that "In the course of a few years...there will be ready as teachers ten or twelve thoroughly well-educated Christian men, ready and willing to go forward and bring their unfortunate countrymen to a knowledge of their Savior."<sup>189</sup> Practically, Streeter reported that he had fourteen acres under cultivation at Freretown and Rabbai as well as 350 cocoa-nut trees at Freretown and "begun digging stone for building purposes, and woodcutting."<sup>190</sup> Streeter continued to report to the Society improvements in the town as well as ponder potential industries for the inhabitants of

---

<sup>188</sup> "The Month. Frere Town." *Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (January 1878), 51.

<sup>189</sup> "The Month. Frere Town." *Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (January 1878), 52.

<sup>190</sup> "The Month. Frere Town." *Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (January 1878), 51.



Freretown including “cotton-growing,” “tanning and dyeing,” and an oil-press but these plans were “deferred for a while, as a large shamba (plantation) has been secured adjoining the Frere Town estate, which will employ many people.”<sup>191</sup> Freretown was growing and thriving.

The success of these developments attracted fugitive slaves to the CMS missions. The *Church Missionary Intelligencer* provided a detailed description of the Africans at Freretown and Kisoludini.

The Africans now connected with the Mission exceed 600 in number; of whom 335 are liberated slaves sent by Dr. Kirk; 170 are “Bombays,” *i.e.* liberated slaves of former years who were taken to Bombay, and have been brought over from thence; 40 are Wanika; and nearly 100 are runaway slaves from the neighbouring districts who have settled down around the station at Rabai; besides which there are some 40 of the Giriama people.<sup>192</sup>

The listing of “runaway slaves” represented a shift in philosophy among the missionaries in Freretown and Kisoludini away from Price’s stated position five years earlier. Their presence created an escalating tension with the slave owners of Mombasa and conflict with the Foreign Office officials in Zanzibar.

Fugitive slaves were now a visible population in CMS stations in East Africa. Although the CMS claimed that the inhabitants of Freretown were not fugitive slaves they openly admitted at Kisoludini that “About half the people more or less connected with the Mission are fugitive slaves. About one hundred are recent runaways from Mombasa or the immediate neighbourhood;

---

<sup>191</sup> “Letters from Mr. J. R. Streeter,” *The Mombasa Mission of the Church Missionary Society. Containing Letters From Bishop Royston of Mauritius, Mr. J.R. Streeter, &c* (London: Church Missionary House, 1879), 15-16.

<sup>192</sup> “The Month,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (May 1879), 309.

A CMS Pamphlet listed the population as “Lay Teachers: European, Male, 3; Female, 2; Native Christian, Male 2; Female, 1. Native Communicants, 45. Native Adherents and their Children, 428. Native Scholars: Boys, 68; Girls 28; Seminarists, 26.” In Kisoludini, they listed the inhabitants as “European Clergyman, 1. Native Christian Teachers: Male, 2. Native Communicants, 19. Native Christian Adherents and their Children, 180. Native Scholars: Boys, 21; Girls 15.” “Statistics,” *The Mombasa Mission of the Church Missionary Society. Containing Letters From Bishop Royston of Mauritius, Mr. J.R. Streeter, &c* (London: Church Missionary House, 1879), 20.

but the majority are from Giriama and other districts fifty miles and more away.”<sup>193</sup> Knowingly taking in fugitive slaves represented a vast shift from Price’s policies to not take them in and obey the local laws. The fugitive slaves became an essential part of the community at Kisoludini. The *Intelligencer* explains that “They are invited every morning to prayer and exposition of Scripture; and special classes are held three days in the week, and on Sundays. More than a year ago Mr. Binns mentioned that seventy or eighty of hem attended regularly and were well-behaved and some already appeared to be intelligently desirous of baptism.” In addition to their participation in the mission’s spiritual life the fugitive slaves “seem industrious, too. Two years ago, in addition to the twenty or thirty houses of the old village of Kisulutini, three long streets had sprung up, stretching away in different directions, all the huts having been built by the fugitives themselves.”<sup>194</sup> The CMS was not the only European mission to accept the fugitive slaves. Going towards Rabai, “at a place called Jongvu, there is a station of the Methodist Misson; and here a considerable number of fugitives had been received.”<sup>195</sup> The widespread practice among the missionaries of harboring fugitive slaves and ignoring local laws and regulations regarding slavery put them at risk with their slaveowning neighbors.

By 1880, the fugitive slave issue ignited hostilities against Freretown and other missions by the inhabitants of Mombasa.<sup>196</sup> Disagreements between the missionaries and Mombasa’s

---

<sup>193</sup> “The East Africa Mission,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (January 1881), 33.

<sup>194</sup> “The East Africa Mission,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (January 1881), 40.

<sup>195</sup> “The East Africa Mission,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (January 1881), 47.

<sup>196</sup> Another threatened attack occurred on May 23, 1876 according to a timeline of the development of Frere Town in: “The East Africa Mission,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (January 1881), 33. More detail, “In may 1876, just after the Sultan’s proclamation against the slave trade and liberation of his own slaves, great excitement arose at Mombasa, really owing to those events, but finding its vent in threats of destroying the then young colony of Frere Town, whose influences was rightly regarded as inimical to slavery and oppression of all kinds. Mr. Price was able to show the malcontents that he had always dealt fairly by them, and had not, as they alleged, harboured their runaway slaves; but notwithstanding this, a night attack on the settlement was organized,

inhabitants escalated to the point that “on two or three occasions lately the Suahili and Arab slave-owners have openly threatened the settlement with destruction.”<sup>197</sup> In one instance a fugitive slave refused to return to her master even though he carried a letter from Streeter, a ranking member of Freretown, ordering the resident missionary to turn her over to her former master. After her refusal to return to her owner, the owner “exclaimed, “Well, this place must be burnt down, and then no refuge will exist.””<sup>198</sup> He was promptly beaten by runaway slaves and only saved from serious injury by the CMS missionary at Kisoludini. The missionaries were in a very combustible situation which they could not get out of. Pressured by their neighbors to return fugitive slaves that were a part of their communities and willing to use violence, the station was again threatened with destruction. Missionaries reported that there were threats against them including at “the Ramadan fast [where] a hundred young men at Mombasa, Mohammedans, took an oath “to *make soup* of the livers of Messrs Ramshaw and Streeter, and to serve up Streeter’s head for the first meal after Ramadan.”<sup>199</sup> These statements emphasized anti-Islamic caricature, the half-savage violent Moslem slave owner. The conflict between the missionaries and the Mombasa residents was escalating to a new, more dangerous level than before.

Naval ships protected the missions near Mombasa and Rabai from attack; however the Foreign Office joined with the Mombasa inhabitants to condemn the missionaries for harboring fugitive slaves. At the Methodist Mission a party of two hundred men from Mombasa did not attack after seeing that “a strong stockade, which had, with the assistance of a friendly tribe, been

---

and (apparently) was, under God, only averted by the prompt interposition of the Wali of Mombasa, who sent thirty soldiers across the estuary at midnight to protect the Mission and next day arrested the ringleaders of the disturbance.” Quote from *Ibid*, 39.

<sup>197</sup> “The Month,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (November 1880), 706.

<sup>198</sup> “The East Africa Mission,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (January 1881), 47.

<sup>199</sup> “The East Africa Mission,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (January 1881), 47.

put up in the night...they saw an attack was hopeless.”<sup>200</sup> At Freretown, the mission was saved by the appearance of a British naval man-of-war carrying a Navy Lieutenant and his family who “accidentally” came to visit the town. Superior force was able to halt hostilities. But, rather than seeing the intervention of the British navy as a secular force, it was rather seen by the inhabitants of Freretown as evidence of divine intervention. They wrote in the *CMS Intelligencer* that “No human arm was stretched out to save the settlement; but a Divine arm was. When the enemy was coming in like a flood, the Lord lifted up a standard against him.”<sup>201</sup> By rejecting the British navy’s role in saving their station, the missionaries were also rejecting secular law and authority.

The fugitive slave issue was solved a month later when Kirk arrived in Mombasa with a consular judge who heard complaints against Streeter and other CMS missionaries by the Arabs of Mombasa. The result was “the runaway slaves must be given up, and that the Arabs had a right to take them back by force, even if they (the slaves) took refuge in the missionaries’ own rooms. Cases of gross ill-usage were to be reported to the Wali, who was to use his discretion as to whether he punished the offenders or not.”<sup>202</sup> The consul judge’s ruling against the missionaries marked the end of the symbiotic relationship between the Foreign Office and the missionaries. For the Foreign Office, Freretown was not a normal mission, having been established with the full support of the British government and consulate in Zanzibar and populated by slaves liberated from slave ships by the British navy. It was expected that missionaries obey the laws and decrees of Sultan Barghash and the British consulate.

---

<sup>200</sup> “The East Africa Mission,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (January 1881), 48.

<sup>201</sup> “The East Africa Mission,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (January 1881), 48.

<sup>202</sup> “The East Africa Mission,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (January 1881), 48.

Missionaries, however, believed that they answered to a higher authority that would protect them.

Nevertheless, Freretown was safe and the Foreign Office continued their efforts against slavery. In the March 1881 issue of the *Church Missionary Intelligencer* it was reported that “all is now quiet at Mombasa” and the settlement provided a foundation from which the CMS sought to build. Kirk and Barghash were still actively opposing the slave trade.<sup>203</sup> After the 1880 hostilities at Mombasa were resolved, Kirk convinced the Sultan to take more action against the overland slave trade. Barghash and Kirk “dispatched Lieutenant Matthews, R.N., the able and energetic Commander of the Zanzibar Nizam, or regular army, to the mainland, with a detachment of the same, and invested him with full powers, as his Commissioner, over the local authorities on the coast...houses were searched, slaves taken, and several slave-dealers, including the ringleader, were seized and brought to Zanzibar.”<sup>204</sup> Kirk’s efforts here and during the signing of the 1873 slave treaty did not go unrecognized and in 1881 the Anti-Slavery Reporter announced with “great pleasure to record that Her Majesty has been pleased to nominate Dr. Kirk as a Knight Commander of the second class of the most distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George.”<sup>205</sup>

## **Conclusion: The Moral Imperial Expansion into Central Africa Before the Partition, 1876-1885**

The founding of Freretown set the stage for exploration and missionizing into Central Africa. The CMS followed Henry Morton Stanley into Buganda, becoming the Protestant faction

---

<sup>203</sup> “The Month,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (March 1881), 182.

<sup>204</sup> “The East African Slave Trade,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (June 1881), 91.

<sup>205</sup> “Sir John Kirk, K.C.M.G.,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (September 1881), 164.

in the sectarian wars of that Central African empire. To secure the route to Uganda and Central Africa a series of missionary stations were founded on the route between Dar es Salaam and the Victoria Nyanza setting the stage for commercial and political expansion into East and Central Africa. As we will see in the next chapter, however, this expansion was upset in 1884 by Germany's entrance into East Africa at the start of the partition of Africa. The Sultan and by proxy Great Britain were unable to deny Germany's new claims in East Africa due to the Sultan's weak link to the coastal towns, his lack of control over the caravans into the interior as well as the political groups that lived in the hinterland, and the low numbers of Europeans made this expansion very tenuous.

Explorers opened up new land for missionary expansion. In letters to the *Daily Telegraph* 1876, Henry Morton Stanley asserted that he "enjoys at the present hour, we venture to assert, the extraordinary distinction of having revealed to geographers the actual and ultimate fountains of the Nile."<sup>206</sup> In these letters, Stanley described his travels, how he converted M'tesa, the Buganda kabaka, from Islam to Christianity, and called for more missionaries to come to Buganda.<sup>207</sup> The next year the CMS answered this call by sending an exploratory, pioneer expedition into Central Africa, including A. M. Mackay, towards Lake Victoria and Uganda. Mackay at first had an effect that was perceived as positive to the missionaries. George Ensor, the Vicar of Renham, wrote to the *Times* that M'tesa "has abolished slavery within the limits of his dominions... To-day, at least half a million through Mtesa's decision are set free from the horrors of the night attack, the deadly coast march, and the miserable existence of the few

---

<sup>206</sup> "Notice," *Daily Telegraph* (15 November 1875), 4. A map of Uganda and the area around Lake Victoria was published the next day. See: "Mr. Stanley's Map of the Lake Victoria Nyanza," *Daily Telegraph* (16 November 1875), 2.

<sup>207</sup> "New African Expedition. Coasting the Great Lake. King Mtesa's Capital," *Daily Telegraph* (15 November 1875), 5.

survivors—that is, three out of ten captured—in the chains of the Arab and the Turk.”<sup>208</sup> Ensor gave all credit for M’tesa’s decision to Mackay. But the Kabaka’s favoritism towards Mackay and Christianity did not continue. In the next issue it was reported that “The Church Missionary Society has received discouraging news of the condition of affairs at the Nyanza Mission. Hostile influences are believed to have been at work, and the attitude of King Mtesa has been for some time not-over-friendly.”<sup>209</sup> M’tesa publicly reconverted back to Islam. This expansion was not stable because CMS missionaries were competing with Roman Catholics, Muslim traders, and indigenous shamans for the Kabaka’s favor.<sup>210</sup>

Missionaries followed Stanley and Mackay, setting up new stations in the interior that created the start of a moral imperial infrastructure through the East African hinterland and attracting commercial notice. At the time of the CMS’s initial expedition to Lake Victoria and Uganda, missionary organizations were expanding into East Africa.<sup>211</sup> A new self-sufficient CMS station was built at Mpwapwa on the route from Bagamoyo to Lake Victoria, which secured the route to Buganda. This station was reinforced with four new missionaries in 1877.<sup>212</sup>

---

<sup>208</sup> “Abolition of the Slave-Trade By King Mtesa,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (October 1879), 241. George Ensor, “African Slavery: To the Editor of the Times,” *The Times* (September 12, 1879), 6.

<sup>209</sup> “Slave-Trade in Central Africa,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (December 1879), 288.

<sup>210</sup> “Letters from the Nyanza Mission,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (February 1879), 88-96. For a personal view of the journey by the sister of A.M. Mackay, one of the missionaries, including letters from Mackay to his family see: Alexina Harrison (Mackay), *A. M. Mackay, Pioneer Missionary of the Church Missionary Society to Uganda* (London: Hodder and Soughton, 1890).

The Anti-Slavery Reporter reported the arrival of the French Missionaries in “Universities’ Mission to Central Africa,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (August 1879), 215.

<sup>211</sup> Besides the Church Missionary Society and the Universities’ Mission to Central Africa, the London Missionary Society also sent a missionary party to Lake Tanganyika. “Arrival of the Missionaries of the London Missionary Society at Lake Tanganyika,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (November 1878), 121.

<sup>212</sup> Letters from these missionaries can be found in: “The New Mission at Mpwapwa,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (September 1879), 529-538.

The CMS was moving beyond the Sultan and Britain's territory and influence. The success of the CMS and other mission stations attracted commercial speculation. In an 1885 pamphlet, David Lindsay proposed

a large Planting Enterprise on the healthy mountain ranges of Usambara, on the East Coast of Africa, and the establishment of a European Settlement in connection therewith, as the surest and most practicable means of promoting Trade in those parts, and carrying Civilisation into the populous countries of Central Africa by the most direct and least difficult route, viz., from Tanga Harbour on the Indian Ocean, to Speke Gulf on the south of the Great Victoria Lake (Victoira N'yanza), passing through Usambara, and through the open pastoral countries of Para, Masai, and thickly-peopled Usukuma.<sup>213</sup>

Based on a draft prospectus titled "The East Africa Syndicate," the proposed plantation, which had the support of the Universities' Mission to Central Africa Archdeacon J. P. Farler of Magila in Usambara,<sup>214</sup> would grow "coffee, tea, cocoa, and other tropical products" "under European management." This served two purposes. The products would "yield very handsome profits" and also "be the means, by the very fact of its necessitating a considerable resident European staff, of pushing trade, which is the forerunner of civilisation, into that country, and through it into the interior of Africa."<sup>215</sup> The creation of a free labor economy that emphasized Christianity and free labor were crucial elements of both anti-slavery and missionary ideology. Missionaries, especially, benefited from this kind of arrangement because it created more conversions by people dependent on or wanting to enter the new economy.

Missionaries took advantage of a major regional crisis in the middle of the 1880s, an East African famine. In a pamphlet published by the CMS it was reported that "During the year 1884,

---

<sup>213</sup> David Lindsay, *Remarks on the Opening of Trade and Cultivation of Tropical Products in the Kingdom of Usabara, East Africa* (1885), 1.

<sup>214</sup> A letter from Archdeacon Farler can be found at: David Lindsay, *Remarks on the Opening of Trade and Cultivation of Tropical Products in the Kingdom of Usabara, East Africa* (1885), 4.

<sup>215</sup> David Lindsay, *Remarks on the Opening of Trade and Cultivation of Tropical Products in the Kingdom of Usabara, East Africa* (1885), 3.



a terrible famine occurred in East Africa, and occasioned a revival of the slave trade there, many of the poor natives having sold themselves for food.”<sup>216</sup> The British Navy again began to regularly drop off liberated slaves caught in the Indian Ocean to Freretown. In January 1885, the CMS reported “two hundred rescued slaves have been handed over by the British authorities to the C.M.S. Mission at Frere Town. These are the first for four or five years. The slave-trade shows signs of activity again.”<sup>217</sup> The missions also began to take in fugitive slaves. Rev. J.W. Handford recalls:

*The famine, besides teaching our people here to value more highly their privileges, has been the means in God’s hands of bringing hundreds within the sound of the Gospel, Wa-Digo, Wa-Nyika, Wa-Giriama, Wa-Taita, have come into the place by droves for no other purpose than to obtain food, and to pick up the fallen mangoes which I allow to become common property for a time, but we felt that God had directed them here for another purpose, and we gathered them together in the church, and made every possible arrangement for their instruction.*<sup>218</sup>

Augmented by a Famine Relief Fund from London, the famine was an opportunity for the missionaries. They were one of the few sources for food and shelter in the region attracting new potential converts. Freretown grew exponentially absorbing both liberated and fugitive slaves setting the stage for another conflict later in the decade.

---

<sup>216</sup> *The Mombasa Mission, East Africa, With an Account of the Church Missionary Society’s Work Among the Freed Slaves at Frere Town. Illustrate* (London: Church Missionary House, 1885), 6.

<sup>217</sup> Quote from: “The Month,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record, A Monthly Journal of Missionary Information* (January 1885), 58. See also: “The Month,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record, A Monthly Journal of Missionary Information* (February 1885), 125. “The Freed Slaves at Frere Town,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record, A Monthly Journal of Missionary Information* (March 1885), 158-167. “Frere Town: More About the Freed Slaves,” “The Month,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record, A Monthly Journal of Missionary Information* (May 1885), 374-376.

Similar reports were given by members of the Universities Mission to Central Africa. See: “The Slave Trade in East Africa,” *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission* (April 1885), 60-61. “The Slave Trade,” *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission* (June 1886), 80-81.

<sup>218</sup> *The Mombasa Mission, East Africa, With an Account of the Church Missionary Society’s Work Among the Freed Slaves at Frere Town. Illustrate* (London: Church Missionary House, 1885), 12.

During this famine, the tenuous nature of missionary expansion became evident. European imperial ambitions and rivalries opened a new chapter for Zanzibar and East Africa, one that destroyed missionary expansion, ended British commercial plans and saw moral imperialism become an ideology that overlaid geopolitical policymaking. The German explorer, Karl Peters annexed large swaths of land from the southern portions of the Sultan's domain for Germany including CMS and UMCA missions. The CMS reacted to the new European power in the region with

much anxiety...regarding the German annexations or protectorates in East Africa” and at the same time “earnestly hope[d that] the Government ha[s] been supporting the rightful position of the Sultan of Zanzibar. Mohammedan as he is, he has behaved throughout his reign with singular liberality and friendliness to England, and when we consider what obstacles might have been put in the way of the Missions having their headquarters or base at Zanzibar, we cannot fail to see how much gratitude is due to him.<sup>219</sup>

This defense of the status quo failed as Britain ignored moral imperialists and agreed to partition the Sultan's domain for geopolitical reasons. This focus on geopolitical concerns shows how moral imperialism worked as a rhetorical cover for policymaking with no real political force during the period of the partition rather than a driver of new policy like it did in the 1870s.

---

<sup>219</sup> “The Month,” *Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (September 1885), 684.

## Chapter 2

### **In the Midst of the Scramble: Moral Imperialism During the Partition of East Africa, 1884-1890**

Moral imperial organizations watched closely as Britain, Germany, and other European nations met during the Berlin Conference, 1884-1885, beginning the partition of Africa. For East Africa, the Berlin Conference began a five year period between 1885 and 1890 that saw the region split between Germany and Great Britain with Zanzibar remaining independent. As Germany and Great Britain maneuvered to claim and occupy their territories through chartered limited liability corporations and to limit each other's geographical spread, the power of moral imperialism and the voices of missionaries and abolitionists in East African policy drastically decreased in favor of geopolitical policymaking. Moral imperial organizations during this period were not united, allowing their ideology to become rhetoric that was used to validate geopolitical strategy, imperial rivalry, and policymaking. By the end of the Partition, anti-slavery rhetoric had justified an international blockade of the coast over the objections of missionaries but not abolitionists. Fugitive slaves caused the newly formed Imperial British East Africa Company to intervene in Freretown during a widescale revolt in Germany's new territories. The Partition ended in East Africa with an international conference focused on the African slave trade in Brussels in 1890.

The Berlin Conference set the rules for the Partition of Africa and the regulations for occupying African territory. This conference included representatives from Germany, Austria-

Hungary, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, the United States of America, France, Great Britain, Italy, the Netherlands, Russia, Sweden and Norway, and Turkey. The main thrust of the General Act of the Conference at Berlin was geopolitical and focused on “the essential Conditions to be observed in order that new Occupations on the coasts of the African Continent may be held to be effective.” Specifically, any of the signing nations at the Berlin Conference who claimed territory in Africa had “the obligation to insure the establishment of authority in the regions occupied by them on the coasts of the African Continent sufficient to protect existing rights, and, as the case may be, freedom of trade and of transit under the conditions agreed upon.”<sup>220</sup> This set the rules of occupation for European powers in Africa. To make a new claim, European powers had to actively occupy the land by establishing an administration, keeping order in the region, and taking steps to develop the economy and infrastructure of their new territory. This was known as the Principle of Effectivity. By maintaining a free trade agenda and setting the terms for European interventions and occupations, the Berlin Conference opened the African continent to European imperialism.

The Anti-Slavery Society sent a deputation to the Berlin Conference to defend Sultan Barghash, who had been their ally since the 1873 treaty, and to lobby against slavery, the slave trade, and on other issues. As the Conference began, the Anti-Slavery Society noted that Zanzibar did not have representation at the conference. This was disturbing for the society because of reports of an increase in the slave trade in East Africa and that “Zanzibar, alone of all the Arab powers on the east coast of Africa, has cleared herself from the stigma of the Slave-

---

<sup>220</sup> *General Act of the Conference of Berlin. Signed February 26, 1885* (C. 4739, 1886), 20. Negotiations during the Berlin Conference can be found in: *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1884-1885).

trade.”<sup>221</sup> Rev. Horace Waller was more explicit, stating, “It would seem that this prodigious straddling of compass-legs, and the pinning of various coloured flags all over the map of Africa will soon push Seyyid Barghash off the eastern edge of the continent if care is not taken and it might be graceful to ask him whether he has or has not any objection to the process even on cartridge paper and calico.”<sup>222</sup> As a member of the Anti-Slavery Society and Universities’ Mission to Central Africa, Waller’s defense of the Sultan emphasized the tenuous position of moral imperialists, especially missionaries, and their ally Sultan Barghash in East Africa. With Zanzibar being excluded from the Berlin Conference and the Sultan’s weak hold on his territories, the progress made by British over the last decade into the interior was under serious threat.

Moral imperialism was a part of the new rules guiding the occupation of Africa in the Berlin Conference’s General Act. The act included only one section specific to the slave trade and another to the protection of missionaries in the Congo Basin. The second chapter of the General Act bluntly states that the signing nations “declare that these territories may not serve as a market or means of transit for the Trade in Slaves, of whatever race they may be. Each of the

---

<sup>221</sup> Charles Allen, “Slavery and the Slave Trade: Zanzibar,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July 1884), 151.

This increase was also noted in 1884 in the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*, the *Times*, and *Proceedings of the Royal Geographic Society and Monthly Record of Geography*. See: “Increase of the Slave Trade in the Nyassa District,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (March 1884), 47. “Consul O’Neill, and the Slave Trade in Eastern Africa,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (January 1885), 261-263. “The Slave-Trade Off the East African Coast: To the Editor of *The Times*,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (January 1885), 263-264. “The Partition of Africa,” *The Times* (November 7, 1884), 2. Henry O’Neill, “Journey from Mozambique to Lakes Shirwa and Amaramba, Parts II and III,” *Proceedings of the Royal Geographic Society and Monthly Record of Geography* (December 1884), 713-741.

<sup>222</sup> “The Anti-Slavery Society and the Berlin Conference,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (December 1884), 223-225. Quote from: Horace Waller, “Zanzibar and the West African Conference,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (December 1884), 226. Horace Waller, “Zanzibar and the West African Conference: To the Editor of the Times,” *The Times* (November 28, 1884), 3. Chauncy Maples, “Zanzibar and the Conference,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (February 1885), 295-296.

Powers binds itself to employ all the means at its disposal for putting an end to this trade and for punishing those who engage in it.”<sup>223</sup> Concerning missionaries, the signers agreed to

bind themselves to watch over the preservation of the native tribes, and to care for the improvement of the conditions of their moral and material well-being, and to help in the suppressing slavery, and especially the slave trade. They shall, without distinction of creed or nation, protect and favour all religions, scientific or charitable institutions, and undertakings created and organized for the above ends, or which aim at instructing the natives and bringing home to them the blessings of civilization.<sup>224</sup>

Although the majority of the Act was focused on the rules of occupation, these two clauses, which incorporated anti-slavery measures, missionizing, and the protection of indigenous peoples into the act, made moral imperialism a part of the imperial projects of all the signing nations.

The President of the Society for German Colonization’s, Dr. Karl Peters,’ treaty signing expedition in East Africa allowed Germany to take advantage of the now signed Berlin Treaty. His actions sparked concern in Britain when the Foreign Office discovered “from a telegram in the public papers that a German vessel of war has been ordered to Zanzibar with the German Consul-General on board” causing “considerable uneasiness” “in the press of this country lest the German Government should have intentions in regard to that country which would be detrimental to the independence of the Sultan of Zanzibar and the interests of Great Britain and India.”<sup>225</sup> Pointing to these two issues, potential threats to a part of Britain’s formal and informal empire, was a warning to Germany to stay away from Britain’s claims. In response the German government replied that they were not threatening the independence of Zanzibar but rather

---

<sup>223</sup> *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1884-1885), 307.

<sup>224</sup> *Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference* (C. 4361, 1884-1885), 306.

<sup>225</sup> “No. 1. Earl Granville to Sir E. Malet,” *Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar* (C. 4609, 1886), 1.

invoking their right under to the Berlin Conference to make “Treaties for the German Empire with the Sultan of Zanzibar with as much right as was done by America in 1835, by England in 1839, by France in 1844, and by the German Hanse Towns in 1859.”<sup>226</sup> East Africa was no longer under the unquestioned hegemony of Britain. This newly emerging imperial power was dangerous to Britain’s informal empire.

British influence in East Africa was diminished when Germany claimed parts of East Africa. Following the signing of the Berlin Conference, Kaiser Wilhelm proclaimed that he was recognizing the treaties signed between Peters and “the Rulers of Usagara, Nguru, Useguha, and Ukami.” The Kaiser noted that these territories were “west of the Empire of the Sultan of Zanzibar and outside of the suzerainty (‘Oberhoheit’) of other Powers,” a statement that the Sultan of Zanzibar vigorously denied.<sup>227</sup> Germany was arguing that the land they were claiming was outside the Sultan’s domain and therefore did not fall within his or Britain’s claims. The newly emerging imperial power was supported by the treaty signers themselves, who did not recognize Zanzibar’s claims over them.<sup>228</sup> The most insulting of these denials was that of Salim-bin-Hamed the “first Plenipotentiary of His Highness the Sultan of Zanzibar in Nguru.” He declared “in the presence of a number of legal witnesses, that the Sultan of Zanzibar does not possess suzerainty or Protectorate on the continent of East Africa, especially not in Nguru and

---

<sup>226</sup> “No. 3. Count Münster to Earl Granville. – Received February 6,” *Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar* (C. 4609, 1886), 5.

<sup>227</sup> “Inclosure in No. 5. Extract from the *Reichsanzeiger*” of March 3, 1885,” *Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar* (C. 4609, 1886), 4-5.

<sup>228</sup> Peters’ treaty with Mangungu, the Sultan of Msovero, in Usagara “declared that he [Mangungu] was not in any way dependent upon the Sultan of Zanzibar, and that he even did not know of the existence of the latter,” while Sultana Mbumi of Mukondoka, also in Usagara stated “on direct inquiry, distinctly declares she is not, and never has been, dependent in any way on the Sultan of Zanzibar.” See: “Inclosure in No. 9. Treaties concluded by the Society for German Colonization with Natives on the East African Continent,” *Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar* (C. 4609, 1886), 7.

Usagara.”<sup>229</sup> Germany was able to exploit Zanzibar’s weak claims to the East African hinterland, especially by Usagara, when they accepted these treaties as legitimate and claim a piece of Africa for its empire.

Sultan Barghash immediately protested Germany’s claims, but his lack of direct control of the hinterland was used against his claims. Outraged, Barghash claimed that “these territories are ours, and we hold military stations there, and those Chiefs who proffer to cede sovereign rights to the agents of the Society have no authority to do so: those places have been ours from the time of our fathers.”<sup>230</sup> It had been known for a decade in Europe that the Sultan’s claims to these territories were often spurious and shallow. Germany used this knowledge to their advantage. They responded to Barghash by arguing that Zanzibar’s territorial claims only consisted of “about twenty-five to thirty widely distant points of that coast...while the intervening country is completely independent.”<sup>231</sup> Furthermore, they argued that the stations in the interior “are simply mercantile settlements established in the interests of the caravans, by means of which trade between Zanzibar and the interior of Africa is carried on.”<sup>232</sup> Britain had used this weakness in Zanzibar’s claimed empire the previous decade to force him to sign the 1873 treaty but never sought to claim any of the coast or hinterland, mainly because they could maintain their influence informally over Zanzibar and with it their control over the Indian

---

<sup>229</sup> “Inclosure in No. 9. Treaties concluded by the Society for German Colonization with Natives on the East African Continent,” *Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar* (C. 4609, 1886), 6-7.

<sup>230</sup> “Inclosure in No. 20. The Sultan of Zanzibar to the Emperor of Germany,” *Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar* (C. 4609, 1886), 13. The protest was also shared with Britain. “No. 47. Sir J. Kirk to Earl Granville.— (Received June 9), *Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar* (C. 4609, 1886), 28.

<sup>231</sup> “No. 25. Aide-mémoire communicated to Earl Granville by Count Münuster, May 5,” *Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar* (C. 4609, 1886), 14.

<sup>232</sup> “Inclosure in No. 59. Draft of Note from Dr. Rohlfe to the Sultan of Zanzibar,” *Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar* (C. 4609, 1886), 32.



Ocean. Germany, though, hungry for territory and an empire did not hesitate to exploit the weaknesses in Zanzibar's claimed territories.

Over the next year, Britain took steps to strengthen the Sultan's territorial claims under the new rules set by the Berlin Treaty. They sent a Vice Consul to Witu to negotiate with a rebel chief to vow his loyalty to Sultan Barghash and also sent an expedition led by a British general to Chagga and Taveta to raise the Sultan's flag over the region. These tactics were meant to bolster the Sultan's claim to the region and stop further German expansion.<sup>233</sup> Other territorial issues, at Barghash's request, were settled through arbitration between Zanzibar, Germany, Britain and France.<sup>234</sup> The reaction to Germany accepting Karl Peters' treaties as valid and claiming territory in East Africa had started an imperial race in the region. The partitioning of East Africa had begun. But, to fully secure their influence and control over their new territories under the Berlin Act, Germany and Britain had to actively possess them. German and British administration differed drastically, with a widespread violent revolt erupted in the southern coastal towns against German rule, while Britain quietly moved in to Mombasa and other northern coastal towns.

---

<sup>233</sup> Including Witu, Chagga, Lamu, and the Masai Plain. See: "Inclosure in No. 42. Ice-Consul Haggard to Sir J. Kirk," *Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar* (C. 4609, 1886), 21-25. "No. 46. Sir John Kirk to Earl Granville. – (Received June 9.)," *Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar* (C. 4609, 1886), 27-28. "No. 48. Earl Granville to Sir E. Malet," *Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar* (C. 4609, 1886), 28-29. "No 73. Sir J. Kirk to Earl Granville. – (Received July 6.)," *Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar* (C. 4609, 1886), 38-39. "No. 77. Sir J. Kirk to Earl Granville. – (Received August 3.)" *Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar* (C. 4609, 1886), 41-43.

<sup>234</sup> Barghash wrote to Bismark on June 12, 1885 saying, "I am disposed to name a Commission, and to leave the decision by arbitration as to the above-mentioned places to the English and French who have settled in those parts." "Inclosure 1 in No. 63. The Sultan of Zanzibar to Prince Bismarck," *Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar* (C. 4609, 1886), 34. See also: "No. 74. Sir J. Walsham to the Marquis of Salisbury. – (Received July 6.)," *Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar* (C. 4609, 1886), 39. Negotiations can be found in: *Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar* (C. 4609, 1886), 39-40, 47-49, 62, 65-79.

## **British Missionaries During the Partition: New Borders and New Critiques, 1885 – 1888**

Germany's entrance to East Africa created an immense amount of uncertainty and turmoil in the region. A violent revolt erupted among the inhabitants in their new territory, known as Bushiri's Uprising. This revolt put British missionaries in the now German-claimed territories in a precarious position, unreachable from Zanzibar, dependent on Bushiri for communication and protection, which he provided, and unsure of the future of their missions and their continuation of their accomplishments over the past decade. It also created a new crisis between Freretown and Mombasa and sparked an international military blockade of the East African coast against the wishes of missionaries. Unlike the 1873 treaty, moral imperialists were not united on this issue as the Anti-Slavery Society refused to openly oppose the blockade. Instead they lobbied for an international conference against African slavery that was postponed because of the blockade that finally occurred after Bushiri's Uprising ended in 1889.

The Royal Geographic Society reported on the uncertainty that followed Germany's announcement and the negotiations of the new borders. As negotiations began between the European powers and Zanzibar in 1885 over the borders of Germany's new territory, the Royal Geographic Society sought to clarify what was occurring in East Africa for interested British organizations and individuals. The *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society and Monthly Record of Geography* emphasized in April 1885 that:

We are able to give a few facts concerning the territory in East Africa which has been recently brought under the protection of Germany. This has been accomplished through the medium of the Society for German Colonisation in East Africa, which sent out a party for the purpose last autumn. The Society's chief envoy, Dr. Peters, has concluded treaties, in which no flaw can be found, with "ten independent sultans," representing Useguha, Nguru, Usagara, and Ukami.<sup>235</sup>

---

<sup>235</sup> "Geographical Notes: German Annexation in East Africa," *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society and Monthly Record of Geography*, (Apr., 1885), 239.

This lack of knowledge created an environment of uncertainty in the Foreign Office, moral imperial organizations and Zanzibar. To solve this uncertainty, Germany, Britain and the Sultan of Zanzibar formed a Boundary Commission to negotiate and clarify the new borders.

Both the Foreign Office and abolitionists valued British missionaries as informants in the region and allies against the slave trade. For the British government, missionaries were able to house an increased number of liberated slaves due to this new surge in the slave trade as Sir John Kirk retired as Consul-General of Zanzibar. There had been an increasing number of slave dhows caught in the Indian Ocean traveling to or from East Africa.<sup>236</sup> Missionaries provided the crucial service of housing the slaves freed on these ships. Abolitionists, on the other hand, valued missionaries as informants on the slave trade. The Anti-Slavery Society requested information from missionaries because they “believe[d] that many Missionaries in Africa might supply us with other similar experiences, the publication of which would be of very great use, by proving to the people of England that the Slave-trade is not, as is so often asserted, a thing of the past.” They offered free subscriptions of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* to missionaries in order to encourage them to participate in the publication.<sup>237</sup> Working from these government numbers as well as missionary observations, the Anti-Slavery Society argued in late 1886 that there was “abundant evidence of the increased vigour of the Slave-traders on the East Coast of Africa and

---

<sup>236</sup> “Annual Summary: Eastern Africa and Nyassa,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (January and February 1887), 4-5. “The East African Slave Trade,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (January and February 1887), 35-36. “Sir John Kirk, G.C.M.G.,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July & August 1887), 124. “Slave Trade Papers, 1887: Increase of Slave-Trade on the East Coast of Africa,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (September & October 1887), 147-150. “Slave-Trade Papers,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (November & December 1887), 188-191.

<sup>237</sup> “Bishop Hannington on the Slave-Trade,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (November & December 1887), 187.

in Arabia during the last year.”<sup>238</sup> Missionaries were key informants for the British about East Africa and their experiences during the partition were closely watched.

British missionaries were anxiously awaiting the results of the Boundary Commission, which was settling the boundaries between the Sultan of Zanzibar’s territory and the new German territory. The CMS was especially concerned because they had a good working relationship with the Sultan and their missions had reached a point of stability and growth – holding confirmations, ordaining Africans, and improving services and facilities in Zanzibar.<sup>239</sup>

The CMS stated:

We need scarcely say that much anxiety is felt regarding the German annexations or protectorates in East Africa. Our own information by letter is fragmentary, and there seems no advantage in publishing. We earnestly hope the Government have been supporting the rightful position of the Sultan of Zanzibar. Mohammedan as he is, he has behaved throughout his reign with singular liberality and friendliness to England and when we consider what obstacles might have been put in the way of the Missions having their headquarters or base at Zanzibar, we cannot fail to see how much gratitude is due to him.<sup>240</sup>

---

<sup>238</sup> *Further Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar [In continuation of “Africa No. 1, 1886:” C. 4609] (C. 4940, 1887), 89-181. “Slave-Trade Papers,” Anti-Slavery Reporter (October & November 1886), 112. “The Times Upon the Recently Issued Slave-Trade Papers,” Anti-Slavery Reporter (October & November 1886), 117-118. Charles H. Allen, “Slavery and the Slave-Trade,” Anti-Slavery Reporter (October & November 1886), 118-119. Charles H. Allen, “Slavery and the Slave Trade: To the Editor of the Times,” The Times (October 9, 1886), 4.*

*Central Africa, a monthly publication of the Universities’ Mission to Central Africa also reprinted excerpts from the Anti-Slavery Reporter reporting a resurgence in the Central and East African slave trade. See: “The Slave Trade,” Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission (August 1887), 121-123.*

<sup>239</sup> “Drug Fund,” *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission* (January 1885), 5. “The Windows in the Slave Market Church,” *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission* (March 1885), 37. W. H. Penney, “Need of Funds: Letter to the Local Secretaries and Other Voluntary Collectors and Workers,” *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission* (March 1885), 44-45. “Our Income for 1885,” *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission* (March 1886), 25-26. “The Month,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record, A Monthly Journal of Missionary Information* (August 1885), 618. Quote from: “East Africa: Letter from Bishop Hannington,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record, A Monthly Journal of Missionary Information* (September 1885), 678.

<sup>240</sup> “The Month,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record, A Monthly Journal of Missionary Information* (September 1885), 684.

Their success under the Sultan over the last decade was much preferable to the unknown entity that was Germany. To protect the mission stations, the Foreign Office attempted to intercede on behalf of the CMS with Germany. The Earl of Rosebery, the Foreign Office Secretary, instructed his consul in Germany to inform Bismarck of “the position of the Church Missionary Society’s Settlements within the German Protectorate... though Her Majesty’s Government are confident that the stations of the Society will be protected...they wish to be able to inform that body that they have received special assurances on the subject from the Imperial Government.”<sup>241</sup> Britain’s attempt to protect the missionaries shows the unstable position they were in as Britain, Germany, and Zanzibar attempted to define new borders for East Africa.

The Boundary Commission finished its work by the beginning of 1887, defining the new boundaries for Germany, Britain, and Zanzibar’s territories. This agreement split East Africa into three domains and leased the administration of custom duties in Pangani and Dar-es-Salaam to the German East African Company.<sup>242</sup> The Royal Geographic Society quickly published the results of this agreement and mapped the new boundaries. The Sultan’s domain was 9,190 square miles and consisted of the islands of Zanzibar, Pemba, and Mafia and a section of the coast. The German Protectorates was 25,900 square miles and consisted of Wito-land and Usagara. They also were allowed to establish protectorates over 122,800 square miles of unclaimed territory.

---

<sup>241</sup> No. 43. The Earl of Rosebery to Sir E. Malet, “*Further Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar [In continuation of “Africa No. 1, 1886:” C. 4609] (C. 4940, 1887),*” 19. The issue was brought up to Bismarck on March 27, 1886. See: No. 48. Sir E. Malet to the Earl of Rosebery. – (Received March 29), “*Further Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar [In continuation of “Africa No. 1, 1886:” C. 4609] (C. 4940, 1887),*” 21.

<sup>242</sup> Germany and England agreed to the borders in October. See: “No. 83. Count Hatzfeldt to the Earl of Iddesleigh –(Received October 29.),” *Further Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar [In continuation of “Africa No. 1, 1886:” C. 4609] (C. 4940, 1887),* 45-46. “No. 84. The Earl of Iddesleigh to Count Hatzfeldt,” *Further Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar [In continuation of “Africa No. 1, 1886:” C. 4609] (C. 4940, 1887),* 46. The Sultan recognized the treaty in December. See: “No. 118. Acting Consul-General Holmwood to the Earl of Iddesleigh. – (Received January 17, 1887),” *Further Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar [In continuation of “Africa No. 1, 1886:” C. 4609] (C. 4940, 1887),* 57-59.

The new German territory included a number of the CMS stations, including Mamboia, Mpwapwa, Uyui, and Masala, and the Universities Mission in U-Sambara leaving only the missions of Mombasa, Taita and Chigga in British control.<sup>243</sup> Finally, Britain was allowed to establish protectorates over 72,000 square miles. An accompanying map of the new borders was reprinted in the CMS's *Intelligencer*.<sup>244</sup> These new borders were approved without consulting the peoples living in them, whether Europeans, Africans, and Swahilis.

As these borders were settled, missionaries faced a new threat because Germany planned to send its own missionaries to East Africa, threatening the British missionaries' existence in the region. The Royal Geographic Society noted that Germany was introducing German missionary societies into East Africa:

A German Missionary Society for Eastern Africa was established at Hersbruck in Bavaria, in January 1886, and has already despatched two missionaries, who have for the present taken up their quarters near Rabbai, but will ultimately penetrate into Ukamba. Another missionary society was established at Berlin, by members of the Company, and will confine its operations to the German territories. A third society was founded at Neunkirchen. These three societies have already despatched seven missionaries and three ladies to Zanzibar.<sup>245</sup>

The *Church Missionary Intelligencer* also reported on the creation of these three missionary societies and that French Catholic missionaries in the region were going to be replaced by men trained at the College of Richenbach.<sup>246</sup> This was the introduction of imperial rivalry among

---

<sup>243</sup> "The Month," *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (February 1887), 115.

<sup>244</sup> "Recent Changes in the Map of East Africa," *Proceedings of the Royal Geographic Society and Monthly Record of Geography* (Aug., 1887), 490-496. "Recent Changes in the Map of East Africa (From the Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society, Aug. 1887)," *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (October 1887), 614-618. Map appears opposite page 616.

<sup>245</sup> "Recent Changes in the Map of East Africa," *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society and Monthly Record of Geography* Vol. 9, No. 8 (Aug., 1887), 496.

<sup>246</sup> Robert Cust, "The Month," *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (May 1887), 312-314.

missionaries in East Africa, with state supported missionary organizations being introduced. Missionaries, as part of the imperial project, were key for future development because, in addition to conversion, they engaged in educational activities, teaching their native language to their parishioners and students. Germany's move to introduce their own missionaries and replace non-German missionaries was their attempt to increase their claims to the region.

This attack on missionaries was not limited to competition in East Africa. The CMS and other British missionary societies also faced serious critique of the traditional British conversion and education methodologies in missions. Dr. Oscar Lenz, who had returned from an expedition to East Africa funded by Kaiser Wilhelm II, had "no favorable estimate of the results achieved by British missionaries in Africa." His opinion was that "The negroes who are taught by [British] missionaries to read and write do not as a rule turn out well. They abandon their former pursuits and become idle mendicants, unwilling to work, and not to be trusted in any civilized employment."<sup>247</sup> Both the CMS and the Universities' Mission to Central Africa disagreed vehemently with Dr. Lenz over his characterization of the effectiveness of their work.<sup>248</sup> Lenz's critique was directly attacking a method of conversion that was falling out of favor in Britain as racist beliefs about the intellectual inferiority of non-Europeans became prevalent. The conversion and missionary methods advocated for by Frere and enacted in Freetown focused on industrial training rather than intellectual training. The downgrading of African abilities and the adoption and spread of racist beliefs based on current scientific theory was repeated again and again during the pre-colonial era.

---

<sup>247</sup> "Dr. Lenz's Journey Across Africa," *The Times* (April 13, 1887), 4, 9. Quote from 9.

<sup>248</sup> "The Month," *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (October 1887), 642-643. J.P. Farler, "Dr. Lenz and the Missionaries: To the Editor of the Times," *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission* (September 1887), 137-141. J.P. Farler, "Dr. Lenz and the Missionaries: To the Editor of the Times," *The Times* (August 24, 1887), 14.

Lenz's attacks against British missionizing were mirrored by a radical critique from within the Anglican Church. Isaac Taylor, the Canon of York, argued at the 1887 Wolverhampton Church Congress that "Islam as a missionary religion is more successful than Christianity." Repeating contemporary classic racist beliefs that were currently supported by Social Darwinism and other "scientific" theories, he explained this success of Islam and failure of Christianity because Christianity was too advanced for Africans and Asians, who were lower and less "civilized" than Europeans.<sup>249</sup> Taylor focused on the CMS, specifically questioning their funding and effectiveness.<sup>250</sup> These arguments against British missionaries struck at the heart of their work in East Africa. The controversy over Taylor's statements at the conference and follow up articles and letters in the British press lasted for several years, hardening anti-Islamic sentiment among abolitionists and missionaries. This anti-Islamic sentiment helped to sever the alliance that existed between the Sultan of Zanzibar, during Barghash's reign, and moral imperialists.

---

<sup>249</sup> "The Church Congress, *The Times* (October 8, 1887), 7. Isaac Taylor, "Islam. To the Editor of the Times," *The Times* (October, 1887), 4. "The Progress of Islam – II," *The Times* (October 31, 1887), 13. "The Progress of Islam – III," *The Times* (November 7, 1887), 13. "The Progress of Islam – IV," *The Times* (November 17, 1887), 13. Eugene Stock, "The Church Missionary Society," *The Times* (November 30, 1887), 7. Isaac Taylor, "The Church Missionary Society," *The Times* (December 27, 1887), 7. Eugene Stock, "The Church Missionary Society," *The Times* (December 28, 1887), 6. "Islam or Christianity," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. & Feb., 1888), 23.

For a summary of the Canon Taylor controversy see: Thomas Prasch, "Which God for Africa: The Islamic-Christian Missionary Debate in Late-Victorian England," *Victorian Studies* (Autumn 1989), 51-73.

<sup>250</sup> "The Month," *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (December 1887), 761-763. "Are Missions a Great Failure?" *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (November 1888), 681-699. Eugene Stock, "The Church Missionary Society's Financial Accounts: A Reply," *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (December 1888), 745-751. "The C.M.S. and its Critics," *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (January 1889), 41-44. "Canon Taylor's Critics," *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (February 1889), 107-109.

The Universities Mission to Central Africa also responded to Canon Taylor. See: "Christian Praise of Mohammedism," *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission* (November 1887), 153-156. "Archdeacon Farler's Reply to Canon Taylor," "Arab Attack on the Scotch Lakes Company: Severe Fighting Near Lake Nyassa," *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission* (April, 1888), 51-53.



Missionary worries during the first years of German involvement in East Africa were minute compared to their troubles during a widespread insurrection against German rule the next year. A month after the German East African Association entered the region, the independent towns and peoples of the coast revolted against their new rulers. This increased the strain on the Foreign Office and the newly chartered Imperial British East Africa Company as they began administering the Sultan of Zanzibar's northern mainland territory after the death of Sultan Barghash on March 27, 1888.<sup>251</sup> English missionaries in the new German territories, especially those of the Universities' Mission to Central Africa, were literally caught in the middle between their African and Swahili neighbors, Germany, and the Foreign Office in a battlefield scenario.

### **Missionaries in the Middle: Chartered Companies, the Universities' Mission to Central Africa, and the Church Missionary Society During Bushiri's Uprising, 1888**

The beginning of the reign of Barghash's successor, Sultan Khalifa, was marked by the first steps towards European colonial rule. Both Germany and Britain introduced European chartered companies to the region to fulfill the requirements of possession under the Berlin Conference in the Sultan's coastal claims east of their new territories defined by the Boundary Commission. This effectively removed the Sultan as the administration of the region. The German East Africa Company and Imperial British East Africa Company allowed the imperial states to increase their claimed territories without expending money from their treasury. The entrance of the German East Africa Company sparked a violent revolt, known as Bushiri's Uprising, during the end of the caravan season and the festival season on the East African coast

---

<sup>251</sup> *Further Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar (C. 5315, 1888)*, 133-135. "The Death of Barghash bin Said," *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission* (May 1888), 63-66.

placing British missionaries in German and British territories in danger.<sup>252</sup> This revolt revived tensions in Mombasa over the issue of missionaries harboring fugitive slaves as the Imperial British East Africa Company began administering Zanzibar's northern mainland territories.

The Royal Charter Company was an imperial tool with its roots in mercantilism that had been resurrected in the nineteenth century after the Indian Mutiny. The perfect example of gentlemanly capitalism, these companies financed imperial and capitalist schemes across the globe.<sup>253</sup> Original royal charter companies from the seventeenth century include the British East India Company, Royal African Company, and Hudson's Bay Company. By the nineteenth century, using a royal chartered company in Africa rather than directly interceding in new territories had a number of benefits for the British Empire, including the fact that creating new colonies and protectorates had fallen out of favor among the British because of financial reasons as well as fears of rebellion after the Indian Mutiny in 1857. After the Berlin Conference, Britain needed a new mechanism of imperialism to occupy its new imperial claims. Having a royal chartered company administer a territory in Britain's informal empire allowed the British increase their influence without draining the Treasury or taking direct control over non-Europeans who might in the future rebel against colonial rule. The Imperial British East Africa Company, along with the Royal Niger Company which received its charter in 1886 and the

---

<sup>252</sup> Jonathon Glassman, *Feasts and Riot: Revelry, Rebellion, and Popular Consciousness on the Swahili Coast, 1856-1888* (London: James Currey, 1995).

This violent resistance fits within the mold of the anti-colonial uprisings that occurred throughout Africa in the late nineteenth century. See: Bruce Vandervort, *Wars of Imperial Conquest in Africa 1830-1914* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998).

<sup>253</sup> For a history of the role of gentleman capitalists or service sector financial institutions in British imperial history see: P.J. Cain and A.G. Hopkins, *British Imperialism: Innovation and Expansion, 1688-1914* (London: Longman, 1993).

British South Africa Company which received its charter in 1889, was an experiment in imperialism, the company as an administrative unit rather than the European nation-state.<sup>254</sup>

The British Imperial East Africa Company differed from other British African chartered companies because it was also an agent of moral imperialism.<sup>255</sup> The company was originally formed by Sir William Mackinnon as the British East Africa Association. He was the owner of the Mackinnon Group, an interconnected network of trading partnerships, private, limited liability shipping companies, and manufacturing firms that controlled the most tonnage on the Indian Ocean.<sup>256</sup> Royally chartered in 1888, under Mackinnon's presidency, the company's board of directors included a number of moral imperial notables like former Zanzibar Consul-General Sir John Kirk. The company's charter also included abolitionist tenets and clauses. Specifically, it stated that "The Company shall, to the best of its power, discourage, and, so far as may be practicable, and as may be consistent with existing treaties between non-African Powers and Zanzibar, abolish by degrees any system of Slave-trade or domestic servitude in the company's territories."<sup>257</sup> This clause, along with the moral imperialists on its board of directors,

---

<sup>254</sup> For histories of 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> century British chartered companies see: E. E. Rich, *The history of the Hudson's Bay Company, 1670-1870* (London, Hudson's Bay Record Society, 1958-59). H.V. Bowen, *The Business of Empire: The East India Company and Imperial Britain, 1756-1833* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006). Robin Law, *The English in West Africa, 1691-1699* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

Other royal companies founded to develop Africa around the same time as the Imperial British East Africa Company include the Royal Niger Company and the British South Africa Company. See: Geoffrey L Baker, *Trade winds on the Niger: the saga of the Royal Niger Company, 1830-1971* (London: Radcliffe Press, 1996). Arthur Keppel-Jones, *Rhodes and Rhodesia: the white conquest of Zimbabwe, 1884-1902* (Kingston [Ont.] : McGill-Queen's University Press, 1987).

<sup>255</sup> See: Arthur Silva White, "Chartered Government in Africa," *The Nineteenth Century* (January 1894), 129.

<sup>256</sup> John S. Galbraith, *Mackinnon and East Africa 1878-1895: A Study in the 'New Imperialism'* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 126-131. J. Forbes Munro, "Shipping Subsidies and Railway Guarantees: William Mackinnon, Eastern Africa and the Indian Ocean, 1860-93," *The Journal of African History*, Vol. 28, No. 2 (1987), 209-230.

<sup>257</sup> The charter can be found in: "Inclosure in No. 52. Charter," *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 40-45. The quote can be found in: *Ibid*, 42.

made the Imperial British East Africa Company a vehicle of moral imperialism in addition to being a for-profit chartered company.

Both Germany and Britain pressured Sultan Khalifa to accept concessions that gave them administrative power on the East African coast during the first days of his reign. At Khalifa's first public reception the new British Consul-General C. B. Euan-Smith met the new Sultan. He was accompanied by representatives from all the British factions involved in East Africa including his own staff, members of the British military, clergymen from the Universities' Mission to Central Africa, and the leaders of the British Indian community at Zanzibar.<sup>258</sup> This symbolized to both Khalifa and the Zanzibar establishment of Britain's extensive representation and economic, military and economic role in East Africa. It represented the old status quo that Germany had changed. Within the first two weeks of Khalifa's reign the Germans were pressing the Sultan to accept a new treaty, the East African Concession, which gave Germany control of the administration of the Sultan's territory adjacent to theirs, including Pangani, Bagomoyo and Dar-es-Salaam.<sup>259</sup> The Concession specified that the German East African Association was granted "all the power which he [the Sultan] possesses on the mainland on the Mrima, and in all his territories and dependencies south of the Uмба River, the whole administration of which he concedes and places in their hands to be carried out in His Highness' name and under his flag and subject to His Highness' sovereign rights."<sup>260</sup> This included appointing commissioners and

---

<sup>258</sup> "No. 7. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury. – (Received May 7)," *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 5.

The CMS was not present at this meeting because they did not have a mission station on Zanzibar.

<sup>259</sup> "No. 6. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury. – (Received May 7)," *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 4.

<sup>260</sup> "Inclosure in No. 17. English Text of German Concession," *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 12-13.

judges with the Sultan's approval, building infrastructure, regulating trade, issuing currency, and collecting taxes and customs. In exchange, Germany guaranteed the Sultan an income and shares in the German East African Association. Khalifa signed the Concession on April 28, 1888, while Euan-Smith was away. The Sultan's weak claims of sovereignty over towns on the East African coast was now in the hands of Germany.

Euan-Smith was concerned about the repercussions of Zanzibar's concession with Germany. He cautioned Khalifa that "he will have at the outset [of the German administration] to exercise much patience and forbearance in dealing with the many representations and misrepresentations that will certainly be made to him by his subjects on the coast."<sup>261</sup> Euan-Smith also offered a similar warning to Vohsen, the new Director-in-Chief of the German Association, asking him "to do his best to minimize the chances of...friction and misunderstanding... [during] the transfer of the Customs administration from native to German management."<sup>262</sup> Britain was worried about the dangers of an inexperienced German administration to the region. These worries were justified. Before the transfer of power, Vohsen explained to a Universities' Mission to Central Africa reverend that "as his Association [the German Company] were anxious to promote the use of the German language in their territory, it might be necessary in time for them, as he expressed it, to buy us out, and that we should move elsewhere," especially the Universities' Mission Magila stations.<sup>263</sup> When Euan-Smith interceded on the Universities' Mission behalf, Vohsen assured him that "the tenour of his

---

<sup>261</sup> "No. 17. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury. – ( Received June 4.)," *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 12.

<sup>262</sup> "No. 25. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury. – (Received June 30)," *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 21.

<sup>263</sup> "Inclosure 1 in No. 26. The Rev. H. Clarke to Colonel Euan-Smith," *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 22.

remarks had evidently been misunderstood” and were just his personal views”<sup>264</sup> not the views of the German company. This exchange, however, did not bode well for a smooth administrative transition or for the British missionaries with stations in the new German territory. The misunderstandings between the German company and UMCA foreshadowed a region-wide conflict between German officials, town mayors or Walis, and the independent-minded coastal residents.

Administrative and cultural missteps by German company officials caused coastal inhabitants to revolt against their new rulers during the festival season, when the towns were traditionally flooded with visitors due to a series of annual festivals and the end of the caravan season. This revolt was not abnormal since the independent coastal towns had regularly rebelled against the Sultan’s rule the previous century. Two towns in particular, Bagamoyo and Pangani, were centers of the uprising. In Bagamoyo, residents violently rebelled against German rule when the German East Africa Association was raised above the Sultan’s flag, chasing the German administrators out of the town. In response, the town was bombarded by German ships. In Pangani, debates over the Sultan’s flag as well as religious issues sparked the violence. While the German East African Association officer was looking for the Wali to demand the Sultan’s flag, he, along with a hundred troops entered a mosque during prayers on a festival day without removing their shoes. Adding insult to injury, the troops’ canines also entered the mosque, a giant insult in the Islamic religion. The result was a widespread insurrection among the independent coastal tribes led by a Pangani Swahili aristocrat, Bushiri-bin-Salim. Bushiri condemned not only the Germans but also Zanzibari rule and forced the German company out of

---

<sup>264</sup> “Inclosure 2 in No. 26. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Rev. H. Clarke,” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 22-23.

the East African coastal towns.<sup>265</sup> The gap between the Sultan's authority and his power on the coast remained continued with a different authority, Germany.

Bushiri's communications to the British Consul-General focused on the safety of missionaries and British travelers in the German company's new territories. On September 26, 1888 one of the Sultan's officials was sent travel to the Universities' Mission to Central Africa Magila Station, located inland from the coast and bring any missionary who wished to leave the station back to Zanzibar. Arriving at Pangani, the official's ship was fired upon by Bushiri's men before he was allowed to land and explain his mission. He was not allowed to continue on to Magila but was given a letter addressed from Bushiri to Euan-Smith. Bushiri guaranteed to the British that "there has happened nothing, which is bad, between your people at Magila and us... Those who are your friends are also friends of us." Bushiri then offered to protect the missionaries by sending his own people to Magila and escorting them to Pangani to sail for Zanzibar. He also insured their safety and safe passage. Bushiri was willing to protect the missionaries, showing that he had a sophisticated view of the politics of the region, separating British, German, and Zanzibar's influence. He reassured Euan-Smith that "You should not be in fear for all your subjects (whether they are) Englishmen, Mahommedans, or Banians; they will receive no bad treatment, but will be treated just as they were done before. There has happened no unpleasant thing between you and us, but there is a dispute between us and the Germans who came to take our places."<sup>266</sup> He was attempting to split the Europeans into a good camp in Britain

---

<sup>265</sup> The uprising was thoroughly chronicled along with its social and political roots in: Jonathon Glassman, *Feasts and Riot: Revelry, Rebellion, and Popular Consciousness on the Swahili Coast, 1856-1888* (London: James Currey, 1995), 199-225. See also: Norman Robert Bennett, *Arab Versus European: Diplomacy and War in Nineteenth-Century East Central Africa* (New York: Africana Publishing Company, New York, 1984), 144-151. J.A. Kieran, "Abushiri and the Germans," *Hadith* (1970) 157-201.

<sup>266</sup> "Inclosure 1 in No. 103. Bushir-bin-Salim of Pangani to Colonel Euan-Smith," *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 77.

and a bad camp in Germany. His words were corroborated by his actions. He went out of his way to welcome and protect British travelers. This welcome was not granted to Germans. Another British traveler affiliated with the CMS recalled serious anti-German sentiments by inhabitants as she traveled through German East Africa.<sup>267</sup>

The positive treatment of missionaries by Bushiri did not stop tensions from arising in Mombasa and Freretown, especially considering the history of the town and mission station as a center for conflicts over slavery. Reverend Price, who had just returned to Freretown because of the crisis, commented on September 29, 1888 that “The news is very bad from the south. All the country is in ferment. War is in the air. We know not what a day may bring forth. You have probably heard by cable of the state of things, and will not forget us in your prayers. I am wiring to you to stop sending out any more missionaries, male or female, for the present.”<sup>268</sup> Tensions were rising again against Freretown and Price was well aware of the threat to the station. He took steps to protect his staff at Freretown. “In view of the possibility of a sudden outbreak and attack, I have warned Capt. Wilson to keep the *Henry Wright* in good trim, and to be ready to get up

---

<sup>267</sup> One CMS missionary commented, “When we arrived at Bushiri’s camp, I think the greater part of his army turned out to meet us and fired over 1000 volleys, some over the hammock and some under. Bushiri showed us every attention.” Quote from: “Eastern Equatorial Africa: The Missionaries at Mpwapwa and Mamboia – Mr. And Mrs. Roscoe’s Journey to the Coast,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (July 1889), 436. For another perspective of the encounter see: “The Month,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (September 1889), 572-573. See also: “East Africa,” *The Times* (December 4, 1888), 5. See also: “Bishop Smythies Among the East African Insurgents,” *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission* (January 1889), 17-21. “Editorial,” *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission* (January 1889), 1-2. “Through German East Africa: The Journey of Dr. and Mrs. Pruen and Mr. Ashe from Mamboya to Zanzibar – Perils, Anxieties, and Deliverance. Journal of Mrs. Pruen,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (February 1889), 99.

<sup>268</sup> Quote from: “News from East Africa,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (December 1888), 785. For Price’s return to Freretown see: Gerald H. Anderson, *Biographical dictionary of Christian Missions* (New York: Macmillan Reference USA, 1998), 548-549.



steam on the shortest notice. She may at least afford us a refuge for the ladies.”<sup>269</sup> The uprising’s repercussions was reverberating north to Mombasa.

Unlike Germany’s administrative takeover of their coastal territories, the transfer of Sultan Khalifa’s administrative powers to the Imperial British East African Company was cautious even though Zanzibar residents were optimistic. A month into the uprising, Sultan Khalifa signed an agreement with the Imperial British East Africa Company through George Mackenzie, its managing director of the Imperial British East Africa Company on October 9, 1888.<sup>270</sup> Repeating Bushiri, Zanzibar’s residents told Mackenzie that the conflict was because of the German’s “unnecessary interference with long-established customs of the people.”<sup>271</sup> Germany was clearly disliked within Zanzibar and blamed for the uprising. The residents welcomed Mackenzie and “he was everywhere met cordially by the natives, who expressed confidence that the English company would respect the religious rites and prejudices of the people and uphold the ancient flag and authority of their Sultan at the ports conceded.”<sup>272</sup> Britain’s history of limited interference in the daily running of the region and respect for local laws provided a direct contrast to German rule. In comparing the two European powers, residents

---

<sup>269</sup> “News from East Africa,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (December 1888), 786.

<sup>270</sup> “No. 86. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury. – (Received October 9, 4:45 P.M.),” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 58. A copy of the Concession can be found at: “Inclosure in No. 132. Concession given by His Highness to Sayyid Khalifa, Sultan of Zanzibar, to the Imperial British East Africa Company,” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 90-94.

A copy of the concession agreements between the IBEAC and the Sultan can be found in: P. L. McDermott, “Appendix I: Concession Given by the Sultan of Zanzibar to the British East African Association; Concession of 9<sup>th</sup> of October 1888,” *British East Africa of IBEA: A History of the Formation and Work of THE IMPERIAL BRITISH EAST AFRICA COMPANY, compiled with the authority of the directors from official documents and records of the company* (London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1893), 263-275.

“The British East African Company. From “The Times,”” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (September. & Oct. 1888), 170.

<sup>271</sup> “The Zanzibar Coast,” *The Times* (October 8, 1888), 5.

<sup>272</sup> “The Zanzibar Coast,” *The Times* (October 8, 1888), 5.

clearly viewed Britain more favorably. Two days after Mackenzie's arrival the concession was signed between the company and the Sultan and he left for Mombasa.<sup>273</sup>

In Mombasa steps were taken to insure that the transfer of power was as peaceful as possible. At Euan-Smith's request the "Sultan has sent official with letters explaining to all coast officials, tribes, and communities objects of the British Company. [sic]" While this was being done the administration of the region now legally under the Imperial British East Africa Company's administration remained "absolutely untouched and unchanged" and Euan-Smith assured the Foreign Office that "The Company's flag will not be hoisted."<sup>274</sup> About a week after the concession was signed reports of "fighting between native inhabitants and Zanzibar porters engaged for the British Company's caravan" reached Euan-Smith. This spot of violence was quickly quelled.<sup>275</sup> Any fighting in Mombasa was worrying for the Foreign Office and Imperial British East Africa Company. Euan-Smith determined that the uprising was caused by "a feeling of hostility to the Company, chiefly on slavery grounds" rather than the regular conflict between Mombasa residents and porters at the end of the caravan season.<sup>276</sup> This event was a wake up call for Mackenzie and the new company. Mackenzie wrote in a letter to Euan-Smith that "It would

---

<sup>273</sup> "The British East African Association," *The Times* (October 10, 1888), 5. "The Zanzibar Coast," *The Times* (October 11, 1888), 5. The October 10 Times article was reprinted in "British East Africa," *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (October 1888), 653-659.

<sup>274</sup> "No. 86. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury -(Received October 9, 4:45P.M.)," *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 58.

<sup>275</sup> "No. 93. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury -(Received October 21, 7P.M.)," *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 60.

<sup>276</sup> "Inclosure 1 in No. 146. Rear-Admiral Fremantle to Admiralty," *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 100.

take very little to set the whole thing [Mombasa] ablaze.”<sup>277</sup> The decade of conflict between missionaries and slaveowners in Mombasa was about to come to a head.

Tensions in Mombasa had again reached a dangerous point because of missionaries harboring fugitive slaves. Reverend Price, who originally refused to work with fugitive slaves when forming Freretown, reacted quickly to the tension, meeting with “all the principal Sheikhs of Mombasa yesterday in full baraza, the Wali, Hamid bin Sulieman, uncle to the Sultan, Mr. Mackenzie, and Gen. Matthews being present.”<sup>278</sup> He invited Mackenzie, Matthews, and “as many Arabs as might wish to accompany us to identify and claim their slaves.”<sup>279</sup> The solution of working within the local laws and customs regarding slavery, which had worked the previous decade, was now impossible because of the sheer number of runaway slaves now being harbored at the mission stations. The result of this visit surprised Price, as three to four hundred runaway slaves were identified and refused to return to their former masters. Price noted that “Not a few have been there for several years, baptized, confirmed by Bishop Parker, living decent Christian lives, independent, with their own houses and shambas, wives and children. We had no suspicion of their being runaways.”<sup>280</sup> They were a part of the mission community. The former slaves were described as being “in hot blood, and desperate, and determined to fight for their liberty; and many of the freed slaves will join them...It is with them a matter of life and death.”<sup>281</sup> This

---

<sup>277</sup> The letter was quoted by Euan-Smith in: “No. 135. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury. – (Received November 19),” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 96.

<sup>278</sup> “News from East Africa,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (December 1888), 786.

<sup>279</sup> “News from East Africa,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (December 1888), 786-787.

<sup>280</sup> “News from East Africa,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (December 1888), 787.

<sup>281</sup> “News from East Africa,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (December 1888), 787.

situation that was tenser than the conflicts of the 1870s because the runaway slaves had something to lose.

Mackenzie's solution to this volatile situation was remarkably simple and confirmed the Imperial British East Africa Company's moral imperial leanings. For the runaway "slaves whose masters are resident at coast ports within the Company's Concession" Mackenzie negotiated their "unconditional freedom" in exchange for an "average payment of 25 dollars a head" to their masters.<sup>282</sup> This solution used a similar methodology as Price and the Foreign Office used the previous decade because it worked within the laws of the region. It is not surprising that Price wrote approvingly about the solution in his November 28, 1889 letter to the CMS in British. He said "The Runaway slave question is, I hope, finally disposed of. Mr. Mackenzie agreed with the Arabs to ransom all found in the Mission stations of Rabai, Ribe, and Jomvu at \$25 per head. In all 450 were claimed and paid for, the whole cost to the company being 2500*l*."<sup>283</sup> At home the CMS thanked Mackenzie in their monthly journal saying "It was an intense relief to read the *Times* telegrams from Zanzibar stating that Mr. Mackenzie, the chief agent of the Company, had determined to pay compensation to the slave-owners, and so secure *de jure* to the poor people at the Mission stations the freedom they have long enjoyed *de facto*" and according to Euan-Smith, the overall effect of Mackenzie's solution "rendered the British Company...extremely popular."<sup>284</sup> This introduction to Mombasa reverberated popularly with the Foreign Office, CMS,

---

<sup>282</sup> "No. 35. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received January 14, 1889)," *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5822, 1889), 21.

<sup>283</sup> "East Africa. Letters from the Rev. W. S. Price," *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (February 1889), 113.

<sup>284</sup> "The Month," *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (January 1889), 50. Quote from: "No. 35. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received January 14, 1889)," *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5822, 1889), 21.

and Mombasa's residents. Without the capital of the Company, this solution would have been impossible.

The Foreign Office also had a role to play in Mackenzie's fugitive slave solution. They issued the papers that legally freed the runaway slaves. For slaves who originally came from outside Mombasa, Euan-Smith issued five hundred and fifty certificates "allowing them to continue in the Mission station where he has been found until he is claimed, and his case can be inquired into."<sup>285</sup> For those from Mombasa, nine hundred and fifty certificates were given to runaway slaves "at the Church Missionary station at Rabai on the 1st January, 1899, amid a very large concourse of the Arab and native population, and was accompanied by signs of general rejoicing" according to the Consul-General.<sup>286</sup> Euan-Smith praised Mackenzie and his solution, stating "The effect that it has had in conciliating the people, and especially the Arabs, and in inclining them to welcome favourably any future proposals that may be put forward on behalf of a Company that has commenced its career with an act of such unparalleled generosity and philanthropy, cannot be overrated."<sup>287</sup> After the ceremony, Price sent a telegram that read "Grand New Year's Day at Rabai; 900 slaves made free by Mr. Mackenzie. Great rejoicings. All send best thanks to Board of Directors, and pray God to prosper Company's work in East Africa."<sup>288</sup> These actions stabilized the region, appeasing all parties, and ending the threat of an insurrection like what was happening in the German territories.

---

<sup>285</sup> "No. 35. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received January 14, 1889)," *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5822, 1889), 21.

<sup>286</sup> "No. 54. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received February 11, 1889)," *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5822, 1889), 35.

<sup>287</sup> "No. 54. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received February 11, 1889)," *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5822, 1889), 35.

<sup>288</sup> "Letters from East Africa," *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (March 1889), 173.

The Foreign Office and Imperial British East Africa Company pressured missionaries after the ceremony to no longer accept runaway slaves and recognize the rule of secular law. Euan-Smith's was instructed "to warn all Mission Societies against harbouring runaway slaves without any exception."<sup>289</sup> Three days after the certificate ceremony Mackenzie wrote a letter to the missionaries in the region stating that he considered the fugitive slave issue closed and that "in the first few instances now occurring of runaway slaves entering your stations, you were to have them arrested and sent down to the Lewali here" and that he would continually inspect the mission stations for new fugitive slaves to "check the persistent breaking of the law which I consider the action of the past."<sup>290</sup> These men were bluntly telling the missionaries that they had to accept the rule of law or face the consequences. The missionaries could no longer ignore and disregard Mombasa's legal system. After two newly escaped slaves were found at Freretown, Euan-Smith privately warned the mission's superintendent that "if the missionaries persist in maintaining this system, which has existed for so many years past, it will be impossible to answer either for their own personal safety, or indeed, for the continuance of the Mission stations."<sup>291</sup> Neither the Company or the Foreign Office would allow the missionaries to cause a new uprising by upsetting their neighbors by harboring fugitive slaves.

The only organization that disagreed with Mackenzie's solution was the Anti-Slavery Society. They were unsatisfied with the Company's pragmatism towards slavery in the new territory and bluntly stated:

---

<sup>289</sup> Julian Pauncefote, "No. 46. Foreign Office to Colonel Euan-Smith," *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5822, 1889), 33.

<sup>290</sup> "Inclosure in No. 54. Mr. Mackenzie to Rev. Mr. Carthew and others," *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5822, 1889), 37.

<sup>291</sup> "No. 114. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury -(Received April 13) ," *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5822, 1889), 71.

Slave-trading, of course, will be prohibited; but it must be remembered that it is the institution of Slavery that produces and supports the Slave-trader and the Slave-raider. We think that the Company ought to be required to avoid any recognition of the Status of Slavery, as has been done by us in India and on the Gold Coast, with most beneficial results. This measure would not disturb existing arrangements but would enable the Slaves to emancipate themselves, as is now successfully done in Egypt.<sup>292</sup>

Mackenzie's solution was the exact opposite, recognizing slavery by paying concessions to slave owners and adapting to local conditions and customs. Mackenzie rejected the Anti-Slavery Society's ideologically pure approach when he came home to Britain in 1889. During the first general meeting of the Imperial British East Africa Company, he condemned the tone of abolitionists and others towards abolitionists, specifically "statements [of bloodthirsty Arabs that] were contrary to his experience." He was contrasting his fifteen years of experience working in Islamic lands with the anti-Arab sentiment of those in Britain. He also advocated for developing trading relationships that were mutually beneficial for the British and Arabs and continuing the policies he set in Mombasa regarding slavery.<sup>293</sup> Mackenzie's position, created outside Britain, existed within the region's laws and mores. From Britain, the Anti-Slavery Society was free to criticize the practical aspects of Mackenzie's solution and use inflammatory racist rhetoric against Islamic and Arab people with no repercussions.

South of the British territories, Bushiri's Uprising drastic escalation also impacted the missionaries of the Universities' Mission to Central Africa. Consul-General Euan-Smith

---

<sup>292</sup> "British East African Company," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Sept. & Oct., 1888), 158-159.

<sup>293</sup> "Imperial British East Africa Company," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (May & June, 1889), 135-138. Quote from 136.

During the 1890 meeting the Company stated that over 4,000 slaves were freed through their methods greatly outpacing the British cruisers average release of 150 slaves per year. The Imperial British East Africa Company and Runaway Slaves," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July & Aug, 1890), 179-180. "The British East Africa Company," *The Times* (July 14, 1890), 4.

recommended that the “Universities Mission be urged strongly to withdraw all their staff now on mainland, specially laymen and ladies, to Zanzibar.”<sup>294</sup> Bishop Smythies of the Universities Mission went to Magila via Pangani in order to give the missionaries the opportunity to evacuate. Smythies intended to remain, along with a few missionaries, at the station. Euan-Smith also “sent escort from the Sultan for four members of the Church Missionary Society who are said to be in imminent danger 90 miles inland from the Saadani district.”<sup>295</sup> The area was no longer considered safe. Euan-Smith attempted to convince Bishop Smythies to change his mind and abandon Magila. He

represented to him [Smythies] that considerations connected with his own safety and that of his brethren might at any time seriously hamper the naval operations on the coast, and that should there be an outburst of feeling hostile to Europeans, the presence of Englishmen at Magila might even place in jeopardy the lives and property of the surrounding tribes who were friendly to the Mission, and would feel bound to protect them.<sup>296</sup>

Euan-Smith’s arguments, which the Bishop acknowledged were sound, were “not able to shake his [Smythies] determination.”<sup>297</sup> Unlike Mombasa, where missionaries acquiesced to the plans of British administrators, Smythies’ was willing to enter into a lawless region to continue his Christian mission.

The law in Germany’s claimed territories was being set by the region’s inhabitants. As he left Zanzibar for the East African coast on November 11, 1888, Bishop Smythies was attacked

---

<sup>294</sup> “No. 102. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury. –(Received October 27, 2:30 P.M.),” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 75.

<sup>295</sup> “No. 123. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury. –(Received November 10, 6 P.M.),” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 85.

<sup>296</sup> “No. 8. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury. –(Received December 17),” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5822, 1889), 3.

<sup>297</sup> “No. 8. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury. –(Received December 17),” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5822, 1889), 3.



by insurgents but was protected by Bushiri. Fired on outside of Pangani, the officials sent with the Sultan were unable to protect him. Rather he was “personally and vigorously assisted by the principle Arab ringleader, named Bushiri.”<sup>298</sup> Bushiri “forced the reluctant coast tribes to allow the members of the Mission to pass through their midst unharmed.”<sup>299</sup> He protected the Bishop of the Universities’ Mission to Central Africa and stopped a riotous crowd by telling them that they had to kill him to reach the Bishop.<sup>300</sup> Euan-Smith attributed Bushiri’s behavior to his guarantee “that the Magila Mission should be protected, and he [Bushiri] was determined to make good his promise.”<sup>301</sup> Only eight of the Englishmen working at Magila chose to return to Zanzibar (five women and three men). However, Bushiri’s good conduct did not matter and in the next section we will see how the European powers worked together to create an international blockade and end the uprising.

### **Finishing the Scramble: A Blockade, Moral Imperial Division, and the End of Bushiri’s Uprising, 1889-1890**

The European response to Bushiri’s Uprising was twofold: an international blockade of the East African coast that justified geopolitical policymaking with anti-slavery and moral

---

<sup>298</sup> “No. 11. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received December 17),” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5822, 1889), 5.

<sup>299</sup> “No. 11. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received December 17),” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5822, 1889), 5.

<sup>300</sup> “Bishop Smythies Among the East African Insurgents,” *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission* (January 1889), 17-21. “Editorial,” *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission* (January 1889), 1-2. Quote from: “Eastern Equatorial Africa: The Missionaries at Mpwapwa and Mamboia – Mr. And Mrs. Roscoe’s Journey to the Coast,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (July 1889), 436. For another perspective of the encounter see: “The Month,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (September 1889), 572-573. See also: “East Africa,” *The Times* (December 4, 1888), 5.

<sup>301</sup> “No. 11. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received December 17),” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5822, 1889), 5.

imperial rhetoric followed by an international convention against the slave trade advocated by moral imperialists in the public sphere. Sentiment against the African slave trade had been increasing throughout Europe due to a tour of European capitals by Cardinal Charles Martini Allemand Lavignerie, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Algiers and Carthage. The Cardinal was calling for an international convention to meet and adopt a new treaty regarding slavery and the slave trade on the African Continent. Before this convention could happen, Germany called for an international blockade of the East African coast using similar anti-slavery rhetoric. In this case, moral imperialism provided a cover for practical policymaking because this blockade was opposed by missionaries, the Indian merchant community, the Arab ruling class, and others in East Africa. The Anti-Slavery Society remained neutral insuring that the moral imperial voice in Britain remained divided and geopolitical strategy, as outlined by Robinson and Gallagher, held sway. The blockade was approved giving Germany time to organize a counterstrike against the rebellion led by Bushiri. The Foreign Office supported both measures but they believed that the danger of the insurgency in East Africa required immediate action and so they postponed the organizing of an international conference.

Moral imperialists also began to organize themselves internationally. Approximately a month before the insurgency began, the Anti-Slavery Society hosted Cardinal Lavignerie on July 31, 1888 in a packed public meeting. The Cardinal called for a new international convention against the African slave trade in front of an audience that included, among others, Bishop Smythies of the Universities' Mission to Central Africa and Sir John Kirk, now a director of the Imperial British East African Company. Rumors circulated that King Leopold II of Belgium attended as well.<sup>302</sup> Lavignerie was primarily addressing the British moral imperial establishment,

---

<sup>302</sup> "Anti-Slavery Crusade. Great Meeting in London," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July & August 1888), 91. See also: "The African Slave Trade, *The Times* (August 1, 1888), 3.

raising the visibility of their issues with his visit. This was the third stop on Cardinal Lavigerie's tour of European capitals to speak out against the African slave trade. "[T]he first time [he did so was] in Rome at the feet of the Sovereign Pontiff, the noble Leo XIII, my father, as he is that of all Christians; the second time in France, my native land; and this double duty of filial respect and of patriotism being accomplished, it is towards you that I turn – the Christians of England."<sup>303</sup> Lavigerie argued that "After having abolished Slavery in America, after having established in the Red Sea and in the Indian Ocean cruisers to prevent the transport of Slaves into Asia, the zeal of the nations of Christendom grew cold."<sup>304</sup> He went on to say that "The principal nations of Europe—England, Belgium, France, Germany, and Portugal – have by common consensus recognised and proclaimed their present and future rights over Africa. They have, however, to face their duties. (*Applause*)."<sup>305</sup> Even though he was primarily preaching to his fellow moral imperialists who had similar views and opinions as his own, his tour reinvigorated international anti-slavery sentiment towards Africa which had lain dormant since the 1870s. By doing so, he was making Europe complicit in the trade through inaction.

The Anti-Slavery Society supported Lavigerie's mission but disagreements between the Bishop and Society emphasized differences within the international abolitionist movement. Lavigerie ended his speech with a call for a "Crusade" against the slave traders, giving "an outline of the measures he would employ to instruct the natives how to band together, so as to protect themselves against the marauding Slave hunters, *by force*." Arming and training Africans

---

<sup>303</sup> "Anti-Slavery Crusade. Address of Cardinal Lavigerie (*Translated by C. H. Allen*)," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July & August 1888), 96.

<sup>304</sup> "Anti-Slavery Crusade. Address of Cardinal Lavigerie (*Translated by C. H. Allen*)," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July & August 1888), 96.

<sup>305</sup> "Anti-Slavery Crusade. Address of Cardinal Lavigerie (*Translated by C. H. Allen*)," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July & August 1888), 104.

into a military body to stop slave trading was drastically different from the Anti-Slavery Society's abolitionist philosophy. In response to Lavigerie, they stated that "The *force*" which the Anti-Slavery Society has always advocated is that of public opinion – a moral force which no Slave-holding Power can successfully resist."<sup>306</sup> As a pacifist organization, the Society could never endorse violence or armed rebellion. Despite this disagreement, the Anti-Slavery Society agreed to join Cardinal's mission and resolved at the end of Lavigerie's speech to "urge upon Her Majesty's Government, in concert with those Powers who now claim either territorial possession or territorial influence in Africa, to adopt such measures as shall secure the extinction of the devastating Slave-trade which is now carried on by these enemies of the human race."<sup>307</sup> The resolution was sent to the Foreign Office in a memorandum.

The Anti-Slavery Society's resolution from the meeting, Cardinal's tour, and subsequent memorials had the desired effect. On September 17, 1888, about a month before the beginning of Bushiri's Uprising, the Marquis of Salisbury, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, responded to Belgium's calling for a conference at Brussels focusing on the African slave trade. Salisbury gave a caveat, however. He said that "They are however, of opinion that suggestions dealing with so large a subject, and surrounded with so many difficulties cannot properly be discussed till they are put forward in a more detailed shape and in a form which would afford some practical basis for united action on the part of the Governments principally interested" and outlined the complexity of the situation regarding domestic slavery and the slave trade from

---

<sup>306</sup> "Anti-Slavery Crusade. Address of Cardinal Lavigerie (*Translated by C. H. Allen*)," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July & August 1888), 106. Emphasis in original.

<sup>307</sup> "Cardinal Lavigerie's Crusade Against Slavery," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July & August 1888), 110.

Egypt to Mozambique.<sup>308</sup> He suggested that “Great Britain, Germany, France, Portugal, Italy, Turkey, Egypt, and Spain, and possibly Morocco and Zanzibar might also be invited.”<sup>309</sup> For Salisbury, the slave trade was a geopolitical issue that had repercussions far beyond Africa. A month later he received a thank you note from the Prince de Chimay, specifically thanking him for letting him know about “the desire of your Government [Great Britain] to see the Government of the King [of Belgium] invite certain Powers to a Conference at Brussels in order to bring about the gradual suppression of the Trade which exists in various parts o the Continent of Africa.”<sup>310</sup> The seeds of the Brussels Conference had been planted.

Progress on the future Brussels Conference was halted by Bushiri’s Uprising. Salisbury received a proposal from Germany to blockade the coast on October 10, 1888. Arguing that the insurrection had its origins around Lake Nyasa, the Germans blamed slave trading Arabs for the coastal disturbances and proposed an international blockade. The events in Pangani and Bagamoyo were not mentioned. Instead, the insurrection was described as being “brought forward principally by the Arabs who are interested in the slave trade,” and caused by “the fanatical and stranger-hating Arab element.”<sup>311</sup> This argument, which depended heavily on anti-slavery rhetoric fit within the moral requirements laid out in the Berlin Conference while avoiding questions of Germany’s right of possession and lack of administrative control. The German Embassy proposed a:

---

<sup>308</sup> “No. 63. The Marquis of Salisbury to Lord Vivian,” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 48.

<sup>309</sup> “No. 63. The Marquis of Salisbury to Lord Vivian,” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 50.

<sup>310</sup> “Inclosure in No. 88. The Prince de Chimay to Lord Vivian,” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 59.

<sup>311</sup> “No. 1. Memorandum communicated by Count Leyden, Oct 8, 1888,” *Correspondence Respecting Suppression of the Slave Trade in East African Waters* (C. 5559, 1888), 1.

joint action of Germany and England in support of the Sultan at first to maritime action, and for this purpose perhaps to establish a blockade of the coast of the mainland of Zanzibar between Kipini and the River Rovuma, by German and English ships in co-operation with the Sultan of Zanzibar. The object of such a blockade would be to cut off all traffic with the insurgent coast districts, and especially that in slave-vessels, and the carriage of arms and ammunition.<sup>312</sup>

This plan would cripple the coastal economy and weaken support for Bushiri's revolt. It would also buy Germany enough time to put together a force to retake the coast.

Salisbury rejected Germany's explanation for the uprising but agreed with some of their moral imperial rhetoric. He communicated to Britain's ambassador to Germany that he thought that the uprising was "due to the errors which have been committed by the German Company themselves," because "Their experience of Oriental habits and character has been insufficient, and in the measures they have taken they have allowed too little for the differences between the conditions to which they are accustomed in Europe and those with which they have had to deal on the African Coast."<sup>313</sup> Salisbury was affected by British biases against Germany. In the British popular mind, Germans were viewed as ruthless, aggressive, and insensitive to their colonial people's cultures.<sup>314</sup> By blaming the newly arrived power in East Africa for the uprising, Salisbury was repeating these views. This, however, did not stop him from partially believing Germany's claims. Pointing to Lavigerie's and others testimony, Salisbury also wrote that he was "disposed to think that there is considerable foundation for the belief that the apprehensions

---

<sup>312</sup> "No. 1. Memorandum communicated by Count Leyden, Oct 8, 1888," *Correspondence Respecting Suppression of the Slave Trade in East African Waters* (C. 5559, 1888), 2.

<sup>313</sup> "The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir E. Malet," *Correspondence Respecting Suppression of the Slave Trade in East African Waters* (C. 5559, 1888), 3.

<sup>314</sup> Kenneth Mackenzie, "Some British Reactions to German Colonial Methods, 1885-1907," *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (Mar., 1974), 165-175.

and the resentment of the slave traders have been a potent cause of the disturbances which have taken place.”<sup>315</sup> These were not, however, major factors in Salisbury’s decision making.

Salisbury’s response to Germany’s proposal was based on geopolitical strategy rather than on Germany’s argument or their appeal to moral imperialism. The blockade was an opportunity to end a geopolitical thorn in Britain’s side in the Indian Ocean, and Salisbury noted that “for the first time the most formidable obstacle which exists to the suppression of the present Slave Trade, namely, the refusal of France to agree to a mutual right of search” could be ended.<sup>316</sup> Geopolitical concerns, represented by the imperial rivalry with France, far outweighed local issues in East Africa. The Foreign Office instructed Consul-General Euan-Smith to inform Sultan Khalifa that they “agreed with that of Germany...to establish, in conjunction with His Highness, a blockade over the coast of his continental dominions, in order to cut off the importation of munitions of war to his insurgent subjects, and to put a stop to the exportation of slaves.”<sup>317</sup> Moral imperialism provided the cover reason that allowed Britain to address longstanding geopolitical issues with France while supporting Germany’s call for a blockade.

Salisbury’s focus on the mutual right of search on the seas received a boost when a British naval lieutenant was killed by slavers. Lieutenant Myles H. Cooper’s spent his final days on the *Griffon*, a British naval vessel.<sup>318</sup> In September 1888, Cooper encountered a suspicious dhow that “was not detained or searched” because France refused the right to mutual search on

---

<sup>315</sup> “The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir E. Malet,” *Correspondence Respecting Suppression of the Slave Trade in East African Waters* (C. 5559, 1888), 3.

<sup>316</sup> “The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir E. Malet,” *Africa No. 6 (1888): Correspondence Respecting Suppression of the Slave Trade in East African Waters* (London: Harrison and Sons, 1888), 4.

<sup>317</sup> “No. 112. Foreign Office to Colonel Euan-Smith,” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 81.

<sup>318</sup> Rev. F. Flynn, “Capture of a Slave Dhow Off Pemba Island by D.M.S. “Turquoise,” *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission* (September 1887), 123-127.

the seas. He was suspicious of the boat because “the dhow had four heads, a very large galley, and a large quantity of slave food and firewood.” Cooper dispatched a smaller ship manned by an interpreter who watched as the dhow anchored at Pemba, disembarked approximately seventy five slaves, and then sold them in an impromptu slave market. Euan-Smith used Cooper’s report to argue that the ability of Arabs to get the French flag at “Mayotta, Nossi Bé, the Comoro Islands or Madagascar” was the biggest practical obstacle to battling the slave trade.<sup>319</sup> Cooper died a month later fighting a slave dhow off of Pemba.<sup>320</sup> This first hand account provided a sensational example of the horrors of the slave trade in East Africa at a key moment in the negotiations for the blockade. His funeral, attended by both the British and German admirals, furthered the international cooperation between Germany and Britain while strengthening the moral imperial rhetoric being used by Germany to support a blockade.<sup>321</sup>

Cooper’s death became a rallying point for the British anti-slavery movement’s campaign against the East African slave trade. Charles H. Allen, the Secretary of the Anti-Slavery Society asked *The Times* “how long will these Arab man-stealers be suffered to pour their slave cargoes into the island of Pemba, in order to cultivate the clove plantations of the Zanzibaris?” while Rev. Horace Waller, a member of both the Anti-Slavery Society and Universities’ Mission to Central Africa, stated, “To expect any Arab in these regions, be he Sultan or mere slave pedlar, to enter heartily into the suppression of a traffic which to him is as daily bread is simply

---

<sup>319</sup> “Inclosure 2 in No. 69. Commander Blaxland to Rear-Admiral Fremantle,” *Reports of Slave Trade on the East Coast of Africa: 1887-88* (C. 5578, 1888), 73. “No. 69. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury. – (Received October 22),” *Reports of Slave Trade on the East Coast of Africa: 1887-88* (C. 5578, 1888), 72.

<sup>320</sup> No. 66. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury.- (Received October 19),” *Reports of Slave Trade on the East Coast of Africa: 1887-88* (C. 5578, 1888), 71.

<sup>321</sup> “The Zanzibar Coast,” *The Times* (October 20, 1888), 5.



ridiculous. Nothing will be done except under compulsion.”<sup>322</sup> This virulent anti-Arab rhetoric (which Mackenzie reacted to when he returned to Britain – see page 126), fed the moral outrage that had been sparked by Cardinal Lavigerie. It also emphasized how the Anti-Slavery Society’s perception of the Sultan of Zanzibar shifted from viewing him as an ally to an enemy of the anti-slavery movement.

Anti-Arab sentiment in the Anti-Slavery Society helped bury the vibrant and vocal opposition of Zanzibar’s inhabitants, including missionaries, to the blockade. Germany continued to blame the uprising on “the hostility that the slave-traders of Arab nationality oppose[d] to the suppression of the Slave Trade and to the legitimate commerce of Christian peoples with the natives of Africa” after Lieutenant Cooper’s death.<sup>323</sup> Zanzibar’s inhabitants, specifically speakers for the Indian merchants and Arab intelligentsia, disagreed with Germany. In October 1888, British Indians at Zanzibar sent a petition to Queen Victoria stating unequivocally that “There is no foundation for the reports recently circulated attributing the native outbreak in the coast districts to religious fanaticism and the hostility of Arab slave traders.” Instead they argued it “was due to the ignorance of the native character displayed by the European *employés* of the German East Africa Company, and especially to their contemptuous treatment of the coast population and the disrespect shown to the Sultan’s officials and the

---

<sup>322</sup> Chas. H. Allen, “A British Officer Killed By Slavers,” *The Times* (October 25, 1888), 13. Horace Waller, “The Pemba Slave Trade,” *The Times* (October 25, 1888), 13.

The Universities’ Mission to Central Africa’s journal published a story about Cooper’s death early in 1889. Waller was a member of the organization. “Gallant Fight With a Slave Dhow: A Brave Officer Killed,” *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission* (February 1889), 28-29.

<sup>323</sup> “No. 3. The Marquis of Salisbury to Count Hatzfeldt,” *Correspondence Respecting Suppression of the Slave Trade in East African Waters* (C. 5559, 1888), 2-3. *The Times* covered the start of the blockade in: “The East African Question,” *The Times* (November 8, 1888), 5. “The East African Question,” *The Times* (November 12, 1888), 5.

Sultan's flag."<sup>324</sup> This condemnation of Germany was significant because Indian traders were British subjects. They had suffered economically due to the uprising and a blockade would cut off even more trade. A week and a half later, an anonymous letter to the editor in the *Times* made a similar argument. Using the pseudonym Ulema, the name of the Islamic scholarly class, the letter bluntly stated that the slave trade was not the cause of the conflict, that trade in slaves was decreasing in Pangani, the locus of conflict in Germany's territory, and warned that if the British joined with the Germans in blockading the East African coast the armed uprising could expand from the German territories into the British territories.<sup>325</sup> Unlike the Indians, this was a warning for Britain to not ally itself with Germany.

Opposition to Germany's logic for and the proposed blockade itself was also vocalized by missionaries in East Africa who also worried that the blockade would cause an escalation in hostilities towards themselves. The Universities' Mission to Central Africa argued strongly that the uprising had been caused by the Germans. Archdeacon Farler blatantly stated that "The Germans in Zanzibar, after forcing the unfortunate Sultan to cede to them the coast line...proceeded to enter into the administration of these territories with an insolence and violence towards the natives foolish beyond conception."<sup>326</sup> When Bishop Smythies arrived in Zanzibar he also strongly denied the German argument for the blockade. He bluntly stated in a letter on November 1, 1888, "*Everyone here knows that the slave trade has nothing to do with it* [the conflict and blockade]. I only hope that God may, in his goodness to us, bring good out of it

---

<sup>324</sup> "The Zanzibar Coast," *The Times* (October 15, 1888), 6.

<sup>325</sup> Ulema, "The Germans in East Africa," *The Times* (November 1, 1888), 8. For information about the role of the Ulema class in Zanzibar see: B. G. Martin, "Notes on Some Members of the Learned Classes of Zanzibar and East Africa in the Nineteenth Century," *African Historical Journal*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (1971), 525-545.

<sup>326</sup> Archdeacon Farler, "The State of Affairs in East Africa. A Paper Communicated to the "Church Times"," *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission* (December 1888), 169-170

all, but it looks very much as if it might result in exterminating missionaries, who would be the great means of checking the slave trade, by being instrumental in altering the ideas of the people.”<sup>327</sup> In Freretown, Rev. Price noticed an announcement of the blockade in November. For Price, the announcement “confirm[ed] my worst fears as to the closing for an indefinite time the Usagara route, and the isolation of our brethren at Mamboya, Mpwapwa, and the Lake.” In his next letter he mentions that “we are all annoyed about the Anglo-German blockade.” When asked by the British admiral for the loan of the C.M.S. steamship, Price explained “It would never do for the *Henry Wright*, known everywhere as the C.M.S. steamer, to be mixed up in the blockade” and refused the admiral’s request.<sup>328</sup> Smythies’ and Price’s concerns show that the blockade was not seen among the British moral imperialists on the ground as a moral imperial step. Instead, it was incredibly dangerous to the missionary project, putting the stations at risk. Price’s refusal to send a ship was very telling, since he had recently collaborated with the Foreign Office in Mombasa’s fugitive slave crisis. Missionaries were insecure and worried about their safety despite Bushiri’s assurances and Mackenzie’s actions in Mombasa. No British subject in Zanzibar outside of the Foreign Office agreed that the blockade was justified and positive for the region.

In Britain, a moral imperial schism over the blockade was seen in the Universities’ Mission to Central Africa when two members voted against a resolution opposing the blockade. The resolution stated “That it is the opinion of this Committee any combined military or naval operations on the coast of East Africa carried on by England and Germany at the present crisis,

---

<sup>327</sup> “Letter from the Bishop,” *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission* (January 1889), 3.

<sup>328</sup> “East Africa. Letters from the Rev. W. S. Price,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (February 1889), 113.

will be fraught with injurious results to the friendly relations which have been maintained for many years past between the natives of East Africa and the English missionaries.”<sup>329</sup> Two members of the committee opposed the measure, Rev. Horace Waller (also a member of the Anti-Slavery Society) and Montagu Burrows, because “it seemed to us yesterday, and I think, will seem to others, preposterous that we should raise our voice against the policy of Her Majesty’s Government, ignorant, as we must necessarily be, of all the complicated reasons of State which have dictated that policy.”<sup>330</sup> Burrows goes on to say that he “believe[s] this [the blockade] to be the very first occasion when a reasonable prospect has been put before us of successfully dealing with the African slave trade.”<sup>331</sup> In light of the missionary opposition to the blockade in East Africa the faith that these two men are putting in the government shows a distinct difference between anti-slavery political maneuvering and missionary concerns. The Brussels Conference was still in limbo until the conflict in East Africa ended.

Like their member Horace Waller, the Anti-Slavery Society did not officially oppose or endorse the blockade, however they were not shy in using the extra attention that the proposed blockade brought to publicize alternative strategies to combat the slave trade. Within a week of the announcement of British agreement to a blockade, Waller publicly commented on the blockade, challenging Salisbury to force the Sultan “to give up the *status* of slavery” by the end of 1888. He assured the Prime Minister that if he did so “he [Salisbury] will have done more to help the poor, wrested preyed-upon Africans – I do not say the Arabs – than any Minister of our

---

<sup>329</sup> “Political Troubles on the East Coast,” *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission* (December 1888), 162. For its presentation in the House of Lords see: “Africa (East Central). Question. Observations. (House of Lords - Nov. 6. 1888),” *Hansards Parliamentary Debates, Third Series* Vol. 330 (1888), 452.

<sup>330</sup> Montagu Burrows, “British Policy on the East Coast of Africa,” *The Times* (Nov 8, 1888), 7.

<sup>331</sup> Montagu Burrows, “British Policy on the East Coast of Africa,” *The Times* (Nov 8, 1888), 7.

day.”<sup>332</sup> This position was safe because it challenged the British government without condemning its current action and kept open the option to pressure the government in favor of Lavigerie’s proposed conference. Anti-Slavery Society neutrality on the blockade insured there was no united popular front of abolitionists and missionaries against the military action, greatly weakening moral imperial opposition to the blockade.

The mixed messages from moral imperialists in Britain meant that the geopolitical benefits for Britain against France prevailed against Zanzibari voices against the blockade. On November 5, two weeks after Lieutenant Cooper’s death, the Foreign Office formally approved the international blockade.<sup>333</sup> Sultan Khalifa privately gave his sanction of the blockade to Euan-Smith five days later, with the caveat that he was unable “to give active assistance with men or ships.”<sup>334</sup> Italy joined the blockade the same day sending one of their man-of-war ships to join the British and German squadrons already off the East Coast of Africa.<sup>335</sup> While Portugal did not join the squadrons and refused to allow other nations ships on its waters, it agreed “to a blockade of required extent of Mozambique coast by their own naval forces only in sufficient strength, and will issue a Decree prohibiting importation and exportation by sea and land of arms and ammunition.”<sup>336</sup> After achieving consensus among these European powers the blockade was

---

<sup>332</sup> Horace Waller, “British Policy in East Africa: To the Editor of the Times,” *The Times* (November 12, 1888), 13. Waller brought up the French flag issue again later that month. See: Horace Waller, “The East African Question: To the Editor of the Times,” *The Times* (November 27, 1888), 11.

<sup>333</sup> “No. 117. Foreign Office to Colonel Euan-Smith,” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 83.

<sup>334</sup> “No. 121. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received November 10, 1888, 4:25 P.M.),” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 84.

<sup>335</sup> “No. 124. Foreign Office to Colonel Euan-Smith,” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 85. “No. 125. The Marquis of Salisbury to Mr. J. G. Konnelly” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 85.

postponed because Sultan Khalifa was struck with fever and “declares himself consequently unable to direct immediate issue of the proclamation of blockade.”<sup>337</sup> Britain and Germany declared the blockade without Khalifa’s proclamation on December 2, 1888.<sup>338</sup>

A month into the blockade the situation in German East Africa was deteriorating. Bushiri’s Uprising had spread to Dar-es-Salaam, famine was imminent, and missionaries and German travelers were held hostage.<sup>339</sup> To turn the tides against the insurgency, the Reichstag approved funding to send a military force to East Africa. Count Bismarck appointed Hermann von Wissmann to lead this force. Bismarck told Britain that

Wissmann had been eight years in Africa and had got on exceedingly well with the natives, displaying tact, forbearance, and kindness towards them. He would proceed first to Egypt, and one of the duties with which he would be charged would be the recruiting and organizing of the police force which it was intended to place at the points held by the Company.<sup>340</sup>

This language was phrased in administrative language that was acceptable under the Brussels Conference. Wissmann’s army was a “police force” that would restore order. By March, Germany had declared martial law at Dar-es-Salaam and Bagamoyo to weaken the insurgents

---

<sup>336</sup> Quote from: “No. 128. Mr. Petre to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received November 17, 10 P.M.),” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 86. See also: “No. 144. Mr. Petre to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received November 25),” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 99. “No. 145. The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir E. Malet,” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 99.

<sup>337</sup> “No. 129. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received November 18, 9:15 P.M.),” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 86.

<sup>338</sup> “Inclosure in No. 150. Notification,” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 102.

<sup>339</sup> “No. 26. Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received January 8),” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5822, 1889), 15.

<sup>340</sup> “No. 29. Sir E. Malet to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received January 7),” *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5822, 1889), 16. For a biography of Wissmann see: “Obituary: Herman von Wissmann,” *The Geographical Journal*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (August 1905), 227-230.

and had also bombarded Saadani in preparation for Wissman's arrival.<sup>341</sup> Wissmann landed at Zanzibar on March 31, 1889 with a thousand troops and began his offensive against the insurgents. He successfully broke Bushiri's forces in a battle on May 8 and began retaking Bagamoyo and Pangani. The blockade ended on October 1, 1889 as battles continued to be fought between Bushiri's followers and Wissmann's forces. By December, an African chief captured Bushiri and turned him over to the Germans for a ransom. He was executed in Pangani, ending the uprising.<sup>342</sup>

### **Conclusion: The 1890 Anti-Slavery Conference of the Powers at Brussels**

As Germany's Hermann von Wissman was beginning his campaign against Bushiri in East Africa, moral imperialists began coalescing around the issue of the Slave Trade Conference at Brussels. Progress towards the conference had been postponed because of the uprising and blockade. Salisbury explained that "in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, the complications which have so suddenly arisen on the mainland coast of Zanzibar render the present moment inopportune for the convocation of a Conference with a view to the suppression of the Slave Trade."<sup>343</sup> This postponement did not sit well with missionaries and the Anti-

---

<sup>341</sup> "Inclosure in No. 111. Admiral Deinhard to Colonel Euan-Smith," *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5822, 1889), "Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury. – (Received March 15, 9:30 PM), *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5822, 1889), 57.

<sup>342</sup> For Wissman's successful attack against Bushiri see: "East Africa," *The Times* (May 11, 1889), 9. "The Wissmann Expedition," *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission* (October 1889), 148-150.

For the end of the blockade see: "East Africa," *The Times* (October 1, 1889), 3. "Blockade at Zanzibar," *The Times* (October 2, 1889), 5. "East Africa," *The Times* (October 28, 1889), 5.

For Bushiri's capture and death see: "East Africa," *The Times* (December 18, 1889), 5. Dr. A. Becker and Iris Davies (trans.), "The Capture and Death of the Rebel Leader Bushiri: Excerpts from Aus Deutsch Ost Afrikas Sturm-und Drangperiode," *Tanganyika Notes and Records* (March 1963), 2-9.

Slavery Society. In December 1888, the Universities' Mission passed a resolution in support for the conference, calling it "a desirable thing, and we earnestly hope it may... come to pass."<sup>344</sup>

The next month in the first issue of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* in 1889, the Society again advocated for "the calling together of a Conference of all the Powers interested in Africa, including Turkey."<sup>345</sup> The society still felt positively about the Conference because Salisbury concluded his statement with "Her Majesty's Government trust that this step, from which so much good may result, is only postponed."<sup>346</sup> They, and their moral imperial peers, were determined to work towards making the conference happen. They did so through democratic means, holding meetings and mobilizing public opinion to create a lobbying and public relations campaign to pressure the Foreign Office.

Within Parliament, an ally of the Anti-Slavery Society began taking steps to lobby for the Conference. The Anti-Slavery Society's 1888 report noted that "On behalf of the Society, Mr. Sydney Buxton gave notice of a motion for a loyal address to the Queen, praying Her Majesty to enter into negotiations for summoning a Conference of the Powers; but owing to parliamentary "complications," the opportunity for raising a debate on this question was not to be found."<sup>347</sup> Buxton was a member of a venerable Quaker abolitionist family whose activities went back to

---

<sup>343</sup> "No. 143. The Marquis of Salisbury to Lord Vivian," *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 99.

<sup>344</sup> "Editorial," *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission* (January 1889), 1.

<sup>345</sup> "Annual Summary, 1888. What the Society Advocates," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. & Feb., 1889), 3.

<sup>346</sup> "No. 143. The Marquis of Salisbury to Lord Vivian," *Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar* (C. 5603, 1888), 99. The Anti-Slavery Society reprinted the message in "Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Nov. & Dec., 1888), 219.

<sup>347</sup> "Annual Summary, 1888. What the Society Advocates," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. & Feb., 1889), 4.



the beginning of the nineteenth century.<sup>348</sup> Buxton returned to the issue in March 1889 starting a debate in the House of Commons that incorporated the Anglo-German blockade, the French mutual search issue, and the horrors of the now “thriving” slave trade in his support of the Brussels Conference.<sup>349</sup> Sir J. Fergusson, the Undersecretary for Foreign Affairs, called the debate “somewhat remarkable, as it has attracted an unanimous expression from all parts of the House,” and after he raised some concerns regarding the debate, the House of Commons unanimously passed a motion to submit an address to Queen Victoria asking her to intercede with other nations to help initiate the proposed conference.<sup>350</sup> This democratic intervention through parliament is characteristic of the new tactics that moral imperialists used over the next decade to pressure the Foreign Office to move beyond its geopolitical policy making and gradualist philosophy when it came to the slave trade.

The unanimous House of Commons motion also jump-started The Anti-Slavery Conference of the Powers at Brussels. The conference began on November 18, 1889 and was attended by representatives from Great Britain, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Congo Free State, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Persia, Portugal, Russia, Spain, Sweden and Norway, Turkey, United States, and the Netherlands.<sup>351</sup> The next month Sultan Khalifah named Sir John Kirk, former Zanzibar Consul-General and a director of the Imperial British East Africa Company, and

---

<sup>348</sup> For the accomplishments of his uncle Thomas Fowell Buxton in the original campaign against the British slave trade, see: Oliver Barclay, *Thomas Fowell Buxton and the Liberation of Slaves* (York: William Sessions, 2001). Ralph Hale, *Buxton the Liberator* (London: Hutchinson & Co., 1946).

<sup>349</sup> Buxton’s claims should not be taken as fact. Abdul Sheriff showed that similar claims made regarding the East African slave trade in the 1860s and 1870s were highly exaggerated. Abdul Sheriff, *Slaves, Spices & Ivory in Zanzibar: Integration of an East African Commercial Empire into the World Economy, 1770-1873* (London: James Currey, 1987), 223-233.

<sup>350</sup> “The Slave Trade,” (March 26, 1889), *Hansards Parliamentary Debates, Third Series* (1889), 8886-927. Quotes from 886 and 916.

<sup>351</sup> “Protocol No. 1 – Sitting of November 18, 1889,” *Translations of Protocols and General Act of the Slave Trade Conference Held at Brussels, 1889-1890; With Annexed Declaration* (C. 6049, 1890), 1-4.

Dr. Arendt from Germany, as Zanzibar's representatives at the Conference.<sup>352</sup> They also represented their respective nations. By giving up its voice at the conference Zanzibar was confirming its status as a puppet state. Although it could not officially participate, the Anti-Slavery Society sent four representatives, including Rev. Horace Waller and Charles Allen, the Anti-Slavery Society Secretary, to present a "collection of papers relating to the Slave Trade." They did not come alone: the Native Races and Liquor Traffic United Committee and the Aborigines Protection Society also sent messages to the conference. The President of the Conference, though, declared "that the affirmations contained in the documents in question [provided by the English societies], cannot bind either the Government of Great Britain, or the Conference which has received them."<sup>353</sup> The attempt by moral imperial organizations to be recognized at the slave trade conference was a failure.

The Conference at Brussels continued through thirty-three meetings until the General Act was finished on July 2, 1890. This act began with a noble goal, "Equally animated by the firm intention of putting an end to the crimes and devastations engendered by the Traffic in African Slaves, protecting effectively the aboriginal populations of Africa, and insuring for that vast continent the benefits of peace and civilization." To counteract the slave trade, the signed powers agreed that "civilized nations" take control of the administrative, judicial, religious, and military services in African territories to strengthen their control of the region, construct roads and

---

<sup>352</sup> "Protocol No. 6 – Sitting of December 19, 1889," *Translations of Protocols and General Act of the Slave Trade Conference Held at Brussels, 1889-1890; With Annexed Declaration* (C. 6049, 1890), 24.

The Sultan had agreed to send a representative the previous month but never did. See: "East Africa," *The Times* (October 21, 1889).

<sup>353</sup> "Protocol No. 4 – Sitting of December 4, 1889," *Translations of Protocols and General Act of the Slave Trade Conference Held at Brussels, 1889-1890; With Annexed Declaration* (C. 6049, 1890), 19.

For the Anti-Slavery Society's perspective of their visit see: *The Slave-Trade Conference at Brussels and the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society* (London: 55, New Broad Street, E.C., 1890). Charles H. Allen, "English Societies at the Brussels Conference," *The Times* (December 9, 1889), 12.

railways, import steamboats to travel to the interior, establish a communication system of telegraph lines, and restrict the importation and selling of firearms and ammunition to Africans and Arabs. It also called for a strengthening of laws against the slave trade, outlined the process to manage freed and fugitive slaves, and focused on trade caravans as an institution that needed to be watched and reformed to battle the overland slave trade. They also focused on limiting the circumstances where “native vessels” could fly a European flag, what documentation has to be carried by these ships, and created an International Maritime Office at Zanzibar to judge cases of slave trade that occurred at sea.<sup>354</sup> These steps, all taken in the name of moral imperialism, were drastic increases in governmentality in Africa which required a larger military presence in the region. Taken together this conference equated itself to a call for full scale imperial control of Africa.

These clauses set a foundation for two major moral imperialist campaigns that transformed the labor and transportation system of East Africa. As a signer of the Brussels Conference, Britain’s responsibility towards the East African slave trade increased as the Imperial British East Africa Company started some economic development in the region. The CMS was especially enthusiastic because “These new political arrangements, along with the decisions of the Brussels Conference, promise a more settled state of affairs for Africa, and open up wide door for future missionary operations.”<sup>355</sup> However, the increased involvement of the company and government also increased British complicity in indigenous transportation systems that involved slavery. The next two chapters will examine these campaigns in the 1890s, namely an anti-slavery campaign led by the Anti-Slavery Society and a campaign to build the Uganda Railroad from Mombasa to Lake Victoria led by the Imperial British East Africa Company. Both

---

<sup>354</sup> *General Act of the Brussels Conference 1889-1890; with Annexed Declaration* (C. 6048, 1890), 20-39.

<sup>355</sup> African Notes,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (August, 1890), 542.

of these campaigns used democratic/parliamentary tactics in the public sphere to force the Foreign Office to move away from a philosophy of gradualism.

## Chapter 3

### **Removing a Stain on the British Flag: The Campaign Against Slavery in East Africa, 1890-1897**

By the Brussels Conference, the ideological fissure between moral imperialists and Foreign Office officials had solidified. Unlike the 1873 treaty, when Sir Bartle Frere and Consul-General (now Sir) John Kirk served as bridges of cooperation between moral imperialism and Foreign Office policymaking, the 1890s saw the Anti-Slavery Society and their moral imperial peers directly target the Foreign Office by mobilizing public pressure. Buoyed by the new geopolitical environment after the Brussels Conference and the drastic shift of viewing the Sultan of Zanzibar as an ally under Sultan Barghash to viewing his successors as an untrustworthy enemy, moral imperialists channeled popular outrage into democratic pressure in order to force the Foreign Office's hand on the issue. Arguing for immediate action on slavery, members of the Anti-Slavery Society targeted the gradual abolitionist methodology of the Foreign Office. One of their tools in this campaign was sensationalist rhetoric which was used to further demonize the Sultan of Zanzibar and link Foreign Office gradualism with maintaining the Arab-dominated power structure and social order of Zanzibar. The moral imperial campaign was hastened by the Imperial British East Africa Company's demise in 1894 putting British East Africa directly under the control of the Foreign Office. At this point, for moral imperialists, East African slavery officially became an immoral system under the British flag and the Anti-Slavery Society intensified their campaign until the Sultan of Zanzibar abolished the legal status of slavery in 1897 at the behest of the Foreign Office.

As we saw last chapter, the Anti-Slavery Society's call to end the legal status of slavery began before the Brussels Conference with a demonization of the Zanzibar Sultan. The perceived alliance that had existed between the anti-slavery movement and Sultan Barghash had disappeared. Prior to the Brussels Conference, Sultan Khalifa issued an edict proclaiming that any slaves entering his territories were declared free after November 1, 1889. Abolitionists viewed this decree with suspicion and distrust. Reverend Waller called Khalifah's proclamation an "Arab trap" in a letter to *The Times* and thought that the Sultan was attempting to avoid the ultimate goal of the abolitionists. "The talk of abolishing the legal *status* of Slavery has greatly alarmed these slippery Slavers, and I repeat that the trap is ingeniously set."<sup>356</sup> Abolitionists no longer valued the Sultan as an ally against the slave trade but rather viewed him in the same context as they saw him as a "slippery Slaver," like his subjects, whose words were not to be trusted. In contrast to the Anti-Slavery Society's perspective, the Church Missionary Society (CMS) applauded the decree, stating, "These are great steps forward; and if, as we trust, the International Slave Trade Conference, to meet shortly at Brussels should take further steps of importance, such as are being proposed by influential persons, then it may be that, through the good providence of God, we are within measurable distance of the entire suppression of slavery in East Africa."<sup>357</sup> Their direct contact with the Sultan and his subjects in Zanzibar and on the coast allowed them to see what kind of step this was in the context of East Africa. Like the blockade, their opinion of the decree differed from the London based Anti-Slavery Society.

---

<sup>356</sup> "The Slave-Trade in Zanzibar and Pemba: Proclamation of the Sultan of Zanzibar, Relative to the Suppression of the Inland Slave Trade," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Sept. & Oct., 1889), 193. Horace Waller, "The Zanzibar Slave Trade: To the editor of the Times," *The Times* (October 10, 1889), 3.

<sup>357</sup> "The Month," *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (November 1889), 697.

The Anti-Slavery Society followed up Reverend Waller's letter with more questions that portrayed the Sultan as not trustworthy and his decree as limited and ineffective. Two days after Waller's letter, C. H. Allen, the Secretary of the Anti-Slavery Society, reinforced Waller's argument with a letter to the *Times*. Allen argued that the 1873 and 1876 decrees signed by Sultan Barghash should not be nullified by Khalifa's recent decree. The *Anti-Slavery Society* also asked about the status of the children of slaves, an issue that was clarified by Sultan Khalifa when he decreed that all children of slaves born after January 1890 were free.<sup>358</sup> They did not trust the Sultan and refused to trust his actions. Non-movement on the issues raised by Waller and Allen reinforced the abolitionist's portrayal of the Sultan Khalifa's decrees. Within a few months, the Bishop Smythies, wrote to *The Times* that

The first proclamation [declaring all imported slaves free] was issued, but only remained posted up in Zanzibar a very short time. The second proclamation [regarding the children of slaves] has not been issued at all. Practically, no action has been taken upon either, and we have every reason to fear to our bitter disappointment, that these promises are entirely illusory, and are likely to remain a dead letter, in spite of urgent representations on the part of the English Government and its representative here.<sup>359</sup>

This microscopic analysis of Sultan Khalifa and his actions showed that the Anti-Slavery Society no longer depended on Zanzibar and the Foreign Office to make progress on slavery issues. Rather, the Anti-Slavery Society preferred that European nations take direct and immediate action through the Brussels Conference.<sup>360</sup>

---

<sup>358</sup> The Slave-Trade in Zanzibar and Pemba: Proclamation of the Sultan of Zanzibar, Relative to the Suppression of the Inland Slave Trade," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Sept. & Oct., 1889), 193-195 "East Africa," *The Times* (October 21, 1889), 5. Charles H. Allen, "The Zanzibar Slave Trade: TO the Editor of the Times," *The Times* (October 14, 1889), 10.

<sup>359</sup> Reprinted in C. A. Smythies, "Slavery at Zanzibar. To the Editor of the Times," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. & Feb., 1890), 12.

However, the next steps against slavery were taken from Zanzibar, not London. As the General Act of the Brussels Conference was being submitted to the British Parliament and other legislative bodies, the next Sultan of Zanzibar, Ali bin Said, took office after the death of Sultan Khalifa in February 1890 and fulfilled Zanzibar's responsibility as a signer of the act by issuing another decree against slavery on August 1, 1890. This decree confirmed the power of existing decrees and ordinances against slavery, prohibited the selling or buying of slaves, and banned former slaves from being slaveholders. Six slave brokers' houses in Zanzibar were immediately closed. The decree also freed slaves when their master passed away with no heirs and when a slaveowner married a British citizen. Slaves also were given the right to purchase their own freedom in front of a "Kadi" in an Islamic court, slave owners were warned against abusing their slaves, and slaves were granted the same legal protection as non-slaves.<sup>361</sup> Each subsequent Sultan took a stronger position against the slave trade. As time passed and Zanzibar grew more and more dependent on Britain, taking new steps against slavery became politically advantageous to the Sultan.

This decree garnered different reactions from the Foreign Office and the Anti-Slavery Society. Sultan Ali's decree was accepted in Zanzibar and applauded by those in Zanzibar, namely Foreign Office and missionaries. *The Times* reported that "Among the lower classes of [Zanzibar] Arabs a disposition exists to regard the decree as absolutely ruinous, but the leading Arabs are quite content to be confirmed, even under the stringent conditions of the decree, in the possession of their present lawfully held slaves, whose condition, indeed, now affords no

---

<sup>360</sup> "Zanzibar: Slave Trade Edicts, Correspondence with the Foreign Office," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Mar. & April, 1890), 53-54. "Zanzibar: Slave Trade Edicts Lord Salisbury's Reply," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Mar. & April, 1890), 54.

<sup>361</sup> "Abolition of Status of Slavery in Zanzibar," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July & Aug. 1890), 141-143. "The Anti-Slavery Decree at Zanzibar," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Sept. & Oct., 1890), 231-233. Quote from Ibid, 232-233. "The Zanzibar Slave Trade," *The Times* (August 2, 1890), 5.



grounds for pity or interference” and the CMS agreed.<sup>362</sup> Euan-Smith, Zanzibar’s Consul General applauded the decree, concluding a letter to the Prime Minister stating “I feel, my Lord, that it is not necessary for me, in conclusion, to expatiate upon the praiseworthy action of the Sultan in consenting, after so short a reign, to publish such a Decree as that which accompanies this dispatch.”<sup>363</sup> Because the decree did not take drastic action against slavery it was palatable to his subjects because it did not challenge the existing social order in Zanzibar. The Foreign Office was creating a philosophy of gradual abolition with each successive Sultan enacting stronger and stronger decrees against slavery.

These conservative changes initiated by the Sultan and applauded by the Foreign Office garnered a negative reaction of the Anti-Slavery Society. The Society declared the new decree a dead letter because the Sultan issued two further decrees canceling key parts of the August 1 decree.<sup>364</sup> The first decree stated “Be it known to all that Slaves who shall run away without just cause, or otherwise behave badly, shall be punished as before, according to justice, and if necessary they shall be brought before us for punishment.”<sup>365</sup> The second decree, declared on August, 20<sup>th</sup> cancelled the clauses in the first decree that allowed slaves to purchase their own freedom.<sup>366</sup> These decrees, which emphasized the complexity of taking steps against the slave

---

<sup>362</sup> “East Africa,” *The Times* (August 4, 1890), 3.

The CMS reported “Arabs made little objection to its [the decree’s] provisions.” SeeL “African Notes: Anti-Slavery Decree of the Sultan of Zanzibar,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (October 1889), 712.

<sup>363</sup> Colonel Euan-Smith to the Marquis of Salisbury, “Zanzibar. Anti-Slavery Decree issued by the Sultan of Zanzibar, (Dated August 1, 1890), Extract,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Nov. & Dec., 1890), 290-293. *Anti-Slavery Decree Issued by the Sultan of Zanzibar, Dated August 1, 1890* (C. 6211, 1890)

<sup>364</sup> “East Africa,” *The Times* (September 2, 1890), 3.

<sup>365</sup> “The Anti-Slavery Decree at Zanzibar: Second Decree – (Translation),” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Sept. & Oct., 1890), 233.

<sup>366</sup> “Annual Summary: Zanzibar,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. & Feb. 1892), 6-7.

trade in Zanzibar, were more evidence for the abolitionists of the untrustworthiness of the Sultan.

Within the Anti-Slavery Society's 1892 annual summary of Zanzibar the emphasized that

It is clear that Oriental Anti-Slavery proclamations are not worth the paper upon which they are written, and nothing but a resolute determination on the part of England to have *the legal status of Slavery abolished* throughout the dominions of the SULTAN OF ZANZIBAR can put a stop to the traffic in human beings, which has become a second nature to the Arabs and others who profit by it.<sup>367</sup>

The Anti-Slavery Society believed that a solution could only be found by Europeans and not by Arabs or Africans. This position amounted to an overall rejection of the Foreign Office anti-slavery methodology of gradualism, which was designed to take steps against the slave trade within the social and political order and stability of Zanzibar.

The Anti-Slavery Society membership had been reinvigorated and strengthened with a younger generation of Quaker abolitionists, especially the relatives of the president of the Anti-Slavery Society, Arthur Pease. Arthur belonged to the Darlington Pease family, a nineteenth century industrial Quaker whose business interests included textile mills, banking, coal and ironstone mining, a railroad and a small shipping concern.<sup>368</sup> Alfred Pease and Joseph Albert Pease joined the society in the 1890s and advocated for abolitionist political positions as representatives in the House of Commons from the Liberal Party. Alfred represented York from 1885-1892 and Joseph represented Tyneside from 1892-1900. These men were following a family tradition of political activity and philanthropy. In Alfred and Joseph's mother's obituary in the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* in 1892, the family was described as having "been noted for their

---

<sup>367</sup> "Annual Summary: Zanzibar," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. & Feb. 1892), 7.

<sup>368</sup> Anne Orde, *Religion, Business and Society in North-East England: The Pease Family of Darlington in the Nineteenth Century* (Lincolnshire, U.K., 2000). M. W. Kirby, *Men of Business and Politics: The Rise and Fall of the Quaker Pease Dynasty of North-East England, 1700-1943* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1984). Joseph Gurney Pease, *A Wealth of Happiness and Many Bitter Trials: The Journals of Sir Alfred Edward Pease, A Restless Man* (York, England: The Ebor Press, 1992), x – xi.

zeal in the Anti-Slavery cause, whilst Sir Joseph Pease has been for many years a generous contributor to the funds of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.” It was also noted that Sir Joseph’s eldest son and Joseph Pease’s older brother “Mr. Alfred E. Pease, rendered good service to the Anti-Slavery cause in the House of Commons during the late Parliament.”<sup>369</sup> The Quaker/Anti-Slavery Society connection was just one of many in a network of organizations that, to greater or lesser degrees, were dedicated to moral imperialism.

This new energy in the abolition movement was reinforced by the publication of memoirs that sensationalized East and Central African slavery and the slave trade to the British public. In 1891, Dr. S. Tristram Pruen, a fellow of the Royal Geographic Society who had been working in East Africa as a doctor with the CMS during Bushiri’s Revolt, wrote for two audiences, “the Philanthropist at home, who wishes to study the Slave Trade in all its bearings, and that felt by the Missionary or Trader who, about to proceed to East Equatorial Africa, desires to know what he is likely to meet with there.”<sup>370</sup> The same year, Monteith Fotheringham, an employee of the African Lakes Company who had fought Arab slave traders in Nyasaland in the late 1880s, called attention to the slave trade, emphasizing, “the ravages of the slavers who threatened to destroy all vestiges of civilization.”<sup>371</sup> These books, and others, created armchair explorers who sought to experience the dangers, wars, and horrors of the slave trade in East and Central Africa in the hyper-jingoistic period of the 1890s. The underlying message of the books made the

---

<sup>369</sup> “Obituary . Lady Pease,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July & Aug. 1892), 253.

<sup>370</sup> S. Tristram Pruen, *The Arab and the African: Experiences in Eastern Equatorial Africa During a Residence of Three Years* (London: London, Seeley and Co., 1891), v-vi.

<sup>371</sup> L. Monteith Fotheringham, *Adventures in Nyassaland: A Two Years Struggle with Arab Slave-Dealers in Central Africa* (London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington, 1891), 2.

previous victories against the slave trade seem inadequate and provided the Anti-Slavery Society popular sentiment to tap in their campaign against East African slavery.

The combination of a renewed Anti-Slavery Society, sensationalized rhetoric and stories, and political pressure in the 1890s overcame geopolitical strategy and a Foreign Office philosophy of gradualism, to abolish the legal status of slavery in Zanzibar and British East Africa in 1897. Buoyed by controversies involving the Imperial British East Africa Company in Uganda as well as its employment policies for expeditions to the interior, members of the Anti-Slavery Society, mobilized religious and civic groups throughout Britain to provide a counterargument to the British government's position of gradual abolition in the region. Once Zanzibar fell directly under the Foreign Office's control in 1895, anti-slavery fervor among the British voluntary societies and within the House of Commons succeeded in creating immense political pressure on the British government to order the abolition of the legal status of slavery in Zanzibar and East Africa.

#### **Uganda, the Imperial British East Africa Company, and Caravan Controversies, 1891-1894**

As described in chapter one, Freretown served as a foundation for the spread of missionizing into the East African hinterland and Central Africa, especially Uganda. In order to reach Lake Victoria and Uganda, the British including the Imperial British East Africa Company and missionaries used caravans, the indigenous transportation and labor system in East Africa.<sup>372</sup> These were often categorized as "slave caravans" in abolitionist literature. In response, the Anti-Slavery Society used several opportunities to sensationalize British involvement as leaders of caravan expeditions causing the Foreign Office, through the Sultan of Zanzibar to more

---

<sup>372</sup> T.O. Beidelman, "The Organization and Maintenance of Caravans by the Church Missionary Society in Tanzania in the Nineteenth Century," *The International Journal of African Historical Studies* Vol. 15, No. 4 (1982), 601-623.

stringently regulate caravans. For the abolitionists, these regulations had the opposite effect because they saw them as the recognition of slavery by the British government in East Africa, which motivated the Society to increase pressure on the Foreign Office to abolish slavery. These controversies galvanized abolitionists to fight even more fiercely in Britain for the abolition of the status of slavery in East Africa.

The Imperial British East Africa Company followed the CMS into tumultuous Uganda. The CMS had tentatively built a congregation under Kabaka Mwanga. In his first years as Kabaka, beginning with his inauguration in 1884, Mwanga captured and executed CMS Bishop James Hannington in 1885 and ordered a half-hearted purge of Christians in 1886. Two years later Mwanga was deposed and sent into exile by a joint Catholic and Muslim revolt, which saw the Muslims briefly gaining complete power. The British restored Mwanga to the throne in 1889.<sup>373</sup> With this intervention, the Imperial British East Africa Company was enlisted to create infrastructure to and from Uganda on behalf of the British empire. The CMS was particularly excited this development. They stated that “the development of communication in East Africa truly wonderful,” and that the company’s shareholders “will not suffer in the long run by this sacrifice [of their dividends].” They were wrong. The Company’s expansion overextended it financially to the point that the company’s Chairman, Sir William MacKinnon, reassured his shareholders that they “...must be contented for a little while to take out their dividends in philanthropy [a year or two].”<sup>374</sup> The Company was a long way from making a profit with the added expense of expanding into Central Africa.

---

<sup>373</sup> Michael Twaddle, “The Muslim Revolution in Buganda,” *African Affairs*, Vol. 71 (January, 1972), 54-72. J. A. Rowe, “The Purge of Christians at Mwanga’s Court: A Reassessment of this Episode in Buganda History,” *Journal of African History*, Vol. 3 (1964), 55-72. C.C. Wrigley, “The Christian Revolution in Buganda,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 2 (Oct., 1959), 33-48.

In order to expand into Uganda, the Imperial British East Africa Company had to find stable methods of communication and transportation through East Africa to Uganda. They depended on the local caravan system as well as the creation of stations, the establishment of roads, and the signing of new treaties with local groups. The Company explained that after they “entered into possession of their territories they lost no time in sending out expeditions to explore the country, establish caravan routes, make roads, survey for railways, establish stations, enter into friendly relations with the natives and ascertain the capacity of the country for economical development.”<sup>375</sup> They gained possession of the new territories by signing treaties with local chiefs, which included clauses to end the slave trade.<sup>376</sup> The Imperial British East Africa Company signed ninety two treaties, which it estimated “amounted to no less than £150,000” “owing to the nature of these caravans, employing large numbers of men for transport purposes” by 1892.<sup>377</sup> These caravans consisted of hundreds of human porters and were governed by the local mores, rules, and labor practices and were the economic/transportation backbone of East Africa.<sup>378</sup> These porters had accompanied every European explorer into the interior as well

---

<sup>374</sup> “The Imperial British East Africa Company,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July & Aug, 1890), 171. “The Month,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (September 1890), 644.

<sup>375</sup> “The Imperial British East Africa Company,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. & Feb. 1891), 20. “Pioneering in British East Africa,” *The Times* (February 9, 1891), 10.

<sup>376</sup> “Imperial British East Africa Company: Occupation of Witu,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Mar. & April, 1891), 79.

<sup>377</sup> P. L. McDermott, *British East Africa or IBEA: A History of the Formation and Work of The Imperial British East Africa Company, compiled with the authority of the directors from official documents and records of the company* (London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1893), 210.

<sup>378</sup> Simpson. Robert J. Cummings, *Aspects of Human Portage with Special Reference to the Akamba of Kenya: Towards an Economic History, 1820-1920*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California Los Angeles, 1975. Abdul Sheriff, *Slaves, Spices & Ivory in Zanzibar: Integration of an East African Commercial Empire into the World Economy, 1770-1873* (London: James Currey 1987). Stephen Rockwel, *Carriers of Culture: Labor on the Road in Nineteenth-Century East Africa* (Portsmouth, NJ: Heinemann, 2006),

as the countless trading expeditions that went back and forth from Central Africa to East Africa.<sup>379</sup>

The use of these caravans to travel to Uganda and other missionary outposts in between Zanzibar and Lake Victoria caught the attention of the Anti-Slavery Society. At the beginning of 1891, the *Times* reported on two Imperial British East Africa Company expeditions to the interior, one led by Captain Frederick Lugard, the future Governor of Nigeria and author of *The Dual Mandate in Tropical Africa*, to Machakos and the other led by Frederick Jackson, the future Governor of Uganda, to Uganda. The paper noted of Lugard's expedition, "It is evident from Captain Lugard's journal that the Company are doing their best to get rid of Slavery without alienating the Slave holder. The Slaves are eager to take service with the Company, at fair wages, which enable them in a short time to purchase their own freedom."<sup>380</sup> Although they phrased it as an anti-slavery measure, *The Times* was openly reporting that the Company was employing slaves on its caravans. The Anti-Slavery Society began investigating. A few months after the *Times* article Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs Sir J. Fergusson answered Arthur Pease's question in the House of Commons about another expedition by stating "it is well-known that slaves cannot be hired from their masters by British subjects, and it will be the duty of Her Majesty's Consul General to see that there is no abuse in the contracts made with the porters engaged."<sup>381</sup> Later, Pease again brought up the issue in relation to H. A. Johnston's

---

<sup>379</sup> Donald Simpson, *Dark Companions: The African contribution to the European Exploration of East Africa* (London: Paul Elek Limited, 1975).

<sup>380</sup> "Pioneering in British East Africa," *The Times* (February 9, 1891), 10.

<sup>381</sup> "The Anglo-Belgian Katanga Company Expedition (House of Commons – May 7, 1891)," *Hansards Parliamentary Debates, Third Series* Vol. 353 (1891), 265.

expedition to Nyasaland.<sup>382</sup> He asked about the contracts signed with porters on Johnston's caravan and how they insured that they were not slaves. Fergusson's answer, that there was "no regulation against the engagement of slaves as porters, provided that contracts are made direct with them, nor would it seem desirable to deprive slaves of the advantage of free labour under European leaders," directly contradicted his previous statement and highlighted the participation of British officials in the East African slave system.<sup>383</sup>

In response to a perceived British complicity and participation in East African caravans and slavery, the Anti-Slavery Society wrote a memorial to the Foreign Office arguing that British subjects should not be involved in the caravan system. For the Society, the caravan system "encourages and stimulates the Slave-trade, which provides these so-called 'porters,'" "creates confusion in the minds of the great Slave-trading chiefs on Lake Nyassa if they see in Mr. Johnston's train Slaves," and "is contrary to the former Anti-Slavery policy of England with regard to Slave labour." More specifically, they contended, "it is very well-known that, although the contract may be made with the Slave it is in reality a contract with his master, and the advance wages, although paid, to save appearances, into the hand of the Slave, immediately finds its way into the pocket of the master."<sup>384</sup> Various newspapers in Britain, including the *Times*, joined with the Anti-Slavery Society in condemning the practice of British officials hiring slave porters. The Universities Mission to Central Africa and CMS also reiterated the Anti-Slavery

---

<sup>382</sup> For more about H. A. Johnston see: Roland Oliver, *Sir Harry Johnston & the Scramble for Africa* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1964).

<sup>383</sup> "Nyassaland (House of Commons – June 1, 1891)," *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Third Series* Vol. 353 (1891), 1386.

<sup>384</sup> "The Hiring of Slaves by British Officials," *Anti-Slavery Society* (July & Aug., 1891), 159-160.



Society's argument in their monthly journals.<sup>385</sup> Moral imperialists, divided over the issue of the blockade, were reuniting around the issue of British complicity in East African slavery on the caravan trail.

The cost of maintaining the route to Uganda and hiring caravans put unbearable stress on the Imperial British East Africa Company and caused the Company to reconsider its commitment to Central Africa. The Imperial British East Africa Company's presence in Uganda was not a part of their original business plan to develop the coast before moving into the interior. As the Company later explained in its official history, "The cost of an expedition to Uganda under the circumstances was an item which the Government themselves would have hesitated to put to a vote in the House of Commons. The capital of the Company was not equal to such enterprises."<sup>386</sup> They were going broke maintaining Britain's presence throughout East and Central Africa. On July 16<sup>th</sup> 1891, the Company's board of directors voted that "all the Company's establishments at Uganda shall be temporarily withdrawn," including their agent Captain Frederick Lugard, because they could not maintain their presence in the region in a fiscally responsible manner.<sup>387</sup> This decision, as we will see, was viewed by moral imperialists, namely missionaries, and the British government as an abandonment of the Company's mission. Because Uganda was also an important piece of Britain's geopolitical strategy, it seen as the key

---

<sup>385</sup> "Hiring of Slaves by British Officials: What the Press Says," *Anti-Slavery Society* (Sept. & Oct., 1891), 211-212. "East Africa," *The Times* (September 12, 1891), 5. "Slave Jobbing," *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission* (August 1891), 122-123. "African Notes. The Hiring of Slaves by British Officials," *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (January 1892), 46.

<sup>386</sup> P. L. McDermott, *British East Africa or IBEA: A History of the Formation and Work of The Imperial British East Africa Company, compiled with the authority of the directors from official documents and records of the company* (London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1893), 114.

<sup>387</sup> P. L. McDermott, *British East Africa or IBEA: A History of the Formation and Work of The Imperial British East Africa Company, compiled with the authority of the directors from official documents and records of the company* (London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1893), 193. "No. 1. Imperial British East African Company to Foreign Office—(Received August 21)," *Further Papers Relating to Uganda* (C. 6847, 1893), 1.

to maintaining control over Egypt because it housed the source of the Nile River, abandoning it was not an option.<sup>388</sup> If the Company left Uganda, it meant the territory was open to claims by other European nations and put the British Empire, missionary activity, and anti-slavery campaigns in jeopardy.

The Company's withdrawal from Uganda placed CMS missionaries in a tough position. "It is true that our Mission was in Uganda long before the Company; true that God gave it a footing in the land," wrote the Society, "But the Company, if it withdraws, will not leave Uganda as it found it. The king had accepted the British protectorate and the British flag; and the moral effect of withdrawal would be great. The Romanist party would rejoice and anti-English influence would prevail."<sup>389</sup> The Universities Mission to Central Africa sent a similar warning about the repercussions of leaving Uganda. "

[I]t is inconceivable that the Directors of the I.B.E.A. Co. will risk the odium that would instantly accrue to them in the event of Capt. Lugard being compelled to scuttle from his post in the midst of a campaign involving numberless lives, the work of the missionaries, and the fate of this most interesting country for many years, to say nothing of our prestige."<sup>390</sup>

A withdrawal from Uganda was a failure for moral imperialists and a threat to Britain's empire.

In response to the announcement, the CMS put a public call out supporters to raise funds "which may possibly return neither principal nor interest, but which may hold open for the Gospel one of the greatest and most effectual doors the world has yet seen" in October 1891. By the end of year they had raised £26,000, enough for the Company to remain in Uganda for another year.<sup>391</sup>

---

<sup>388</sup> For an analysis about Rosebery's thinking about the geopolitical factors regarding the decision to stay in Uganda see: Ronald Robinson and John Gallagher, *Africans and the Victorians: The Official Mind of Imperialism* (London: Macmillan and Company, 1967), 311-330.

<sup>389</sup> "Editorial Notes," *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (September 1891), 697.

<sup>390</sup> "Uganda, and the "I.B.E.A." Co.," *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission* (November 1891), 169.

Giving up Uganda was unacceptable to the CMS and their supporters. They were refusing to leave the region.

While cooperation between the CMS and Imperial British East Africa Company maintained a British presence in Uganda, moral imperialists continued to connect East Africa's caravan labor system with slavery through anti-Arab rhetoric. In 1891, Sultan Ali, in consultation with the British Consul-General at Zanzibar issued a decree against the employment "of Slaves, coolies, and porters in the Sultan's dominions for service outside these dominions" because of a scarcity of labor with the new demands in the German territories and Central Africa.<sup>392</sup> European efforts to administer East and Central Africa were depleting the available laborers. Following this decree, the Universities' Mission to Central Africa quoted a reverend in Zanzibar stating that, "The slaves on the island are getting very restless. It seems they are being very cruelly used by the Arabs."<sup>393</sup> The Anti-Slavery Society continued to publish articles connecting caravans, abusive Islamic slavery, and Johnston hiring slave porters on his British-sponsored expeditions.<sup>394</sup> Unlike the previous anti-slavery decrees, moral imperialists were united regarding British involvement in the abusive "slave" caravan system in East Africa.<sup>395</sup>

---

<sup>391</sup> Quote from: "Editorial Notes," *The Church Missionary Intelligencer and Record* (October 1891), 780. "No. 3. Imperial British East Africa Company to Foreign Office .-(Received November 12.)," *Further Papers Relating to Uganda* (C. 6847, 1893), 2-3. McDermott, 203.

<sup>392</sup> "East Africa," *The Times* (September 12, 1891), 5. This article was reprinted in "Hiring of Slaves by British Officials," *Anti-Slavery Society* (Sept. & Oct. 1891), 211.

<sup>393</sup> "Slavery in Zanzibar," *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission* (May 1892), 74.

<sup>394</sup> They published a denial from Johnston about hiring slaves, a letter from a Lake Tanganyika missionary supporting the charges, and a reprint of a letter from Captain Lugard to the Imperial British East African Company about his capture of a slave caravan in the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*. See: "The Hiring of Slaves by British Officials," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. & Feb. 1892), 12-14. "Slave Caravans in the Territories of the Imperial British East Africa Company," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Mar. & April, 1892), 85-86.

<sup>395</sup> After the decree *The Times* reports that while Arabs had their defenders, "They are generally represented as demons who bear fire and sword and devastation wherever they go, carrying off thousands of

When CMS funding ran out in late 1892, the Imperial British East Africa Company again attempted to withdrawal from Uganda. The Company ordered Lugard to completely vacate from Uganda by December 31<sup>st</sup> 1892, “the term up to which the Company had agreed with the friends of the Church Missionary Society and its own contributory friends to prolong the occupation.”<sup>396</sup> With the Company’s fundamental financial situation unaltered, staying in Uganda was still financially unsustainable. This news spread throughout the British press, Parliament, and abolitionist journals.<sup>397</sup> Mackinnon, the company president, pointed to a lack of government subsidy when explaining the withdrawal to the Foreign Office:

The Directors would emphatically but respectfully add that if even a moderate portion of the assistance granted by other Governments in the development of the territories assigned to them in Africa had been afforded to this Company for similar purposes, there would not now be any necessity for withdrawing the only evidence of British influence from Uganda and the lake districts.<sup>398</sup>

The phrase “withdrawing the only evidence of British influence from Uganda and the lake districts” was designed to force the British government’s hand. If the Company withdrew from that region they were also abandoning Britain’s claim to those territories under the Berlin Conference because there would be no effective occupation. The Company, unable to survive on

---

natives into slavery, and slaughtering ten people for every one they enslave.” “How the Arabs Work in Central Africa,” *The Times* (October 27, 1891), 12.

<sup>396</sup> Quote from: “No. 6. Imperial British East Africa Company to Foreign Office. – (Received May 12.),” *Further Papers Relating to Uganda* (C. 6847, 1893), 3.

<sup>397</sup> “The Abandonment of Uganda,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (May & June, 1892), 168-169. “The Abandonment of Uganda,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (May & June, 1892), 181-183. “The Feuds in Uganda,” *The Times* (June 13, 1892), 5. “The Abandonment of Uganda,” *The Times* (June 14, 1892), 5. “Parliamentary: Uganda,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July & Aug., 1892), 214-215. “The Disturbances in Uganda (House of Commons – August 9, 1892),” *The Parliamentary Debates, Fourth Series* Vol. 7 (1892), 191.

<sup>398</sup> Quote from: “No. 6. Imperial British East Africa Company to Foreign Office. – (Received May 12.),” *Further Papers Relating to Uganda* (C. 6847, 1893), 3. McDermott, 203.

its own and out of funds from their moral imperial allies, was reaching out to the government for help.

The Anti-Slavery Society also lobbied for the British government to intervene in Uganda. The Society sent a large deputation of approximately a hundred and twenty men from various organizations including the Presidents of the London Chamber of Commerce and Liverpool Chamber of Commerce, to the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, the Earl of Rosebery to argue against a withdrawal.<sup>399</sup> The sheer size and diversity of the deputation represents how seriously abolitionists saw the Company's withdrawal from Uganda as a danger to their campaign in East and Central Africa. After meeting with the Anti-Slavery Society deputation, the Foreign Office stated that "the resources of the Company are unequal to their continued occupation of Uganda" and agreed to give a "pecuniary contribution towards the cost of prolongation of the occupation for three months, up to the 31<sup>st</sup> March."<sup>400</sup> The Company accepted the government's proposal.<sup>401</sup> This marked Britain's first monetary investment in East and Central Africa. Until this point, they had administered the region through the Imperial British East Africa Company. This investment marked the first step from informal imperialism to formal imperialism.

With the British funding of the Company's occupation of Uganda came Foreign Office oversight. Zanzibar Consul-General Sir Gerald Porter was appointed the Special Commissioner

---

<sup>399</sup> "Deputation to the Earl of Rosebery, R.G. From the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society Against The Threatened Abandonment of Uganda and its Effect upon the Slave Trade," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (1892), 257-276.

<sup>400</sup> "No. 21. Foreign Office to Imperial British East Africa Company," *Further Papers Relating to Uganda* (C. 6847, 1893), 22.

<sup>401</sup> "No. 23. Imperial British East Africa Company to Foreign Office.—(Received October 4.)," *Further Papers Relating to Uganda* (C. 6847, 1893), 23. P. L. McDermott, *British East Africa or IBEA: A History of the Formation and Work of The Imperial British East Africa Company, compiled with the authority of the directors from official documents and records of the company* (London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1893), 205.

to Uganda. He was ordered “to frame a Report, as expeditiously as may be, on the best means of dealing with the country, whether through Zanzibar or otherwise.”<sup>402</sup> Moral imperialists in the House of Commons supported British funding for the Company to remain in Uganda. Joseph Pease explained his vote to subsidize the company and send a commissioner to Uganda to his Tynesdale constituents. He stated that

...he believed that if we left Uganda without making any provision the Slave-trade in that district, which is, whether we like it or not, in our sphere of influence, would be encouraged. Therefore he thought it was right, on that ground alone, to send a Commissioner to report as to what provision should be made, even if we propose to evacuate Uganda, so as to prevent the Slave-trade being encouraged there.<sup>403</sup>

By basically repeating the Foreign Office’s statement, with an anti-slavery perspective, regarding Uganda, Pease was actively supporting the government’s move towards formal imperialism in East Africa and Uganda in order to enact anti-slavery measures. He was becoming a key advocate for anti-slavery measures in East and Central Africa in the House of Commons. By doing so, he was cementing his role as spokesman for the Anti-Slavery Society. Pease continued by inquiring about other issues in Central Africa, including a slave trader revolt in around Lake Nyasa, today Lake Malawi.<sup>404</sup>

Portal’s report to the Foreign Office damned the Imperial British East Africa Company and ended their role as Britain’s informal imperial agent in their territories.<sup>405</sup> He described the

---

<sup>402</sup> Quote from: P. L. McDermott, *British East Africa or IBEA: A History of the Formation and Work of The Imperial British East Africa Company, compiled with the authority of the directors from official documents and records of the company* (London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1893), 206. See also: Sir Gerald Portal, *The British Mission to Uganda in 1893* (London, Edward Arnold, 1894), 6.

<sup>403</sup> “Mr. J. A. Pease, M.P., on Uganda,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (March & April 1893), 96.

<sup>404</sup> “Parliamentary,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (March & April 1893), 86. “Nyassaland (House of Commons – April 28, 1893),” *The Parliamentary Debates, Fourth Series* Vol. 11 (1893), 1496.

<sup>405</sup> This topic will be explored in more depth in the next chapter.

Company's efforts to administer Uganda and develop a transportation network between East Africa and Lake Victoria as a failure. Although Portal expressed gratitude to the company for their work, his report to Parliament recommended transferring the administration of Uganda to the Foreign Office, either under their direct control or indirectly through the Sultan of Zanzibar.<sup>406</sup> Evacuation, which was the Company's solution, was viewed as an unattractive option because:

The control of Uganda means, in the course of a few years, a preponderance of influence and of commerce in the richest and most populous section of Central Africa; a withdrawal from Uganda entails, besides the legacy of war and bloodshed left to that country itself, a renunciation on the part of England of any important participation in the present work of development, in the suppression of Slavery, and in the future commerce of East and Central Africa.<sup>407</sup>

Evacuating was a geopolitical and moral imperial sin. Portal's recommendations, based on both geopolitical and moral imperial reasons, led to a Protectorate being formed over Uganda in 1894 effectively removing the Company as the administrators of Central Africa.

Portal's recommendations to reform the caravan system and with it the communication and transportation network of East and Central Africa were highlighted in a posthumous book published under his name. Abolishing the system was impossible because of the key role it played in connecting East and Central Africa together although he did advocate for the replacement of caravans by the roads and railroads. Many of his recommendations appeared in *The Regulations to be observed by Caravan leaders and others in the engagement and treatment*

---

<sup>406</sup> Gerald Portal, *The Mission to Uganda* (London, Edward Arnold, 1894), 25.

<sup>407</sup> "Uganda: Report by the Late Sir Gerald Portal," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Mar. & April, 1894), 77. "Final Report on Uganda. As to the future of the country," *Reports Relating to Uganda by Sir Gerald Portal* (London: Harrison and Sons, 1894), 32.

*of Porters*, issued by the next Sultan, Sultan Hamid ibn Thuwayni, in 1894.<sup>408</sup> These regulations defined a porter to be “any native African engaged for service on the caravan” and instituted a fee of 10 rupees per porter to be paid to the government when signing a contract with a porter. This contract included “the name, tribe, and race of each porter, and a description.” A porter’s wages were to be paid in front of a government officer and the porter was to be supplied with adequate clothing, supplies, medicines, and rations. Caravan leaders were required to keep a government-supplied book which included the regulations and be used to record the distance traveled each day, charges against, deaths, desertions, or discharges of porters, cloth supplied to porters, and anything else the caravan leader found interesting. Caravan leaders faced fines or imprisonment for breaking the regulations or breaching a contract with their porters.<sup>409</sup> This measure allowed for closer oversight of porters by the British government. Through bureaucratization, supervision and surveillance, record keeping and other measures represented an increase in governmentality as the labor and transportation of East Africa were regulated more heavily by the British.

The Anti-Slavery Society again felt that the new regulations amounted to British complicity in the trade and the recognition of slavery under the British Flag. They disagreed with the Foreign Office, which emphasized “the fact that they [the regulations] do not affect the Slave questions, but are designated for the protection of natives by limiting the class of employers who engage them.” Their Secretary, Charles H. Allen, wrote a letter on October 17, 1894 to the Foreign Office stating, “This Society has received information from a reliable source that a tax of ten rupees per head is now levied by the Zanzibar Government upon all Slave porters engaged

---

<sup>408</sup> Gerald Portal, *The Mission to Uganda* (London, Edward Arnold, 1894), 173.

<sup>409</sup> All quotes from: “Slavery in Zanzibar. Poll-tax on Slave Porters Levied by British Administration,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Sept. & Oct. 1894), 275-280.



for caravan work on the mainland – over and above the amount agreed upon as wages – the greater part of which of course finds its way into the hands of the so-called owner of the Slave.”<sup>410</sup> The regulations, rather than appeasing the Anti-Slavery Society, motivated the organization to continue lobbying for the immediate abolishment of slavery in the Sultan of Zanzibar’s domain.

### **The Anti-Slavery Society, the Foreign Office, and the Case Against Gradual Abolition, 1893-1895**

As moral imperialists focused on the caravan system and Uganda, the Anti-Slavery Society’s case against the Foreign Office’s policy of gradual abolition in Zanzibar and East Africa was building both inside the House of Commons and outside among the general public. This insider/outsider strategy created constant pressure on the Foreign Office to consider the option of an immediate abolition of the status of slavery in East Africa. Within parliament, new Anti-Slavery Society members, especially Joseph Pease,<sup>411</sup> pressured the Foreign Office directly in Parliament to address the question of slavery in Zanzibar and East Africa and attacked the idea that a policy of gradual abolition through enforcing existing decrees was the best way to fulfill Britain’s anti-slavery responsibilities under the Brussels Conference and maintain stability in the British controlled areas. Outside of parliament, the Anti-Slavery Society mobilized public opinion to counteract Foreign Office arguments through sensationalizing the horrors of slavery and the slave trade in the Zanzibar Protectorate to the British media, religious and civic societies, and in Parliament.

---

<sup>410</sup> “Slavery in Zanzibar. Poll-tax on Slave Porters Levied by British Administration,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Sept. & Oct. 1894), 276.

<sup>411</sup> “New Members of the Committee,” *Anti-Slavery Society* (Mar. & April 1893), 101.

The debate between the Foreign Office's policy of gradual abolition and the Anti-Slavery Society's call for immediate abolition in East Africa began with a letter to the *Daily News* on May 9. Written by Charles Allen, Secretary of the Anti-Slavery Society, the letter was titled, "Slaves Kidnapped in Zanzibar" and stated that Allen had heard "from a private source" that a "vessel flying a French flag," "which was destined for the Persian Gulf and owned by Arabs residing there" contained a "small concealed chamber not many feet square." This chamber held "a number of boys and girls, estimated at about fifty" who immediately "stretched out their hands and arms, and pleaded piteously for water, food, and air, as there was practically no ventilation." Because he did not name his source it is impossible to tell if this was a factual description or anti-slavery propaganda. Allen goes on to calculate that "As 200 slaves have been captured in one month, it is easy to calculate that something like 4,000 have been carried away captive from Zanzibar and neighbouring ports, or an aggregate of from 40,000 to 50,000 a year." He did not elaborate on his methodology to reach this number. These sensationalist descriptions allowed him to dramatically argue for the need for the abolition of slavery in the region stating, "Nothing short of this can possibly stop these scandalous kidnappings, which are carried on in an island under the protection of the British flag."<sup>412</sup> Allen's claims, made without valid evidence using sensational language, and conclusion sparked a critical response from Foreign Office officials in Zanzibar.

J. Rennell Rodd, the Consul-General at Zanzibar from 1892-1894, replied to Allen's claims in an argumentative manner, dissecting his claims with the goal of disproving them. He took a disparaging tone towards Allen's arguments, seeking to expose his sensationalist language as fiction. Referring to Allen, he stated:

---

<sup>412</sup> *Paper Respecting the Traffic in Slaves in Zanzibar* (C. 7035, 1893), 5.

It is, therefore, a matter for regret to find a writer who officially represents an influential body publishing a letter in the press, which, though written in all good faith, appears to me to indicate a culpable ignorance of a subject on which the public will assume him to be an authority, a letter which is seriously calculated to mislead and to convey to British officers an unmerited reproach.<sup>413</sup>

By bluntly accusing Allen of ignorance, misleading the public, and proposing an impossible approach to combat the East and Central African slave trade, Rodd, a representative of the Foreign Office, was attacking the very validity of the Anti-Slavery Society itself. He goes on to dispute Allen's numbers, arguing that it was demographically impossible for that many slaves to be taken out of Zanzibar and Pemba and pointing to the successful alliance between the Sultan's intelligence and the British officers that caught the vessel Allen referred to in his letter. Although Rodd admitted that "a certain number may have escaped our vigilance; but even so, I adhere to my opinion that very few slaves have been removed this year beyond those which have been recaptured and liberated, and all our information tends to show that those engaged in this traffic are bitterly complaining that their trade is made impossible."<sup>414</sup> For Rodd, British efforts against slavery were effective and the Anti-Slavery Society's claims and therefore its proposals were invalid.

Later that year, the Anti-Slavery Society unsuccessfully argued for an immediate abolition of slavery in East Africa to the Foreign Office. In a memorandum to the Foreign Office on August 9, 1893 they argued

The fact that Great Britain has assumed the Protectorate over Zanzibar has placed her in a position towards the Slave population of those territories perfectly different from that existing at the time referred to [the 1870s and 1880s], and it is therefore

---

<sup>413</sup> *Paper Respecting the Traffic in Slaves in Zanzibar* (C. 7035, 1893), 4. "The Traffic of Slaves in Zanzibar," *The Times* (August 16, 1893), 4.

<sup>414</sup> *Paper Respecting the Traffic in Slaves in Zanzibar* (C. 7035, 1893), 4. "The Traffic of Slaves in Zanzibar," *The Times* (August 16, 1893), 4.

incumbent upon her to declare that Slavery is an institution that cannot be recognised in any country under the protection of Her Majesty.<sup>415</sup>

The Anti-Slavery Society pointed to past moments of abolition in the British Empire, namely the abolition of slavery in India in 1843, the abolition of slavery and the slave trade in the Gold Coast in 1874 and, the abolition of slavery in Cyprus in 1874.<sup>416</sup> Rodd was provided with the Anti-Slavery Society memorandum and immediately began to argue against comparing India and the Gold Coast to Zanzibar because those were colonies. Without the rule of law that a colony provides, Rodd asserted “it is difficult to believe that any influence short of force which could be brought to bear upon a Sultan” because “Mahommedan law debars the slave from such civil rights as are secured to him by the Indian Act of 1843” and “it is not to be anticipated that the introduction of such a principle so directly opposed to Mahommedan religious law would readily commend itself to the Sultan, or be accepted without a struggle by his subjects.”<sup>417</sup> Rodd was again showing disdain for the evidence, analysis and policy suggestions of the Anti-Slavery Society by showing how they were ignorant of the facts on the ground. Their suggestions, based on the assumption of complete control of the Sultan by the British were not legally possible in Zanzibar. Also, the Foreign Office feared that slaveowners would abandon the British protectorate for German East Africa, leading to a loss of revenue from the clove plantations in Zanzibar and destabilize Britain’s ally, if slavery was abolished. Instead of depending on the

---

<sup>415</sup> “Zanzibar,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July & August 1893), 180. See also, British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, “No. 1. British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society to the Earl of Roseberry.-{Received August 10.},” *Correspondence Respecting Slavery in Zanzibar* (C.7707, 1895), 1-2.

<sup>416</sup> “No. 1. British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society to the Earl of Roseberry.-{Received August 10.},” *Correspondence Respecting Slavery in Zanzibar* (C.7707, 1895), 2-8.

<sup>417</sup> “No. 8. Mr. Rodd to the Earl of Roseberry.-{Received December 31.},” *Correspondence Respecting Slavery in Zanzibar* (C.7707, 1895), 14.

Sultan to abolish slavery, Rodd proposed “The introduction of other labour than slave labor into Zanzibar would doubtless make it far easier to bring out this desirable end [of abolishing slave labor East Africa].”<sup>418</sup> This step, which had no financial plan supporting it at the time, would introduce competition to slave labor and gradually allow for the replacement of slavery with free labor.

With the beginnings of this debate, the Anti-Slavery Society increased its efforts to mobilize a network of organizations to help lobby for an immediate abolition of the legal status of slavery in East Africa. The Society sent deputations to “some of the best known religious bodies in England” to raise awareness and gain support for their abolition campaign. They first approached the Society of Friends (the Quakers), who then joined the Anti-Slavery Society in deputations to the Methodists and Baptists.<sup>419</sup> These groups formed a moral imperial network that could be called to counter Foreign Office claims and reticence. With the assistance of the Quakers and a network of civic and religious organizations, the Society also secretly planned “steps that have been taken of a confidential nature, which at present can only be alluded to.”<sup>420</sup> They quietly dispatched Donald Mackenzie, their own Special Commissioner to Zanzibar, Pemba, and the East African Coast, to investigate slavery and slave trade conditions in the region. While in Zanzibar he also was “reporting to the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce on the

---

<sup>418</sup> “No. 8. Mr. Rodd to the Earl of Roseberry.-{Received December 31.},” *Correspondence Respecting Slavery in Zanzibar* (C.7707, 1895), 18.

<sup>419</sup> “Annual Summary, 1895–Zanzibar and Pemba: Slavery Under British Protection,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan.-May, 1895), 5.

Other religious groups also took actions at their meetings. See: “Resolution of Free Church Congress, March, 1895,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. – May, 1895), 41. “The Baptists and Slavery in Zanzibar,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. – May, 1895), 54. Members of Parliament also spoke to religious groups. Thomas Bayley a Member of Parliament, also spoke at the Congressional Church about slavery in Zanzibar. See: “The Slave Trade,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. – May, 1895), 56.

<sup>420</sup> “Annual Summary, 1895–Zanzibar and Pemba: Slavery Under British Protection,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan.-May, 1895), 5.

commercial prospects of this part of East Africa [and] to Sir Edgar Vincent on the smuggling of tobacco into Turkey through the Arabian ports.”<sup>421</sup> Mackenzie was described as “a gentleman” with “experience of Mohammedan customs and Slavery amongst the Arabs of North-West Africa, coupled with some knowledge of Arabic.”<sup>422</sup> He represented the network of organizations, including humanitarian, religious, and commercial organizations, which the Anti-Slavery Society was creating to raise public pressure on the Foreign Office around the issue of East African abolition. By providing firsthand accounts, this experienced expert in Islamic Africa, could counter Foreign Office voices from East Africa who disagreed with the Anti-Slavery Society.

Meanwhile, the Anti-Slavery Society continued its debate with the Foreign Office over gradual abolition in the House of Commons. These debates created a cohesive public position for the Anti-Slavery Society and their allies. At the end of 1893, Joseph Pease directly questioned Foreign Office officials about the policies that were going to be applied to the island of Witu, specifically a proclamation by the Sultan of Zanzibar allowing slaves to be inherited by the sons of their lawful owners. Pease also inquired about whether slaves working for the Sultan were being paid and whether the Sultan was financially benefiting from any slave labor.<sup>423</sup> These two questions emphasized how abolitionists equated the Foreign Office’s policy of gradualism with

---

<sup>421</sup> “No. 2. Mr. A. Hardinge to the Earl of Kimberley.—(Received April 22.),” *Correspondence Respecting Slavery in the Zanzibar Dominions* (C. 8275, 1896), 1.

<sup>422</sup> Donald Mackenzie, *A Report on Slavery and the Slave Trade in Zanzibar, Pemba, and the Mainland of the British Protectorate of East Africa* (London: British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, 1895), Inside Front Cover.

<sup>423</sup> Parliamentary,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (November & December 1893), 305-315. “Slavery in British East Africa (House of Commons – November 30, 1893),” *The Parliamentary Debates, Fourth Series* Vol. 19 (1893), 91-93. “Witu (House of Commons – December 14, 1893),” *The Parliamentary Debates, Fourth Series* Vol. 19 (1893), 1358-1359, “Slavery in Zanzibar (House of Commons – December 15, 1893),” *The Parliamentary Debates, Fourth Series* Vol. 19 (1893), 1485-1486, “Slavery in East Africa (House of Commons – December 28, 1893),” *The Parliamentary Debates, Fourth Series* Vol. 20 (1893), 322.

an increased complicity in East African slavery by Britain. The next year, abolitionists responded to the Foreign Office in the House of Commons through Pease. Pease called for the abolition of the status of slavery rather than the abolition of slavery itself because immediate emancipation

would mean the sudden withdrawal of all labour, and that might be productive of hardships to even the Slaves themselves, and would be accompanied by other complications, such as the possible revolt of the Arab Slave owners, or demands for compensation, whereas the abolition of the legal status of slavery would not involve any disturbance, and where the Slaves were kindly treated and contented they would remain in their *status quo ante*, but the right to procure protection would be a potent force against a cruel master, who no longer could with impunity be able to maim, mutilate, or ill-treat his Slave at will, and there would be no cessation of progress.<sup>424</sup>

Pease was calling for a half-measure towards abolition because immediate emancipation was unacceptable for the Treasury (paying compensation), and the Foreign Office (revolt against Britain's ally the Sultan). He was positioning the Anti-Slavery Society's campaign in a way that maintained Britain's rule and its identity as a "civilizer" of non-Europeans. By partially capitulating to political realities, Pease was placing the Anti-Slavery Society in an effective position against Foreign Office inaction without abandoning the goals of the Society.

The Foreign Office policy of a gradual abolition was beginning to change due to the new geopolitical arrangement in East and Central Africa in the mid 1890s. When the next Consul-General of Zanzibar, Arthur Hardinge, took office in 1894, he was given explicit instructions on his duties regarding slavery and the slave trade. Referencing the Brussels Act, the Earl of Kimberley, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, required Hardinge to maintain a policy of gradualism and continue his predecessors' work with the British navy to suppress the slave trade by sea going to Zanzibar and Pemba and to "insist on the faithful execution of the measures

---

<sup>424</sup> "Parliamentary. House of Commons," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (May & June 1894), 136. "Civil Services and Revenue Departments Estimates, 1894-5 (House of Commons – June 1, 1894)," *The Parliamentary Debates, Fourth Series* Vol. 25 (1894), 237.

which have been taken for its gradual abolition.”<sup>425</sup> Like his predecessors, Kimberly advocated for the implementation of already existing decrees and regulations while recognizing the importance of maintaining the Arab social order and planning for the next step in abolishing slavery. He told Hardinge that “It will be your duty to recommend any further measures which may seem to you feasible for facilitating the total abolition of slavery, without injustice to the Mahommedan owners.”<sup>426</sup> His position, like his predecessors, was unchanged however the situation had changed. By this point Britain had created a protectorate in Uganda and the Imperial British East Africa Company was in the process of bankruptcy and liquidation. By the end of 1894, the Foreign Office Secretary instructed Hardinge to “take into immediate consideration the statuses of slavery as now existing in the Islands of Zanzibar and Pemba, and the question whether some fresh steps cannot be taken towards its speedy execution” while weighing potential economic damage that could be accrued with the added expense of creating the court system and police force to enforce abolition.<sup>427</sup> The move from informal to formal imperialism in East and Central Africa were causing the Foreign Office to change its policy towards slavery. Although they wanted a gradual controlled transition to free labor, their position on abolition moved closer to Anti-Slavery Society proposals.

The Anti-Slavery Society and their supporters were beginning to see some success from their strategy of maintaining the pressure against the Foreign Office policy of gradual abolition. Their secret weapon, Donald Mackenzie, Special Commissioner to Zanzibar, Pemba, and the

---

<sup>425</sup> “No. 11. “The Earl of Kimberley to Mr. A. Hardinge,” *Correspondence Respecting Slavery in Zanzibar* (C.7707, 1895), 24.

<sup>426</sup> “No. 11. “The Earl of Kimberley to Mr. A. Hardinge,” *Correspondence Respecting Slavery in Zanzibar* (C.7707, 1895), 24-25.

<sup>427</sup> “No. 12. “The Earl of Kimberley to Mr. Hardinge,” *Correspondence Respecting Slavery in Zanzibar* (C.7707, 1895), 26.



East African Coast, left for Zanzibar in February, 1895. That same month, Joseph Pease inquired in the House of Commons what steps had been taken to abolish slavery or free illegally held slaves in Zanzibar and Pemba. Sir Edward Grey, Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, responded that a Vice Consul had just been appointed and was about to start working in Pemba. Grey also said that “The prompt abolition of slavery in these islands presents many difficulties but her Majesty’s Government are now considering how the object in view can best be obtained.”<sup>428</sup> This open admission that the Foreign Office was coming to the same position as the Anti-Slavery Society was an insufficient success for the Society. Pease and his abolitionist allies were not satisfied with slow pace of governmental progress. Two months later petitions were submitted to Parliament from the Anti-Slavery Society, “the Society of Friends, the Congregational Union, and some 15 other Petitions in support of the abolition of Slavery in Zanzibar, Pemba, and other British Protectorates. A Petition was subsequently presented from the Baptist Union.”<sup>429</sup> The London Chamber of Commerce also sent a memorial to the British Government that “presses upon the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs the necessity for putting an end to the status of Slavery in Zanzibar, in a manner similar to that carried out in India.”<sup>430</sup> Moral imperialism was fighting back through public pressure against the gradual methods of the Foreign Office towards abolition in East Africa.

---

<sup>428</sup> “Parliamentary: The Slave Trade and Consular Reports,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan.-May, 1895), 18. “Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba (House of Commons – February 7, 1895),” *The Parliamentary Debates, Fourth Series* Vol. 30 (1895), 196.

<sup>429</sup> “Parliamentary: Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. – May 1895), 18. “Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba (House of Commons – February 7, 1895),” *The Parliamentary Debates, Fourth Series* Vol. 30 (1895), 196.

<sup>430</sup> “The London Chamber of Commerce and Slavery and the Slave-trade,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. – May 1895), 39.

With their special commissioner in East Africa, Pease and the Anti-Slavery Society began bureaucratic moves in the House of Commons to match the public pressure being raised by the moral imperial network they put together. Less than a week after the petitions were submitted, Pease motioned to reduce the £500 allocated to suppress the Slave trade and former African slaves to £400 “as a protest against an expenditure which fails to accomplish its object”<sup>431</sup> “– viz., the suppression of Slavery and the Slave-trade.”<sup>432</sup> According to Pease, he “moved the reduction of the vote in conformity with the recognized Parliamentary practice of calling attention to a subject upon a vote in Supply.”<sup>433</sup> This motion was designed to highlight the issue of East African slavery to the Foreign Office, his peers, and the press. After a debate with Undersecretary Grey of the Foreign Office, Pease sought to withdraw his motion because Grey informed him that the money had already been spent and stated that the current government recognized “that Slavery must be terminated.” Grey also informed the House of Commons that a report was to be researched to investigate how the legal status of slavery could be abolished in Zanzibar and Pemba. Unable to withdraw, Pease voted against his motion and it failed 106 for and 153 against.<sup>434</sup> Pease had voted against his own motion because “voting against a Government who had at least pledged itself that “the thing should be done (*i.e.*, the institution of

---

<sup>431</sup> “Parliamentary: Debate on Suppression of Slavery in Zanzibar,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. – May 1895), 20. “Supplementary Estimates (House of Commons – March 8, 1895),” *The Parliamentary Debates, Fourth Series* Vol. 31 (1895), 664.

<sup>432</sup> “Parliamentary: Debate on Suppression of Slavery in Zanzibar,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. – May 1895), 20.

<sup>433</sup> “Mr. J. A. Pease on his Motion: To the Editor of “The Times,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. – May 1895), 35-36. Pease, Joseph, “Mr. J.A. Pease on his Motion: To the Editor of The Times,” *The Times* (March 14, 1895), 7.

<sup>434</sup> “Parliamentary: Debate on Suppression of Slavery in Zanzibar,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. – May 1895), 32. “Supplementary Estimates (House of Commons – March 8, 1895),” *The Parliamentary Debates, Fourth Series* Vol. 31 (1895), 683.

Slavery abolished) and “at the earliest possible moment.” I felt I had, therefore, no alternative but to vote against my own motion, which was purely formal in character.”<sup>435</sup> Besides showing Anti-Slavery Society fervor for the issue of East African abolition, the motion showed a division in the House of Commons on the issue as well as the beginnings of an agreement between the Foreign Office and Anti-Slavery Society on the issue.

Pease’s parliamentary action was an opportunity to publicly reemphasize and clarify the Anti-Slavery Society position on slavery in British East Africa. With a growing consensus between the Foreign Office and Anti-Slavery Society on the need for action, he had to take his case to the general public, which he accomplished by publishing a pamphlet entitled *How We Countenance Slavery in East African British Protectorates*. He published it because “The statements, and articles also, which have appeared in the press in connection with the Slavery debate in the House of Commons, raised on the Supplementary Estimates on March 8<sup>th</sup>, 1895, indicate a general ignorance of the exact position and situation in our East African British Protectorates which is probably shared by the public and is likely to mislead.”<sup>436</sup> To control and focus this debate, Pease gave a history of British involvement in Zanzibar and Pemba including issues from the 1880s and first five years of the 1890s. His overall theme was that Britain was complicit in this trade. He stated, “The Arab is content and feels that he is incurring no risk when he can point to British connivance with a system of Slavery permitted on islands under our own direct control, and in which we are indirectly interested. All our fussiness about the Slave-trade appears to the Arab to be nothing but a transparent sham.”<sup>437</sup> Pease’s perception of British

---

<sup>435</sup> “Mr. J. A. Pease on his Motion: To the Editor of “The Times,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. – May 1895), 35-36. Pease, Joseph, “Mr. J.A. Pease on his Motion: To the Editor of The Times,” *The Times* (March 14, 1895), 7.

<sup>436</sup> Joseph A. Pease, *How We Countenance Slavery in East African British Protectorates* (London: British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, 1895), 1.

hypocrisy, spoken through Arab voices, formed the foundation of the East African anti-slavery campaign during its last years. Anti-Slavery Society members and allies in the House of Commons began to consistently ask questions raised in Pease's pamphlet to Foreign Office officials during the month of April in 1895.<sup>438</sup>

Meanwhile, the Anti-Slavery Society's Special Commissioner to East Africa, Donald Mackenzie, was conducting his investigation in Zanzibar. He had met with Consul General Hardinge. Mackenzie recalled the meeting by stating that "after my return to Zanzibar [from German East Africa], I called for the first time on Mr. Hardinge...to whom I spoke freely on the Slave question, and he commented on the same subject with equal frankness. I was very favourably impressed with this gentleman."<sup>439</sup> His perspective was reciprocated. Hardinge was "pleased to find that he [Mackenzie] is fully alive to the importance both of the labour question and of the relation of the whole slavery problem to the social and religious life of our Mahomedan population here" in their conversation. Hardinge cautioned patience on the issue because he "believed[d] it would be well that the Report and suggestions which he [Mackenzie] will make to the Philanthropic Societies on whose behalf he is visiting these countries should be

---

<sup>437</sup> Joseph A. Pease, *How We Countenance Slavery in East African British Protectorates* (London: British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, 1895), 4.

<sup>438</sup> For debates within Parliament in the first half of 1895 see: "Parliamentary: Mombasa Railway and Slavery," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. – May, 1895), 33-34. "Mombasa Railway and Slavery (House of Commons – April 2, 1895)," *The Parliamentary Debates, Fourth Series* Vol. 32 (1895), 714-715. "Slavery in East Africa (House of Commons – April 4, 1895)," *The Parliamentary Debates, Fourth Series* Vol. 32 (1895), 928. "Parliamentary: Mombasa and Uganda Railway," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. – May, 1895), 34. "The Mombasa and Uganda Railway (House of Commons – April 2, 1895)," *The Parliamentary Debates, Fourth Series* Vol. 32 (1895), 1614. "Parliamentary: British Subjects and Slave Labour," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. – May, 1895), 34. "Hiring Slaves (House of Commons – May 10, 1895)," *The Parliamentary Debates, Fourth Series* Vol. 33 (1895), 916. "Parliamentary: Slavery in Zanzibar," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. – May, 1895), 34-35. "Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba (House of Commons – April 29, 1895)," *The Parliamentary Debates, Fourth Series* Vol. 33 (1895), 36.

<sup>439</sup> Donald Mackenzie, *A Report on Slavery and the Slave Trade in Zanzibar, Pemba, and the Mainland of the British Protectorate of East Africa* (London: British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society), 1.

carefully considered before any further steps are taken with a view to immediate abolition.”<sup>440</sup>

While they differed on method, this meeting between Hardinge and Mackenzie was cordial and emphasised an agreement on the need for further action against slavery.

Hardinge’s report to the Foreign Office was submitted in March 1895, after his meetings with Mackenzie and Pease’s motion. Hardinge was well aware of Pease’s motion and the debate in the House of Commons. He wrote to the Foreign Office on March 13<sup>th</sup>, in response to a “telegraphic report of the views expressed in the House of Commons in favour of the immediate abolition of slavery in these islands, even if it were necessary to make up the deficit in their revenues by means of a grant from Imperial funds.”<sup>441</sup> He agreed with many of his predecessors’ arguments against such an action, including the central role slavery plays in Islamic and Arab cultures and governing systems, infrastructure issues dealing with the number of slaves, potential migration to the German Protectorate if immediate abolition is enacted, loss of revenue, and the cost of an increased British presence to enforce abolition.<sup>442</sup> He concluded that he did “not feel able to recommend the immediate abolition, whether by the introduction of the Indian Act or by any other sweeping measure, of the legal status of slavery.” Instead, like Rodd, he recommended that “the existing Decrees can continue to be enforced, and an increasing number of slaves freed every year” and “measures may be simultaneously adopted for gradually introducing Chinese or

---

<sup>440</sup> No. 14. “Mr. A. Hardinge to the Earl of Kimberley.-{Received April 5},” *Correspondence Respecting Slavery in Zanzibar* (C.7707, 1895), 42.

<sup>441</sup> No. 14. “Mr. A. Hardinge to the Earl of Kimberley.-{Received April 5},” *Correspondence Respecting Slavery in Zanzibar* (C.7707, 1895), 38.

<sup>442</sup> Hardinge goes into depth on the loss of revenue that the Protectorate would sustain if slavery was abolished in: “No. 14. “Mr. A. Hardinge to the Earl of Kimberley.-{Received April 5},” *Correspondence Respecting Slavery in Zanzibar* (C.7707, 1895), 38-42.

Indian coolie labour.”<sup>443</sup> As we will see next chapter, this suggestion was one of many that brought Indian labor to East Africa to build the Uganda Railroad. The Foreign Office’s position on East African slavery had remained unchanged and they were still refusing to take anti-slavery steps move with the immediacy that the abolitionists required.

As this report was being submitted, Mackenzie was traveling to Pemba to investigate slavery and the slave trade. He followed the Anti-Slavery Society tactic of sensationalizing horrific stories about slavery. While traveling through the island he took a

walk through some of the shambas, a name given to plantations or estates; some of the Arabs were not pleased, but they did not forcibly oppose my progress. I saw the Slaves working everywhere, attending to the rice fields. Some were clearing the ground from surplus vegetation, which they burnt, thus making preparations for the great rains, which they expected to come very soon; others were clearing the ground around the clove trees, which were all out in beautiful buds, promising an abundant crop when their season arrived.<sup>444</sup>

Arab reticence to allow Mackenzie on their property without permission, caused him to view the shamba owners as suspicious and therefore it was evidence of Arab secrecy regarding the slave trade. These suspicions were validated because he found when speaking to slaves that they “complained that they had been brought from Zanzibar under false pretences, they having been told that they were required for their masters’ plantations, but on their arrival they had been sold.” Inhabitants of the island, when questioned about whether slaves were treated cruelly replied “that they were sometimes, and that often they were beaten to death, in order to strike terror into the minds of the others. The punishment of Slaves was left to the masters’ own

---

<sup>443</sup> No. 13. “Mr. A. Hardinge to the Earl of Kimberley.-{Received March 27},” *Correspondence Respecting Slavery in Zanzibar* (C.7707, 1895), 27, 37.

<sup>444</sup> Donald Mackenzie, *A Report on Slavery and the Slave Trade in Zanzibar, Pemba, and the Mainland of the British Protectorate of East Africa* (London: British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society), 3.

discretion, with no check of any sort on the part of the authorities.”<sup>445</sup> Later, he investigated a “tumble down old prison” where prisoners were heavily chained and fettered “because they had attempted to run away from their cruel masters and gain their freedom – a very eloquent commentary on the happiness of the Slaves!”<sup>446</sup> Mackenzie’s investigation was validating Anti-Slavery Society claims about the horrors of the East African slave trade and slavery that the Foreign Office had earlier denied. Rather than a trade in decline it appeared to thrive with no regulations in Mackenzie’s narrative.

Mackenzie’s language went further than sensational stories; he also consistently used racialized tropes about Arabs and Africans that were prevalent in British society to describe the slave trade. Regarding the Omani inhabitants, he said “That [Slavery] was the cheapest form of labour the Arabs could find, and they grew rich, and flourished in Oriental luxury on the lives of the poor blacks whom they looked down upon as animals created for their especial purpose.”<sup>447</sup> He also framed the recent caravan regulations in similar terms of Arab cruelty. Citing a 30% mortality rate, Mackenzie argued that “rules were drawn up in order to control in some way the leaders of the caravans [who abused and tortured the porters], or the Europeans who hire the Slaves as porters, but they only mitigate the evil very slightly, the rules not being sufficiently stringent.”<sup>448</sup> His perspective reinforced the Anti-Slavery Society and abolitionists’ perspective

---

<sup>445</sup> Donald Mackenzie, *A Report on Slavery and the Slave Trade in Zanzibar, Pemba, and the Mainland of the British Protectorate of East Africa* (London: British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society), 8.

<sup>446</sup> Donald Mackenzie, *A Report on Slavery and the Slave Trade in Zanzibar, Pemba, and the Mainland of the British Protectorate of East Africa* (London: British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society), 4.

<sup>447</sup> Donald Mackenzie, *A Report on Slavery and the Slave Trade in Zanzibar, Pemba, and the Mainland of the British Protectorate of East Africa* (London: British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society), 14. “A Report on Slavery and the Slave-Trade in Zanzibar, Pemba, and the mainland of the British Protectorates of East Africa,” *Anti Slavery Reporter* (June – Aug., 1895), 86.

<sup>448</sup> Donald Mackenzie, *A Report on Slavery and the Slave Trade in Zanzibar, Pemba, and the Mainland of the British Protectorate of East Africa* (London: British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society), 16. “A Report on Slavery

that porters were slaves and criticism that “free labour” was non-existent because when slaves were hired as free labor they gave half their earnings to their owner. Rather than stabilizing and institutionalizing East Africa’s labor and transportation infrastructure, the caravan regulations instead continued to fan the racist beliefs about Africans and Asians that underlay anti-slavery fervor and action.

Mackenzie spent the end of his investigation in Zanzibar and Mombasa, conversing with British officials. He found two arguments, a practical gradualist argument from Foreign Office officials and an anti-African sentiment. Sir Lloyd Matthews, the First Minister of Zanzibar, “promised to do everything that was possible to carry out any measures for the abolition of Slavery which the British Government might determine.” Mackenzie also spoke to Commissioner Johnston of Nyasaland who “expressed his horror of the whole business and his determination to use every means in his power to put it down within his sphere of influence.” Both men’s statements reflected the position of the Foreign Office. Mackenzie left Zanzibar for Mombasa believing that “though I may differ from them on the Slave question, I feel sure that they are both sincere in their convictions being, no doubt, influenced by their surroundings and respective official positions.”<sup>449</sup> The influence of their personal beliefs of a Foreign Office official and his ability to act was limited.

Mackenzie’s report concluded that the abolition of slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba would have little effect on the economy of the islands. Mackenzie said that:

If all the Slaves of Zanzibar and Pemba were freed to-morrow I do not think for a moment that it would disturb the prosperity of these islands. The freed Slaves could not live on their freedom, they would have to work for their living; the

---

and the Slave-Trade in Zanzibar, Pemba, and the mainland of the British Protectorates of East Africa,” *Anti Slavery Reporter* (June – Aug., 1895), 88.

<sup>449</sup> Donald Mackenzie, *A Report on Slavery and the Slave Trade in Zanzibar, Pemba, and the Mainland of the British Protectorate of East Africa* (London: British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society), 12.



necessity for labour on *shambas* and in port towns would not cease with the abolition of Slavery; the Arab would require labour for his *shamba*; the merchant would require men for loading and discharging cargo, and for his warehouse; the householder would still want servants. If the Slaves were free they would receive their pay in full, work more willingly and better for their employers, and, the blacks being vain and fond of dress, their freedom would, in my opinion, improve the trade in manufactured goods.<sup>450</sup>

This directly contradicted statements from the British Foreign Office consulate represented in Hardinge's report that argued that the abolition of slavery would be catastrophic for the region. Mackenzie was supported by CMS Bishop Alfred Tucker who wrote "the African will not work more than he can help in a state of Slavery; but, as a matter of fact, he will work and does work in a state of liberty... The abolition of Slavery in my opinion will not lead to less, but rather to increased production."<sup>451</sup> These two voices, both from East Africa had a weight that previous claims from the Anti-Slavery Society did not. Mackenzie, unlike his funders, was able to recommend the immediate abolition of the legal status of slavery as soon as possible based on first-hand experience creating a strong argument with emotional undertones to counteract Foreign Office expertise.

The circulation of Mackenzie's report with the support of civic and religious groups throughout Britain created a strong counterview to the position of gradual abolition and positioned the Anti-Slavery Society to abolish the legal status of slavery in the new Zanzibar Protectorate. The Anti-Slavery Society celebrated Mackenzie's report and conclusion by sending a copy to every Member of Parliament, over two hundred newspapers in Britain, and to the

---

<sup>450</sup> Donald Mackenzie, *A Report on Slavery and the Slave Trade in Zanzibar, Pemba, and the Mainland of the British Protectorate of East Africa* (London: British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society), 20-21. "A Report on Slavery and the Slave-Trade in Zanzibar, Pemba, and the Mainland of the British Protectorates of East Africa," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (June – Aug., 1895), 94.

<sup>451</sup> "Confirmation of Mr. Mackenzie's Report," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (June – Aug., 1895) 104. John H. Kennaway, "Bishop Tucker on Slavery in Zanzibar. To the Editor of the Times," *The Times* (August 3, 1895), 6.

Foreign Office.<sup>452</sup> The Society's argument against gradualism was that immediate action against the legal status of slavery needed to be taken since "the Reports from Her Majesty's Representatives in Zanzibar, past and present, have been received, supplemented as they are by the carefully-drawn Report of the Society's Special Commissioner."<sup>453</sup> The Foreign Office was on the defensive.<sup>454</sup> As we will see next section, the British East Africa's official recognition as a British protectorate, essentially ending the previous system of informal imperialism, and a new government, allowed the Anti-Slavery Society and their moral imperial allies to significantly escalate their campaign against Foreign Office gradualism in order to abolish the legal status of slavery in British East Africa.

### **Meetings and Mobilizations: The Final Push in the Campaign to Abolish the Status of Slavery in East Africa, 1895-1896**

Fall 1895 through 1896 saw the final push of the moral imperial campaign against East African slavery. Under a united front and with a clear consistent message, a network of moral imperial organizations loosely organized by the Anti-Slavery Society and their allies in the newly elected parliament consistently maintained pressure from both inside and outside the government. Buoyed by the new political environment in Britain with the election of a Conservative Party dominated House of Commons and Zanzibar's new status as a protectorate, sensationalist arguments about British complicity in the East African slave trade were

---

<sup>452</sup> For some articles that covered the report see: "Press Criticisms," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (June – Aug., 1895), 97- 103.

<sup>453</sup> "Memorial from the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (June – Aug., 1895), 108.

<sup>454</sup> "Questions and Debate: Slavery in Pemba and Zanzibar," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (June – Aug., 1895), 11. "Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba (House of Commons – August 16, 1895)," *The Parliamentary Debates, Fourth Series* Vol. 36 (1895), 152-153.

strengthened while the Foreign Office argument of gradual abolition weakened. The Anti-Slavery Society took advantage of the new general election to build support for abolition of East African slavery. A postcard was sent to every candidate from the Anti-Slavery Society asking them to sign a pledge stating, "I promise to vote for the abolition of Slavery in Zanzibar, Pemba, and all other British Protectorates, should I be elected to Parliament." Over two hundred candidates from every political party signed the pledge and returned the postcards to the Society, including close to seventy returning members of Parliament.<sup>455</sup> This was the first step to pressure the new government into a corner through the use of democratic tactics, lobbying, letters to the editor, and other moral imperial political strategies.

The Anti-Slavery Society followed up this newfound parliamentary power with a show of widespread public support that highlighted the network of organizations they had put together to campaign against Foreign Office gradualism. On October 14, 1895, the Anti-Slavery Society held a public meeting to expound on the horrors of slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba and the inaction of the British government. The society's president, Arthur Pease, chaired this meeting in the Egyptian Hall of the Mayor of London's Mansion House. Donald Mackenzie, Joseph Pease, the Rev. Horace Waller and other dignitaries attended. The Anti-Slavery Society felt that the meeting "prov[ed] that the Society has lost none of the public at large, the room being well filled, the Society of Friends, and members of City business houses being largely and influentially represented, whilst the greatest interest was manifested in the proceedings."<sup>456</sup> The Universities' Mission to Central Africa also commented in support, offering their horror stories of slavery in

---

<sup>455</sup> "The New Parliament," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (June – Aug., 1895), 131

<sup>456</sup> "Slavery Under the British Flag: Official Report of the Meeting," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Sept.-Nov., 1895), 148.

Zanzibar.<sup>457</sup> The massive scale of public support for Anti-Slavery Society goals showed the strength and cohesiveness of the network of organizations that the society had put together in their campaign against East African slavery.

The motions that were passed during the meeting followed a, by now, familiar pattern, repeating the same arguments for abolition that had previously been made to the Foreign Office.

Joseph Pease made the first motion of the meeting:

That this Meeting, whilst desiring to record its sense of the wisdom and consistency which led the Government, in time past, to abolish the status of Slavery in India, on the Gold Coast of Africa, in Cyprus, and elsewhere, whereby freedom was ensured to all natives of those countries under British protection, would hereby express its deep regret that the break in the continuity of the national moral policy should still be allowed to exist with regard to the Slaves now held in Bondage in the British Protectorate of Zanzibar.<sup>458</sup>

The phrase “now held in Bondage in the British Protectorate of Zanzibar” was significant different from motions passed in previous meetings because, for Pease and other abolitionists, British complicity in the slave trade was no longer a question for debate. Pease concluded his speech by viewing Zanzibar as an example for other parts of the Islamic world. He said “If we set an example in those areas over which we have control in the East of Africa, that example will be followed by other nations, and concerted action may then bring pressure to bear upon those Mohammedan races whose laws tolerate Slavery, though the Koran itself encourages manumission.”<sup>459</sup> Abolition in East Africa was part of the Anti-Slavery Society’s strategy to

---

<sup>457</sup> “Slavery in Zanzibar,” *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Universities’ Mission to Central Africa* (January 1896), 12-13.

<sup>458</sup> “Slavery Under the British Flag: Official Report of the Meeting,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Sept.-Nov., 1895), 161.

<sup>459</sup> “Slavery Under the British Flag: Official Report of the Meeting,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Sept.-Nov., 1895), 163.

combat slavery throughout the world. Reverend Waller ended the meeting when he motioned to “emphatically urge Her Majesty’s Government to abolish the *status* of Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba without further delay, inasmuch as the continuance of a state of Slavery necessarily leads to a corresponding activity in the Slave-trade.”<sup>460</sup> Both motions passed unanimously.

The Mission House meeting had two effects, spreading through the media and inspiring other meetings throughout Britain. First, it successfully publicized the issue of abolishing the legal status of slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba. The Anti-Slavery Society published excerpts from twenty four newspapers that covered the meeting in the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*. The Universities’ Mission to Central Africa also reprinted a *Times* article in their journal. With only one exception, the *Pall Mall Gazette*, the publicity was positive.<sup>461</sup> The second effect of the Mansion House meeting was that smaller meetings began popping up around Britain for the remainder of 1895. The Society of Friends held similar meetings around Britain protesting slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba through passing resolutions, which were then sent to government officials. A meeting in Gloucester unanimously passed a resolution, which was sent to the “Prime Minister, Parliamentary leaders and local members” that stated:

That this meeting, having heard with indignation that Slavery is still tolerated in the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba, which are under the Protectorate of Great Britain, notwithstanding the fact that its illegality was declared by treaty and proclamation in 1873, respectfully and earnestly appeals to Her Majesty’s Government to adapt such immediate and pacific measures as will speedily

---

<sup>460</sup> “Slavery Under the British Flag: Official Report of the Meeting,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Sept.-Nov., 1895), 165.

<sup>461</sup> “Opinions of the Press,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Sept., - Nov., 1895), 168-183. “Slavery in Zanzibar: From “The Times” of December 26, 1895,” *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Universities’ Mission to Central Africa* (February 1896), 28-29.

The debate between the Anti-Slavery Society and the *Pall Mall Gazette* can be found in: “A Pro-Slavery Argument,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Sept. – Nov., 1895), 188. “A Pro-Slavery Argument: Reply to Mr. Waller’s Letter,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Sept. – Nov., 1895), 202.

enforce the abolition of Slavery in all the East African territories under British influence and control.<sup>462</sup>

The Gloucester resolution misconstrued the 1873 treaty when it confused slavery with the slave trade and was repeating the Anti-Slavery Society's dead letter argument against the Sultan of Zanzibar. These false statements were not important because the resolution was one of many that were sent to government officials from meetings throughout Britain.<sup>463</sup> The sheer mass of meetings, despite inaccuracies in the resolutions, was representative of a widespread grassroots sentiment against slavery and the slave trade in East Africa, which bolstered the Anti-Slavery Society's cause.

By the next year, the Anti-Slavery Society appeared to have won their campaign against the legal status of slavery in East Africa. Anti-Slavery Society members in the House of Commons began 1896 with consistent pressure on the Foreign Office issue around the issue of the abolition of the status of slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba. The Foreign Office stalled, stating that they will "make a full statement on the subject" in the future.<sup>464</sup> This, though, did not satisfy abolitionists and on March 27, 1896, Joseph Pease moved to reduce the allocation for Slave-trade services from £1000 to £800 restarting the public discussion over slavery in Zanzibar. This tactic, which he had used before, had the same effect. After a lengthy debate Pease withdrew his motion after Mr. Curzon reassured Pease and the entire House that Hardinge, the Consul-General of Zanzibar had instructions to carry out the abolition of the status of slavery when he returned to

---

<sup>462</sup> British Responsibility for Slavery: Meeting in Gloucester," *Anti Slavery Reporter* (December, 1895), 232.

<sup>463</sup> "The Condition of British East African Protectorates," *Anti Slavery Reporter* (December, 1895), 226-227. "A Protest from Bristol," *Anti Slavery Reporter* (December, 1895), 234-240.

<sup>464</sup> "Parliamentary: Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. – Feb., 1896), 50-51. "Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba (House of Commons – February 13, 1896)," *The Parliamentary Debates, Fourth Series* Vol. 37 (1896), 234. "Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba (House of Commons – February 17, 1896)," *The Parliamentary Debates, Fourth Series* Vol. 37 (1896), 457-458.

the region that fall. The *Anti-Slavery Reporter* published the transcript from this meeting as well as three articles from British newspapers that were also critical of the Foreign Office.<sup>465</sup> The growing consensus for abolition was growing and taking action on the issue was becoming politically unavoidable for the Foreign Office.

The Anti-Slavery Society's campaign was further bolstered by events sensationalizing the horrors of slavery and the slave trade in Zanzibar. In 1896, a case of gross cruelty towards a slave by Ali bin Abdulla of Pemba was reported.<sup>466</sup> According to the *Zanzibar Gazette*, Abdulla was found guilty in Zanzibar's British Court of

punish[ing] him [a runaway slave] by having double irons welded on his flesh just near the ankles, the irons being connected by a bar with a clove tree between the unfortunate mans legs... To prolong his misery and save him from a speedy death, a cocoa-nut was given to him morning and evening as food and drink, and thus chained, and thus starved, the miserable man continued in that selfsame spot, exposed to all the inclemencies of weather and to the ravages of insect life, for seven months.<sup>467</sup>

Abdulla was sentenced to seven years in prison, fined five thousand rupees, and was to be deported after completing his sentence in a well publicized decision that was reprinted in missionary and abolitionist journals.<sup>468</sup> The Anti-Slavery Society did not hear about Abdullah's trial until late March. This was too late for Joseph Pease to include in his inquiry with the Foreign Office about flogging of slave porters working on British caravans, although Pease

---

<sup>465</sup> "Parliamentary: Slavery in Zanzibar," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (March – April, 1896), 96-108. "Supply (House of Commons – March 27, 1896)," *The Parliamentary Debates, Fourth Series* Vol. 37 (1896), 311-336. The articles are reprinted in: "What the Press Says," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (March-April, 1896), 108-109.

<sup>466</sup> "Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba," *Anti-Slavery Society* (Jan. – Feb., 1896), 48.

<sup>467</sup> Reprinted in: "Atrocious Torture of a Slave in the British Island of Pemba," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. – Feb., 1896), 111 - 112.

<sup>468</sup> "Post Bag," *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Universities' Mission to Central Africa* (April 1896), 69.

asked the Foreign Office about Abdullah's case in June 1896.<sup>469</sup> These stories allowed abolitionists to keep the pressure on the Foreign Office.

Pressure was also maintained on the Foreign Office through stories of the caravan system. The Anti-Slavery Society sent a memorial to the Foreign Office based on the experiences of CMS Bishop Tucker with slavery in East Africa. Tucker emphasized the cruelties and hardships porters faced in caravans transporting government stores to and from the coast and Uganda. During one of its marches, Tucker's caravan encountered another caravan carrying pieces of the *William Mackinnon* steamer. The Bishop reported that "It [The caravan] started from the coast about 400 strong, and is returning with only 150 men in its ranks." Later the Bishop "came upon a very saddening sight. In an old encampment were three men belonging to the caravan we passed several days ago, the steamer caravan of the Government. They were entirely without food and were simply waiting in the wilderness for death."<sup>470</sup> The Anti-Slavery Society's memorial "urge[d] that such conduct as detailed in Bishop Tucker's narrative be strictly investigated."<sup>471</sup> The Anti-Slavery Society also included a copy Tucker's comments in the January 1896 edition of the *CMS Intelligencer*.<sup>472</sup> The united front of moral imperialists represented opinions in both London and East Africa regarding slavery. Their reminder of British complicity in East African slavery through the caravan system reinforced the need for abolition.

---

<sup>469</sup> "Questions in Parliament: Slavery at Zanzibar," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (March – April, 1896), 114, "Slavery at Zanzibar (House of Commons – March 12, 1896)," *The Parliamentary Debates, Fourth Series* Vol. 38 (1896), 743. Parliamentary: Slave-Owners at Pemba," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (May – July, 1896), 143-144. "Slavery in Zanzibar (House of Commons – June 30, 1896)," *The Parliamentary Debates, Fourth Series* Vol. 42 (1896), 385-386.

<sup>470</sup> "En Route to Uganda: Letters from the Bishop," *The Church Missionary Intelligencer* (January 1895), 23 – 24.

<sup>471</sup> "Slave Porters in British East Africa," *Anti Slavery Reporter* (Dec., 1895), 47.

<sup>472</sup> "Slave Porters in British East Africa," *Anti Slavery Reporter* (Dec., 1895), 47.



The Foreign Office response was only a half measure against slavery, focused again on caravans and increasing governmental control over the transportation and labor infrastructure of East Africa. H. Percy Anderson of the Foreign Office announced “that the attention of Her Majesty’s Agent and Consul-General in Zanzibar will be called to the correspondence; I am, however, to add that he is paying great attention to the question of transport, and has recently prepared new rules for the regulation of caravans fitted out at the coast.”<sup>473</sup> The new rules emphasized greater government oversight of porters, their punishments, and more humanitarian rules for what to do when a porter fell sick.<sup>474</sup> The Anti-Slavery Society published a copy of the new regulations in the middle of 1896. Donald Mackenzie, although critical of the regulations for not going far enough said, “If they are however strictly carried out, they cannot fail to place the Slave porters on a better footing than they have been in the past.”<sup>475</sup> The moral imperial theme of questioning the efficacy of any action against slavery less than full abolition was being repeated against these new regulations.

Moral imperialists hostilely reacted against any hint that abolition was being postponed. Bishop Tucker of the CMS criticized a study the potential effects of the abolishment of slavery in East Africa. He said that “It has been suggested by Mr. Hardinge, Her Consul-General at Zanzibar, that a Royal Commission should be appointed to consider the operation of the immediate or deferred abolition of slavery in the British East Africa and Zanzibar Protectorates.”

---

<sup>473</sup> “Slave Porters in British East Africa,” *Anti Slavery Reporter* (Dec., 1895), 48.

<sup>474</sup> “British East Africa Protectorate: Fresh Regulations for Porters,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (May – July, 1896), 129-131.

<sup>475</sup> “Memoranda on the Above Regulations for the Registration and Protection of Slave Porters,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (May – July, 1896), 131.

The Bishop wholeheartedly opposed such a commission calling it “absurd.”<sup>476</sup> For the Bishop, who was located in East Africa, East African slavery was not a question of study but of action. He responded to the proposal by sending a memorial to Hardinge, which argued that “a legalised condition of slavery in Mombasa, Zanzibar, Pemba, and the coast districts is more or less intimately connected with slave raiding and trading in the interior of the continent” and advocated “that the legal status of slavery in the above-mentioned districts which are under the control of Her Majesty’s Government may be abolished without delay.” The memorial signed by fifteen missionaries in Uganda, and according to Tucker “had time allowed of its circulation the memorial would doubtless have been signed by every missionary in these regions” was particularly significant because it represented a consensus among missionaries and was repeating an Anti-Slavery Society position.<sup>477</sup>

The Foreign Office was moving too slowly for the moral imperialists who, after over a half decade of campaigning, were impatient for action. Without the intermediary of the Imperial British East Africa Company, which as we will see in the next chapter was liquidated and surrendered its charter and administrative responsibilities in East Africa in 1895 due to the enormous expense of maintaining the route to Uganda, British East Africa became a formal part of the British Empire. After the British government declared East Africa a protectorate, however, they continued to base their rule on the Sultanate. This allowed them to continue the argument of maintaining the rule of the Sultan and protect the social order of Zanzibar, which included a

---

<sup>476</sup> “The Mission Field: Eastern Equatorial Africa,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer* (Aug., 1896), 615. “Slavery in British East Africa: Bishop Tucker’s Views,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (May – July, 1896), 124. Alfred R. Tucker, “Slavery in East Africa. To the Editor of the Times,” *The Times* (June 23, 1896), 4.

<sup>477</sup> “The Mission Field: Eastern Equatorial Africa,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer* (Aug., 1896), 616. “Slavery in British East Africa: Bishop Tucker’s Views,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (May – July, 1896), 126.

gradual abolition policy rather than immediate abolition. Shattering this premise was the last step in the campaign to abolish the legal status of slavery in East Africa.

### **Conclusion: The Sultan's Decree Abolishing the Legal Status of Slavery, 1897**

The illusion of indirect rule as the basis for Foreign Office arguments for gradual abolition was shattered in late 1896. Sultan Hamid bin Thuwayni, viewed as friendly by the British, was rumored to have been assassinated by poison by his nephew Khalid on August 25, 1896. When Khalid proclaimed himself Sultan, the British issued an ultimatum to him to abandon the palace the next day. Khalid did not respond to the ultimatum, leading to a British bombardment from three naval ships for fifty minutes reducing the building to rubble. By 2:30 PM on August 27<sup>th</sup> a new, British supported Sultan, Sultan Hamud bin Muhammad, took office.<sup>478</sup> These actions ended the appearance of an independent Sultan of Zanzibar. It was now impossible to avoid or deny British complicity in supporting slavery in East Africa by pointing to Islamic or Arab practices or argue that they had to maintain and respect the Zanzibar social/political order. With no room left to defend gradualism, the Foreign Office finally caved to the public pressure raised by the Anti-Slavery Society and their moral imperial allies, abolishing the legal status of slavery in Zanzibar and British East Africa.

Following the bombardment of the Zanzibar palace, members of the Anti-Slavery Society used Britain's actions to bluntly state that Britain was liable for East African slavery and take steps to try to influence the future abolition process. Joseph Pease wrote a letter to *The Times* that was published five days after the devastating attack. He demanded that the British government

---

<sup>478</sup> "Zanzibar. British Ultimatum," *The Times* (August 27, 1896), 3. "Zanzibar. Bombardment of the Palace. New Sultan Appointed," *The Times* (August 28, 1896), 3. "Death of the Sultan of Zanzibar," *The Times* (August 29, 1896), 3. "The Bombardment of Zanzibar," *The Times* (October 2, 1896), 6. "The Zanzibar Bombardment," *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Universities' Mission to Central Africa* (November 1896), 187-192.

“carry out immediately the reiterated pledge given to Parliament that the legal *status* of slavery within the Zanzibar Protectorate shall be abolished.” He called the current political system of Zanzibar “a British one and that the Sultan is little more than a puppet set up to blind the British public to the responsibilities which attach to us” “maintained at as unnecessary cost of several thousand pounds, which might be saved if the Sultanate were abolished.”<sup>479</sup> The last barrier to abolition that Britain had to respect the Zanzibar social and political order was removed. The Anti-Slavery Society issued a memorial to the Foreign Office arguing against compensation to slave owners for their slaves after slavery was abolished. They stated “it would be most unjust to lay any such burden upon the shoulders of the British taxpayer, seeing that almost all the Slaves in that territory have been illegally held in bondage since the Sultan signed the Treaty of 1873.”<sup>480</sup> They also opposed any “prolongation of Slavery, with added cruelty, under the term of ‘apprenticeship.’”<sup>481</sup> These statements set the Society’s terms to the Foreign Office regarding abolition in East Africa despite the fact that the Foreign Office had made no concrete proposals regarding the issue.

No progress could be made on abolition until Consul-General Hardinge returned from a six month holiday from Zanzibar starting July 1<sup>st</sup>, 1896. This absence was a surprise to Pease and other abolitionists in the House of Commons who had expected a proclamation by autumn 1896. Instead they were reassured by Curzon, that “Her Majesty’s Government are already engaged in considering, in consultation with Mr. Hardinge, the best method of carrying out the pledges

---

<sup>479</sup> Joseph A. Pease, “Zanzibar and Slavery: To the Editor of the Times,” *The Times* (September 1, 1896), 8.

<sup>480</sup> “Slavery in the East Africa Protectorate: Memorial From the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Aug. – Sept., 1896), 190.

<sup>481</sup> “Slavery in the East Africa Protectorate: Memorial From the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Aug. – Sept., 1896), 191.

which they gave to the House earlier in the year." After Hardinge returned to Zanzibar, Salisbury, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, wrote to him on February 10, 1897 that "The frequent communications that have passed between Her Majesty's Government and yourself during your recent visit to this country have enabled the Government to arrive at a decision as to the main steps to be taken by them in fulfillment of the pledges which they have given in Parliament for the abolition of the legal status of slavery in the Islands of Zanzibar and Pemba."<sup>482</sup> The Anti-Slavery Society had won their campaign but the implementation of abolition showed that gradualism still existed.

The government urged caution when abolishing slavery in order to maintain East African social and economic order. They referred to two cases of the breakdown of social order or the failure of free labor during previous local abolition events in East Africa.

When a large number of slaves were freed by the British East Africa Company at Magareni, they are reported to have looted the *shambas* and committed many excesses. It is as yet too early to pronounce definitely on the permanent success of the attempts to obtain free labour for work on the Uganda Railway; but it is known that when Sir Lloyd Mathews endeavoured both in Zanzibar and in Pemba to work plantations upon the free labour system, the bulk of the freed slaves to whom he offered a wage and land, after a short experience, deserted and declined to work.<sup>483</sup>

In order to avoid the breakdown of social order, Salisbury recommended "that slave-owners who can prove to the satisfaction of the Courts legal tenure of any slaves under the terms of Seyyid

---

<sup>482</sup> "No. 1. The Marquess of Salisbury to Mr. A. Hardinge," *Instructions to Mr. Hardinge Respecting the Abolition of the Legal Status of Slavery in the Islands of Zanzibar and Pemba* (C. 8394, 1897), 1. "Africa No. 1 (1897) Instructions to Mr. Hardinge respecting the Abolition of the Legal Status of Slavery in the Islands of Zanzibar and Pemba," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (April – June 1897), 74.

<sup>483</sup> "No. 1. The Marquess of Salisbury to Mr. A. Hardinge," *Instructions to Mr. Hardinge Respecting the Abolition of the Legal Status of Slavery in the Islands of Zanzibar and Pemba* (C. 8394, 1897), 3. "Africa No. 1 (1897) Instructions to Mr. Hardinge respecting the Abolition of the Legal Status of Slavery in the Islands of Zanzibar and Pemba," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (April – June 1897), 75.

Ali's Decree of August 1890, and damage resulting from abolition, shall be entitled to receive compensation for such slaves."<sup>484</sup> This compensation was to be determined by the Sultan's judiciary, which was an Islamic system, and could not be seized for past debts by British Indian moneylenders. The Sultan was to be reassured that he could appeal to the British for financial aid due to any strain caused by abolition or with keeping economic and social order after abolition. The caution behind gradualism was tempering the radical notions implicit in immediate abolition.

Sultan Hamoud bin Mahomed bin Said issued the proclamation abolishing the legal status of slavery on April 6, 1897 after receiving instructions from Hardinge. His audience for the proclamation had a:

good deal of anxious speculation among them as to the object with which they had been sent for; but whether derived from foreign or Indian informants who had access to the English press, the impression was general among them that it was connected with impending changes respecting slavery, and perhaps with the announcement of a general emancipation of slaves, which, ever since the bombardment, had been expected, or, at least, considered likely.<sup>485</sup>

The impending proclamation was not a surprise. In it, the Sultan argued "And whereas the Apostle Mahomed (may God grant him blessings and peace!) has set before us as most praiseworthy the liberation of Slaves, and we are ourselves desirous of following his precepts, and of encouraging the introduction of free labour." He also pointed out that the current system necessitated his subjects taking out loans at high interest, which is also against Islamic law. The proclamation was couched in Islamic terms. He was investing abolition and free labor with an

---

<sup>484</sup> "No. 1. The Marquess of Salisbury to Mr. A. Hardinge," *Instructions to Mr. Hardinge Respecting the Abolition of the Legal Status of Slavery in the Islands of Zanzibar and Pemba* (C. 8394, 1897), 5. "Africa No. 1 (1897) Instructions to Mr. Hardinge respecting the Abolition of the Legal Status of Slavery in the Islands of Zanzibar and Pemba," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (April – June 1897), 78.

<sup>485</sup> "No. 1. Mr. A. Hardinge to the Marquess of Salisbury.\*-(Received May 12.)," *Abolition of the Legal Status of Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba* (C. 8433, 1897), 1.

Islamic overtone and maintaining the basis of the authority of his title. This tactic worked and his subjects received the decree without major opposition. Hardinge reported that “I hear that the great body of Arabs, when the measures were in their turn explained to them, expressed acquiescence, without a dissentient voice, in their provisions, and that many of them seemed greatly relieved at the[ir] moderate character.”<sup>486</sup> Moderating immediate abolition made it palatable to the Zanzibar elite, maintaining the region’s social/political order.

At home, the Anti-Slavery Society criticized this proclamation as insufficient because it was not the abolition of slavery. This was a continuation of its dead letter argument made against the Sultans of Zanzibar in the early 1890s. Although not legally slaves anymore, these men and women continued to live in de facto slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba. Article IV of the Sultan’s proclamation made it difficult for slaves to leave their former shambas due to a vagrancy clause. Specifically, it stated that

Any person whose right to freedom shall have been formally recognised under the preceding article shall be liable to any tax, abatement, *corvée*, or payment in lieu of *corvée*, which our Government may at any time hereafter see fit to impose on the general body of its subjects, and shall be bound on pain of being declared a vagrant to show that he possesses a regular domicile and means of subsistence; and where such domicile is situated on land owned by any other person, to pay to the owner of such land such as rent (which may take the form of an equivalent in labour or produce) as may be agreed upon between them before the District Court.<sup>487</sup>

The *Anti-Slavery Society* was outraged by this clause commenting that “It actually forbids a Slave from walking out of a state of Slavery into freedom, even after abolition has been

---

<sup>486</sup> “No. 1. Mr. A. Hardinge to the Marquess of Salisbury.\*-(Received May 12.),” *Abolition of the Legal Status of Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba* (C. 8433, 1897), 1.

<sup>487</sup> “Inclosure 3 in No. 1. Extract from the Zanzibar “Gazette” of April 7, 1897,” *Abolition of the Legal Status of Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba* (C. 8433, 1897), 4-5. “The Abolition of Slavery in Zanzibar,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (April – June, 1897), 84-85.

decreed.<sup>488</sup> Slavery was abolished legally but slaves remained East Africa's labor population, mollifying the concerns of the Zanzibari elite and maintaining the region's social hierarchy.

Although the Anti-Slavery Society did not like many aspects of the decree, there was still a certain amount of celebration among moral imperialists. The CMS noted the abolition as a victory in a short statement in their monthly magazine.<sup>489</sup> The Universities' Mission to Central Africa stated "This decree we shall receive with joy, and watch the execution of it with interest, in the assurance that the best will be done under difficult circumstances."<sup>490</sup> This was a bittersweet victor for the Anti-Slavery Society. When put into practice, the decree conformed to the cultural norms of the region and practical needs of the British Empire and the Sultan of Zanzibar. Instead of abolishing slavery on British humanitarian terms, the Foreign Office abolished the legal status of slavery in a way that preserved the region's social and financial stability. The long road towards an ostensibly immediate abolition of the legal status of slavery insured that the precepts of Foreign Office gradualism succeeded.

---

<sup>488</sup> "The Abolition of Slavery in Zanzibar," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (April – June, 1897), 85.

<sup>489</sup> "The Mission-Field: Eastern Equatorial Africa," *The Church Missionary Intelligencer* (July, 1897), 536.

<sup>490</sup> "On the Abolition of the Legal Status of Slavery in Zanzibar," *Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Universities' Mission to Central Africa* (May 1897), 72.



## Chapter 4

### **“Civilizing” East Africa: Moral Imperialists, Anti-Imperialists, and the Building of the Uganda Railroad, 1890-1901**

Besides providing a foundation for the abolition of the legal status of slavery, the 1890 Brussels Conference also set the stage for building a modern transportation system in East Africa. The conference specifically encouraged, “The construction of roads, and in particular of railways, connecting the advanced stations with the coast, and permitting easy access to the inland waters, and to such of the upper courses of the rivers and streams as are broken by rapids and cataracts, in view of substituting economical and rapid means of transport for the present means of carriage by men.”<sup>491</sup> The Imperial British East Africa Company and the Foreign Office used this clause to seek Treasury funds for a railroad from Mombasa to Lake Victoria. In support of the plan, moral imperialists promoted the railroad as an agent of “civilization,” meaning that it disrupted and bypassed caravans, the African social/economic system in the region, and further incorporated the region into the British Empire.<sup>492</sup> Anti-imperialists within the House of Commons challenged this narrative, arguing that the railroad and its supporters were self-interested businessmen seeking a subsidy to continue their imperial project. This conflict underlay every step of the building process, from the survey, to explanations for the demise of

---

<sup>491</sup> *General Act of the Brussels Conference, 1889-90; With Annexed Declaration* (C. 6048, 1890), 21.

<sup>492</sup> A similar process occurred in the Cameroons in West Africa. See: Ralph A. Austen and Jonathan Derrick, *Middlemen of the Cameroons Rivers: The Duala and their Hinterland, c. 1600-1960* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

the Imperial British East Africa Company, and finally to the building of the railroad itself from 1896-1901.<sup>493</sup>

The Imperial British East Africa Company believed the Uganda Railroad was the next step for East Africa. According to the company's 1890 report to their shareholders,

The construction of a railway to Lake Victoria, and the placing of steamers on that great inland sea, is, in the opinion of the directors, of urgent importance inasmuch as it will not only most speedily develop the trade of the countries lying between the coast-line and the lakes, but will tap the great centre of Uganda and the populous districts surrounding the shores of Lake Nyanza. It is intended at an early date to submit a scheme for the carrying out of this great work, and the concerted action of the Governments at the recent Conference at Brussels for the suppression of Slavery and the Slave-trade, and the restriction of the trade in arms and alcoholic liquors suggests a reasonable hope of material support being afforded by the State towards the prosecution of such works as the construction of railways.<sup>494</sup>

As signers of the Brussels Conference, the Company could now safely ask for government investment to help administer and develop the region between the East African coast and Lake Victoria. They did not have the financial capital to safely expand beyond their original domain without risking bankruptcy. To support their argument, the company was looking towards Britain's diplomatic and moral duty. Imperial British East Africa Company President William Mackinnon said "To his [Mackinnon's] mind the best civiliser they could aim at was a railway, and he felt that they would have a good claim on the friendly consideration of her Majesty's

---

<sup>493</sup> For the official administrative history of the building of the Uganda Railroad see: M.F. Hill, *Permanent Way: The Story of the Kenya and Uganda Railway, Being the Official History of the Development of the Transport System in Kenya and Uganda* (Nairobi: East African Railways and Harbours, 1950).

<sup>494</sup> "The Imperial British East Africa Company: Report of the Company, Railway to Victoria Nyanza," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July & August 1890), 178.

George Mackenzie, a director of the company, also publicly endorsed building roads and railways after he returned from his initial trip to East Africa to combat the slave trade during a meeting of the Royal Colonial Institute, on November 11, 1890. "British East Africa. By Mr. George S. Mackenzie," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Nov. & Dec., 1890), 300

Government if they asked them to do something towards getting the railway carried on without much delay towards Victoria Nyanza.”<sup>495</sup> Backed by an international treaty and framed as social improvement, the railroad created an alliance between the Conservative Party government and the Imperial British East Africa Company.

The Imperial British East Africa Company had already begun to develop transportation and communication systems throughout the East Africa coast before the Brussels Conference was concluded. By July 1890, the company was in the process of laying rail on the coast and on Zanzibar. They had also purchased a steamboat to facilitate communication and trade in the region. In addition to these transportation initiatives, the company made progress in developing a communication infrastructure by connecting Mombasa to Zanzibar via telegraph and starting to lay telegraph lines between East African ports. Moral imperial interpretations of the effects of the Company’s actions are a useful insight in how the railroad was supposed to “civilize.” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter* stated that “Native traders have settled in considerable numbers in Mombasa and other British ports while the banking facilities placed within their reach by the Company have already had the effect of greatly increasing trade, and of attracting ivory and other caravans from the interior.”<sup>496</sup> The increase of British capital through the Imperial British East Africa Company in the region was viewed as a “civilizing” element, spreading free trade and European monetary customs.

Oposing the moral imperialists and their plans for a railroad were anti-imperial ideologues that formed the Radical wing of the Liberal Party. Small in number and political force, these men in the House of Commons and their supporters, like J.A. Hobson, were

---

<sup>495</sup> “The Imperial British East Africa Company,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July & Aug, 1890), 171

<sup>496</sup> “The Imperial British East Africa Company: Report of the Company, Railway, Shipping, Port Works, &c,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July & August 1890), 177.

beginning to formulate critiques of imperialism that would influence the understanding of imperialism in the twentieth century. Based on anti-imperial arguments in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, pacifism and internationalist doctrines and Britain's humanitarian tradition, the most ideologically rigid Radicals believed that Britain should withdraw from the rest of the world and cease all imperial activity. Rejecting the hierarchy of races and Britain's civilizing mission, anti-imperialists looked to events like the Indian mutiny with the perspective that non-Europeans were unable to be governed by Europeans and should be left to themselves.<sup>497</sup> This was a rejection of moral imperialism and Britain's civilizing mandate. While anti-imperial Radical were mainly ineffective in the late 1890s, failing to stop or even effect the Boer War later, at the start of the decade they held enough sway to oppose the Imperial British East Africa Company and delay the start of the building of the railroad during the Liberal government of 1892-1895.

The Imperial British East Africa Company laid the groundwork for the Uganda Railroad as part of Britain's "civilizing" mission. "Civilizing" was equated with the incorporation of East and Central Africa into the British empire by displacing former centers of power, transportation, and social structures in favor of new a new European based and controlled system. By bypassing indigenous travel practices (caravans) in traveling through East and Central Africa to Uganda, the railroad simplified travel and disrupted indigenous African social structures. As the process moved from the planning to the building stage, descriptions of Africans changed from being potentially useful as labor in the 1870s to being deemed useless by the British. This transition had an unanticipated consequence, setting the stage for a white settler society in East Africa after the railroad was finished. This chapter will detail the bureaucratic and political discussions that preceded the stages of the railway's creation. Beginning with an 1892 vote to fund an

---

<sup>497</sup> Bernard Porter, "Introductory: the Nineteenth-century Legacy," *Critics of Empire: British Radicals and the Imperial Challenge* (London: Macmillan, 1968), 1-34.

engineering and cartographic survey, moral imperialists and anti-imperialists conflicted over the details of the railroad, whose construction started after the end of the Liberal Government in 1895 and ended in 1901, and the very existence of the Imperial British East Africa Company.

**An Unlikely Alliance: The Imperial British East Africa Company, Lord Salisbury's Foreign Office, and the Moral Imperial Argument for a Railroad, 1890-1892**

The Brussels Conference caused the Imperial British East Africa Company and Foreign Office to cooperate in order to promote and plan the railroad. These unlikely allies, moral imperialists in the Company and geopolitical strategists in the Foreign Office, worked together to seek a grant from the Treasury for the initial survey of the railroad. They did so for different reasons. For the Imperial British East Africa Company governmental support was the only chance for the Company to expand towards Uganda in a financially responsible manner. The Foreign Office, however, calculated that the alliance and the railroad was the best way for Britain to fulfill their responsibility to the Brussels Conference. It was financially more stable than other methods of policing and controlling the routes to Lake Victoria and had the added benefit of securing Uganda. With the same goal, this short-lived alliance faced down anti-imperial criticism in the House of Commons to get the railway survey funded and operating.

The Imperial British East Africa Company interpreted the Brussels Conference as requiring a new relationship with the British Government due to their unplanned expansion and investment into Central Africa. They argued in their official history that “the state should make some contribution towards the work which it had undertaken to do by joining in the Brussels

Act.”<sup>498</sup> The Company’s board of directors knew they could not afford to maintain their presence in East Africa and Central Africa without governmental aid. To strengthen this argument they also argued that Britain was falling behind in comparison to other European powers in Africa. They stated that it was “impressed with the substantial manner in which other European Powers having territorial interests in Africa were recognising their responsibilities, while Great Britain alone elected so far to leave the burden of her national duty on the limited resources of a private corporation formed for other objects.”<sup>499</sup> In the face of future bankruptcy by maintaining Britain’s presence through the entirety of East Africa towards Uganda, the Company was appealing to imperial rivalry to make the strongest geopolitical and nationalist argument they could to procure a government subsidy for a future railroad.

Although the Foreign Office and Imperial British East Africa Company had different motives their shared goal of building a railroad caused them to work together for government funding for a railroad. By the end of 1890, the Foreign Office, with the Imperial British East Africa Company’s expertise and input, requested an annual grant from the Treasury to build a railroad from Mombasa to the Lake Victoria region. The Foreign Office explained the need for government investment, after following a policy of informal imperialism with the chartered company funding East Africa’s administration, by referencing the Brussels Conference. They said that “In consequence of the operations of the [Imperial British East Africa] Company Her Majesty’s Government have hitherto escaped any direct responsibility as regards the sphere, but

---

<sup>498</sup> P. L. Mcdermott, *British East Africa or IBEA: A History of the Formation and Work of The Imperial British East Africa Company Compiled with the Authority of the Directors from Official Documents and the Records of the Company* (London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1893), 176.

<sup>499</sup> P. L. Mcdermott, *British East Africa or IBEA: A History of the Formation and Work of The Imperial British East Africa Company Compiled with the Authority of the Directors from Official Documents and the Records of the Company* (London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1893), 173.

the position is altered in this respect by the Slave Trade Conference.”<sup>500</sup> In a follow up letter to the Treasury, the Foreign Office argued that they had two options to fulfill their obligations under the Brussels Conference, a railroad or the establishment and staffing of military stations in East Africa. They calculated that “the proposed payment for a railway will not be in excess of the cost of establishing military posts with flying columns; 25,000£ a- year” and “be the most effective of the two” in combating the slave trade and encouraging commerce.<sup>501</sup> According to this logic the railroad was the most cost effective way for Britain to fulfill the Brussels Conference.

The Treasury and Imperial British East Africa Company conflicted over the expense of the railroad survey, specifically over safety precautions. The Treasury originally estimated the initial cost of a “preliminary survey or reconnaissance by experts of the proposed route” at £10,000, however, Sir William Mackinnon, Chairman of the Imperial British East Africa Company, disagreed. He calculated the cost to be £25,000 with much of the increase used to provide security. To arbitrate, the Treasury sought the expert opinion of Sir Guilford Molesworth, a civil engineer who had built railroads in India. Molesworth estimated in July of 1891 that the initial survey would take approximately six months. He thought the expedition should be led by an engineer “experienced in railway work in a hilly country,” a second engineer in case something happens to the first engineer, “a surgeon, two European transport officers, who might probably be lent by the Imperial British East Africa Company, and an European officer in

---

<sup>500</sup> “No. 1. Foreign Office to Treasury,” *Papers Respecting Proposed Railway from Mombasa to Lake Victoria Nyanza* (C. 6560, 1892), 1.

<sup>501</sup> “No. 2. Foreign Office to Treasury.,” *Papers Respecting Proposed Railway from Mombasa to Lake Victoria Nyanza* (C. 6560, 1892), 2-3.

command of the fighting men.<sup>502</sup> The fighting men and second engineer were necessary because Molesworth, like the Imperial British East Africa Company, viewed the region between the East African coast and Lake Victoria as dangerous and filled with hostile tribes, especially the Masai. He estimated the expedition's size needed to accommodate eighty or a hundred Indian soldiers (depending on whether they were equipped with machine guns), two hundred and fifty porters from the East African coast, and pack animals to carry supplies.<sup>503</sup> Molesworth's determined the cost of the survey as £20,000, closer to the Company's estimate than the Treasury's.

As Molesworth was calculating the cost of the survey, the Anti-Slavery Society began to mobilize for the railroad survey vote, adding a moral imperial argument to the debate. The Anti-Slavery Society actively supported the Mombasa to Victoria Nyanza "railroad as a substitute for portage by Slaves" and issued a memorial to the Foreign Office that tied the Imperial British East Africa Company's withdrawal from Uganda to the need for a railroad.<sup>504</sup> They argued that

the cost of a railway to the lake would be small in comparison with the enormous expenditure in life and treasure that has been incurred by the efforts of Her Majesty's navy to check the transport of Slaves from the African coasts, and they would therefore earnestly call upon Her Majesty's Government to take such immediate steps as shall avert so deplorable a result as the abandonment of the country of Uganda.<sup>505</sup>

Like the Foreign Office and Imperial British East Africa Company, the Anti-Slavery Society saw the railroad as an overall cost-saving measure for the British Empire as well as a moral imperial necessity to combat the slave trade. The Society's case was bolstered by Captain Lugard of the

---

<sup>502</sup> "Inclosure 2 in No. 4. Sir G. Molesworth to Treasury," *Papers Respecting Proposed Railway from Mombasa to Lake Victoria Nyanza* (C. 6560, 1892), 6.

<sup>503</sup> "Inclosure 2 in No. 4. Sir G. Molesworth to Treasury," *Papers Respecting Proposed Railway from Mombasa to Lake Victoria Nyanza* (C. 6560, 1892), 6.

<sup>504</sup> "The Victoria Nyanza Railway," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July & Aug. 1891), 186.

<sup>505</sup> "The Victoria Nyanza Railway," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Sept. & Oct., 1891), 214.



Imperial British East Africa Company's endorsement of the railroad as well as a widespread reaction in the British media, including *Morning Post*, *The Globe*, *Daily Graphic*, *The Times*, and *The St. James's Gazette*.<sup>506</sup> Anti-Slavery Society rhetoric that sensationalized the proposed railway and opposed the abandoning of Uganda was used in these articles. Moral imperial language framed the first step of the railroad to the British public.

Meanwhile, in consultation with the Imperial British East Africa Company, the government continued planning for the railroad survey. After the Treasury's first choice refused to lead the survey, Captain James Macdonald accepted the position in August 1891. He had served as a railway surveyor and engineer in India for the previous seven years.<sup>507</sup> His experience in India colored his perspective and choices when planning the survey. Returning to London, he was put into immediate contact with the Treasury and the Imperial British East Africa Company. The Treasury's instructions were explicit. He was ordered to

survey the route from Mombasa, via Dagoreti or thereabouts, to the Victoria Nyanza, following generally the lines of reconnaissance indicated in the inclosure to his letter of the 12th September last to the Directors of the Imperial British East Africa Company, but with a discretion of deviating from them, with a view of choosing the easiest, cheapest, and most direct railway route.<sup>508</sup>

---

<sup>506</sup> Lugard endorsed a railway "to run from Mombasa to Malindi, connecting the coasts ports...as a means of checking the Slave-trade and smuggling, and of bringing into touch the ports in the Company's territory, would be invaluable." See: "Captain Lugard Reports," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Sept. & Oct., 1891), 223.

The *Morning Post* article was reprinted in "The Victoria Nyanza Railway," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July & Aug. 1891), 186-190. All other papers were reprinted in "What the Press Says," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Sept. & Oct., 1891), 215-220.

<sup>507</sup> "No. 5. Treasury to Foreign Office. – (Received August 27.): Inclosure in No. 5. Treasury to Imperial British East Africa Company," *Papers Respecting Proposed Railway from Mombasa to Lake Victoria Nyanza* (C. 6560, 1892), 7. J. R. L. Macdonald, *Soldiering and Surveying in British East Africa, 1891-1894* (London: Edward Arnold, 1897), 1.

<sup>508</sup> "Inclosure 2 in No. 6. Instructions to Captain Macdonald, R.E., regarding the Survey of Railway Routes between the East Coast of Africa and the Victoria Nyanza." *Papers Respecting Proposed Railway from Mombasa to Lake Victoria Nyanza* (C. 6560, 1892), 8.

In order to accomplish these goals, the Imperial British East Africa Company provided Macdonald with “a somewhat bewildering mass of reports, maps, and books, [and] asked me to furnish without delay a scheme of operations which could be carried out in about nine months, and an estimate of the cost of these operations.”<sup>509</sup> Macdonald used these resources to plan his survey and also as background material, especially when it came to hypothesizing the effects of the railroad on the different African groups in East Africa. However, he was given the freedom to develop his own plans and reject the Imperial British East Africa Company’s recommendations. This was a sign that the alliance between the Company and government was not stable.

The Imperial British East Africa Company was not trusted within the Foreign Office because of its moral imperial leanings. To the Foreign Office, the Company was not “a purely commercial body.” They distrusted company officials because “it is notorious that the majority of, if not all, the subscribers [of the company] are actuated rather by philanthropic motives than by the expectation of receiving any adequate return for their outlay.”<sup>510</sup> Placing philanthropic motives above their fiduciary responsibility as shareholders in a royally chartered company positioned the company in the same category of the Anti-Slavery Society, which was publicly conflicting with the Foreign Office in East African slavery. However, at this point the Foreign Office and Imperial British East Africa Company needed each other. They continued forward in their joint argument for a railroad based on the clause in the Brussels Conference.

---

<sup>509</sup> J. R. L. Macdonald, *Soldiering and Surveying in British East Africa, 1891-1894* (London: Edward Arnold, 1897), 2.

<sup>510</sup> “No. 1. Foreign Office to Treasury,” *Papers Respecting Proposed Railway from Mombasa to Lake Victoria Nyanza* (C. 6560, 1892), 1

When building his staff for the survey, Macdonald rejected the Imperial British East Africa Company's instructions regarding security in favor of his experience on the Indian frontier. Macdonald later recalled that the Imperial British East Africa Company "emphasized the necessity of providing in the estimates for a sufficient military escort, as it was unfortunately feared that the survey would lead to hostility on the part of certain tribes" and suggested "a company of native infantry with a Maxim gun."<sup>511</sup> East Africa was viewed by the Company as a hostile environment that would resist European incursion through the survey. Macdonald, with his experience on the Indian frontier, disagreed and instead of African soldiers, he hired more European and Indian staff for a secondary surveying party. His subordinates, two Royal Engineer lieutenants P. G. Twining and H. H. Austin had previously worked with Macdonald and were stationed in India. They were in charge of gathering Macdonald's old Indian staff for the expedition. Rather than the Maxim guns, Macdonald chose "to increase my survey Khalassies to forty men – an Indian survey Khalassie is a man trained as a chainman, etc."<sup>512</sup> A Khalassie was a contracted worker not under indenture.<sup>513</sup> Macdonald's Khalassies were for the most part his former surveyors in India. His experience in India clearly caused him to prefer non-African Indian labor to African labor, a preference that we will see again from British engineers from India.

As Macdonald's plan was finalized and approved, the Anti-Slavery Society began to lobby for the survey funding vote in the face of anti-imperial opposition from Radicals in the

---

<sup>511</sup> J. R. L. Macdonald, *Soldiering and Surveying in British East Africa, 1891-1894* (London: Edward Arnold, 1897), 2.

<sup>512</sup> J. R. L. Macdonald, *Soldiering and Surveying in British East Africa, 1891-1894* (London: Edward Arnold, 1897), 2.

<sup>513</sup> The definition for Khallasie can be found in footnote 47 of Thomas R. Metcalf, *Imperial Connections: India in the Indian Ocean Arena, 1860-1920* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), 245.

Liberal Party in the House of Commons. In their October 1891 memorial to the Foreign Office, the Anti-Slavery Society clearly identified the railroad as an anti-slavery and moral imperial issue. They stated that “The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society has always looked upon the making of this railway as the commencement of an important line of policy for opening up Central Africa to legitimate commerce, thus materially checking the Slave-trade.”<sup>514</sup> Similar to the Niger River expeditions in the middle of the nineteenth century, the Anti-Slavery Society was arguing that free trade promoted by the existence of the railroad would end the slave trade by attacking the infrastructure that supported it, the caravans.<sup>515</sup> With the support of Alfred Pease, M.P. and Sydney Buxton, M.P., two Anti-Slavery Society members in the House of Commons, the Society sent “out a short general letter to Members of the Opposition, urging them to vote for the grant on Anti-Slavery grounds,” which argued that the railroad fulfilled Article I of the Brussels Conference.<sup>516</sup> With a general election that year, the Society was appealing for House of Commons members to vote to fund the railroad on moral, national, and imperial grounds. They were asking the Radicals in the Liberal Party to ignore the imperial aspect of moral imperialism and vote for the funding and expansion of the British Empire into East and Central Africa.

The debate between moral imperialists and anti-imperialists in the House of Commons over funding the survey occurred on March 4, 1892. The question put to the House of Commons was if “a sum, not exceeding £20,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which

---

<sup>514</sup> “Victoria-Nyanza Railway. Proposed Grant for Survey of Line,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. & Feb. 1892), 55.

<sup>515</sup> See: Howard Temperley, *White Dreams, Black Africa: The Antislavery Expedition to the River Niger, 1841-1842* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991). William Page, *Commerce and Industry: a historical review of the economic conditions of the British empire from the Peace of Paris in 1815 to the declaration of war in 1914, based on Parliamentary debates* (London: Constable and Company, Ltd., 1919). 239.

<sup>516</sup> “Victoria-Nyanza Railway. Proposed Grant for Survey of Line,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. & Feb. 1892), 55.

will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1892, as a Grant in Aid of the Cost of Preliminary Surveys for a Railway from the Coast to Lake Victoria Nyanza.”<sup>517</sup> Opponents to funding the survey in the House of Commons, like Henry Labouchere of Northampton, a well known Radical in the Liberal Party, focused their criticism on the Imperial British East African Company itself, challenging the company’s competence, effectiveness, and civilizing rhetoric. This attack was more than an attack on the future railroad and imperial expansion. It was an attack on moral imperialism and the very vehicle of British imperialism in Africa, the royally chartered company, one which Labouchere extended to the British South Africa Company later in the decade.<sup>518</sup>

Labouchere focused on the fiscal rationale for the railroad and attacked the humanitarian motives of its supporters. He focused his criticism in two directions, against the Imperial British East Africa Company and moral imperialism. Regarding the Company, he said “I have the greatest doubt and suspicion of anyone who comes forward in this House and begins by telling us he is a philanthropist. I know what has been done in the name of philanthropy; and while I esteem philanthropists, I look upon with great doubt and suspicion when they want guarantees.”<sup>519</sup> This was a clear attack against Company directors and shareholders, saying that

---

<sup>517</sup> “Orders of the Day. Supply-Civil Services and Revenue Departments, 1891-(Supplementary Estimates) – 4 March 1892,” *The Parliamentary Debates. Fourth Series: Commencing with the Seventh Session of the Twenty-Fourth Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. II (1892), 50-51.

<sup>518</sup> Labouchere told Chamberlain in 1896 that the Prime Minister had his support if he would end chartered companies, especially the British South Africa Company. Bernard Porter, *Critics of Empire: British Radicals and the Imperial Challenge* (London: Macmillan, 1968), 61-62.

Charles Miller summarizes the conflict between anti-imperialists and the government in: Charles Miller, *The Lunatic Express: The Building of an Impossible 600 Mile Railway Across East Africa* (London: Macmillan Company, 1971), 285-290.

<sup>519</sup> “Orders of the Day. Supply-Civil Services and Revenue Departments, 1891-(Supplementary Estimates) – 4 March 1892,” *The Parliamentary Debates. Fourth Series: Commencing with the Seventh Session of the Twenty-Fourth Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. II (1892), 56.

their philanthropic goals, their moral imperial and civilizing rhetoric, should not be supported by the government. In response to the Anti-Slavery Society's memorial, he said that "Those who come forward in this loose, wild, reckless way without giving details how the money is to be spent, are not the best friends of those who wish to kill the traffic, and hon. Gentlemen opposite have no right to assert that those who object to this railroad are opposed to the putting down of the Slave Trade."<sup>520</sup> In both cases, Labouchere was attempting to remove moral imperialism as a factor in the discussion and focus the question into a debate over funding imperialism.

Labouchere's attack was countered in the House of Commons with moral imperial rhetoric and emotional appeals during a tumultuous debate.<sup>521</sup> Uganda and Lake Victoria figured centrally in the government and moral imperial arguments for the railroad. George J. Goschen, M.P. stated in the House of Commons that Lake Victoria was a center of the slave trade and the railroad would stop the trade. He said that "I have seen maps showing that there are these caravan routes [in the British sphere], and that throughout the territory all round Lake Victoria Nyanza are clustered numerous spots where slave raiding mainly exists."<sup>522</sup> Another member of the House of Commons and director of the Imperial British East Africa, William Burdett-Coutts, attempted to counter an argument against creating an infrastructure from the coast to Uganda because of instability in the Buganda kingdom and the hostility between Muslim, Catholic and

---

<sup>520</sup> "Orders of the Day. Supply-Civil Services and Revenue Departments, 1891-(Supplementary Estimates) – 4 March 1892," *The Parliamentary Debates. Fourth Series: Commencing with the Seventh Session of the Twenty-Fourth Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. II (1892), 59.

<sup>521</sup> Alfred Pease, M.P., of the Anti-Slavery Society attempted to speak three times in favor of the grant but was unable to be heard. "Victoria-Nyanza Railway. Proposed Grant for Survey of Line," *Anti-Slavery Society* (Jan. & Feb. 1892), 56.

<sup>522</sup> "Orders of the Day. Supply-Civil Services and Revenue Departments, 1891-(Supplementary Estimates) – 4 March 1892," *The Parliamentary Debates. Fourth Series: Commencing with the Seventh Session of the Twenty-Fourth Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. II (1892), 88.

Protestant factions.<sup>523</sup> Repeating these talking points about combating slavery and maintaining stability in Buganda allowed moral and emotive logic to overtake the debate and shift it away from Labouchere's criticism. After a question regarding whether or not shareholders and directors of the Imperial British East Africa Company could vote the survey money was approved 211 to 113.<sup>524</sup>

Any resonance of Labouchere's arguments or his fellow Radicals in the Liberal Party among the electorate was dangerous to the Company's future. Their critiques required a moral imperial response to the general public because of the general election that year.<sup>525</sup> The likelihood of a government subsidy for a railroad with the Liberal Party in control was much less than that of a Conservative government. Imperial British East Africa Company director and Conservative Party member, Burdett-Coutts, M.P. addressed his constituents about the importance of the survey vote and defending the Imperial British East Africa Company.<sup>526</sup> During this speech he made three points, that the company spread the "English Sphere of Influence" by "advanci[ing] their money...to carry commerce, civilisation, and peaceful progress

---

<sup>523</sup> "Orders of the Day. Supply-Civil Services and Revenue Departments, 1891-(Supplementary Estimates) – 4 March 1892," *The Parliamentary Debates. Fourth Series: Commencing with the Seventh Session of the Twenty-Fourth Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. II (1892), 79.

<sup>524</sup> "Orders of the Day. Supply-Civil Services and Revenue Departments, 1891-(Supplementary Estimates) – 4 March 1892," *The Parliamentary Debates. Fourth Series: Commencing with the Seventh Session of the Twenty-Fourth Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. II (1892), 91. The *Anti-Slavery Reporter* published the votes of every member of the House of Commons who voted on the grant. See: "Victoria-Nyanza Railway. Proposed Grant for Survey of Line," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. & Feb. 1892), 56-59.

<sup>525</sup> For a description of the lead up to the 1892 general election, the election, and its aftermath see: Ian Cawood, "The 1892 General Election and the Eclipse of the Liberal Unionists," *Parliamentary History* Vol. 29, pt. 3 (2010), 335-357.

<sup>526</sup> "Mr. Burdett-Coutts, M.P. and the Mombasa Railway," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Mar. & April, 1892), 89-90.

amongst its unhappy and neglected tribes,<sup>527</sup> that they opened up a new market for British manufacturers, and

Thirdly, and by far the most important, the Company has been carrying out a great national obligation solemnly undertaken by the British Government in conjunction with other European Powers at the Brussels Conference – an obligation which bound it and other signatories to that agreement to use every possible means to suppress the horrible Slave-trade in Africa. (Cheers)...It was a solemn undertaking on the part of England, it was almost projected by England, and here we have before us in this railway the sole and only means of putting an end to Slavery in Africa.<sup>528</sup>

Framing the debate in this way tied the Company to nationalist and moral imperial sentiments. Through Boudett-Coutts, the Company was arguing that building the railroad was Britain's moral duty to combat the slavery.

The Anti-Slavery Society also framed the survey vote debate as a moral responsibility of Britain after the House of Commons vote. They made connections between combating the slave trade, building the railroad, and civilizing East and Central Africa. The Society took steps “to raise public interest – upon purely Anti-Slavery grounds – in the larger question that must shortly arise as to the building of the railway itself; and with that view it has circulated the following documents amongst Parliamentary Candidates and other influential persons.” The railroad was a key part of Anti-Slavery Society's strategy in East and Central Africa. The documents they sent included a letter from the Society's Secretary, Charles Allen. He argued that without the railroad “it is practically impossible to bring the great and populous region of Uganda into touch with British interests.” A railroad should, according to Allen

---

<sup>527</sup> “Mr. Burdett-Coutts, M.P. and the Mombasa Railway,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Mar. & April, 1892), 89.

<sup>528</sup> “Mr. Burdett-Coutts, M.P. and the Mombasa Railway,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Mar. & April, 1892), 89-90.



recommend itself to all those who are interested in extending the commerce of this country, at a time when protective duties are closing so many markets to our manufacturers, and it is most desirable therefore that the public voice should demand at the coming Election that whatever party may be in power Her Majesty's Ministers should be called upon to further a measure so calculated, at a comparatively trifling cost, to advance the cause of humanity, civilisation, and commerce.<sup>529</sup>

The Anti-Slavery Society was working hard to maintain momentum for anti-slavery steps, like the railroad, after the general election.

These efforts to frame the railroad after the survey vote were semi-futile. A new parliamentary majority was elected consisting of the Liberal Party, including the radical anti-imperialists who had opposed and criticized moral imperialists during the railroad survey vote, and Irish Nationalists. Under this new government, progress on the railroad stopped until 1895. Despite this setback, Captain Macdonald completed the survey of the proposed route for this railway during the general election and its aftermath occurred. His report mainly featured cartographic descriptions of the landscape as well as the difficulties of traveling through the East African terrain. He also commented on the complexity of East African caravan culture for Europeans and the potential effects of the railroad; especially on the Africans whose territories he was traveling through, their relations to each other and Europeans, and their potential to be “civilized” or acculturate themselves to European commercial and social mores.

### **Macdonald's Survey from Mombasa to Lake Victoria, 1891-1892**

Macdonald's survey, consisting of an expedition whose core was distinctly non-African, represented a rhetorical remaking of East African physical and social geography. Macdonald believed that the railroad was transformative. He said that “Civilization alone will have an

---

<sup>529</sup> “British East Africa and the Mombasa Railway.” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Mar. & April, 1892), 123-124.

enormous deterring effect on slavery, and civilization can only reach such a distance in the wake of a railway. By any other means, it must be a slow, partial, and costly process.”<sup>530</sup> By following Macdonald along his route a clear vision will appear of what he meant by the phrase “civilizing,” which, besides anti-slavery measures, included an awareness and acceptance of capitalism, developing a work ethic among Africans that was useful for Europeans, and destroying and replacing of indigenous governing systems with systems that were easier for Europeans to monitor and control. He mapped out a new East Africa, one controlled by Britain, in a detailed geographic survey of the potential railroad routes and hypothesizing the possible “civilizing” effects of the railroad on East and Central African inhabitants.

Macdonald assembled his staff of Europeans and Indians outside East Africa, in Aden. The Europeans under his command consisted of three Royal Engineers – Captain Pringle, the Executive Engineer, Lieutenant Twining and Lieutenant Austin, both Assistant Engineers – and Sergeant Thomas, a surveyor from India. Supplementing them were Indians including one surveyor, two draughtsmen, four Jemadars (the lowest rank for a Viceroy's Commissioned Officer in the British Indian Army), and thirty seven Khalassies (trained Indian survey employees). Macdonald’s official report commented that the Indians “were half Pathans, half Panjabis, enlisted in Rawwal Pinid and Peshawar; several of them had previously served with Captain Macdonald on Railway Survey and Construction work, on the north-west frontier of India.”<sup>531</sup> These Indians, trained in dangerous frontier conditions, were Macdonald’s replacement for African soldiers. With his primary staff of Royal Engineers, company employees, and Indian contracted labor in place, Macdonald left for East Africa on November 17, 1891.

---

<sup>530</sup> *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 100.

<sup>531</sup> *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 105.

Arriving in East Africa a week after he left Aden, Macdonald encountered the East African landscape for the first time. He prepared for the survey like an invader, using his time to train his staff and acculturate himself to the landscape. Macdonald went on two short preliminary expeditions to “reconnoiter for a feasible ascent on to the first step of the interior plateau, some fifteen miles inland, to see if a system of triangulation beyond this was feasible, and also to gain a little experience, however slight, of what caravan work was like” as the Imperial British East Africa Company finished their preparations for the survey. He described these short expeditions as excursions into a hostile territory that was unsuitable for scientific survey work. Triangulation was impossible because of the densely wooded hills and Macdonald recalled that “The discomforts of this preliminary canter were considerable; it rained on the average twice a day, and on one occasion my camp went astray.” The rain and non-level hole filled ground made the region “not conducive to accurate in measurement.”<sup>532</sup> These first impressions of East Africa labeled even the landscape as hostile and alien to the scientifically minded Macdonald.

Each step of Macdonald’s survey had a moral imperial component, namely a description of the Africans that bordered his route and the potential effects of the railroad on them. These descriptions were collected in a single chapter in his report to Parliament.<sup>533</sup> He depended on the Imperial British East Africa Company for information on these groups, specifically on “the previous knowledge of the I.B.E.A. Company’s officials in East Africa, and to reports kindly placed at our disposal by the directors of the Company.”<sup>534</sup> His descriptions represented both his

---

<sup>532</sup> J.R.L. Macdonald, *Soldiering and Surveying in British East Africa, 1891-1894* (London: Edward Arnold, 1897), 9.

<sup>533</sup> This chapter included descriptions of “the various tribes through which the projected railway would pass, or be adjacent to ...their characteristics and capabilities, numbers and strength, probably relations with the railway under construction, and on open line, so far as this is possible.” *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 82.

<sup>534</sup> *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 82.

and the Company's perspective on African peoples and their development. In this chapter, Macdonald outlines how a railroad could act as a civilizing agent of British imperialism. It ended conflict between ethnic groups and instilled free trade and capitalist practices by encouraging trade and connections to the West. This argument was based on the social effects of work of Imperial British East Africa Company on the coast. Macdonald said "The establishment of the company's stations among these people at Takunga, Magarini, and Makengeni has greatly ameliorated their condition, and they are now able to move about with their flocks, undeterred by the fear of their once formidable rivals, the Wa-Galla."<sup>535</sup> He assumed that similar progress would follow the railway into the interior towards Lake Victoria.

A railroad could also make caravans, the indigenous African transportation system and a thorn in the side for Europeans like Macdonald, obsolete. His expedition, which was organized as a caravan, consisted of seven Europeans, forty one Indians, seven Swahili headmen and interpreters, forty *Swahili* askari, two hundred and seventy Swahili porters, and twenty four Swahili servants and cooks, consisted of more Africans than the Europeans and Indians who did the "skilled" labor. The Imperial British East Africa Company recruited Africans and assigned two company transportation officers as porters for Macdonald.<sup>536</sup> The survey's first division left on December 18, 1891. The departure from Mombasa stunned Macdonald. The captain later recalled that

the start was most trying to the tempter, though not without its ludicrous aspect. Every detail had been arranged the day before; but the Swahili porter, as long as he is within the reach of the drink-shops of the coast, is a mortal on whose action

---

<sup>535</sup> *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 82.

<sup>536</sup> The Company also set up depots "at Tsavo, Kibwezi and Machako's, and Lugard's first stockade on the Sabaki River near Makangeni" in preparation for Macdonald. J.R.L. Macdonald, *Soldiering and Surveying in British East Africa, 1891-1894* (London: Edward Arnold, 1897), 8.

no reliable forecast can be based. A good many men were absent and others paraded late; some objected to their loads while others energetically seized a box or a bale and vanished into the surrounding jungle. Ultimately, after much noise and not a little unparliamentary language, the division marched off, with its drums beating.<sup>537</sup>

While Macdonald was shocked by the behavior of the caravan porters, describing it almost like a comedic scene, Frederick Jackson, one of the Transportation Officers was not surprised. He said, “To an old hand the start of our safari was a very usual experience, but to these R.E. officers it was a revelation, as everything had to be carefully arranged and every detail considered beforehand. At the given hour the porters began to struggle up; some were very late, some never came at all, pandemonium reigned.”<sup>538</sup> The second division left on December 23.<sup>539</sup> The chaos of the first division’s departure was repeated and Macdonald’s opinion of the reliability of African labor decreased. For Macdonald, African labor practices were laughable and not conducive to European planning methods.

The survey expedition was different from a caravan because each segment of the route was divided into several marches in order for the European staff to collect the detailed measurements needed to complete the survey. The extra work caused Jackson to comment that “Marching with a survey party is necessarily slower work, than the ordinary caravan is accustomed.”<sup>540</sup> Macdonald’s expedition began by surveying two routes to Tsavo. The division under Pringle surveyed “the recognized route viâ Taru and Teita,” while Macdonald’s division

---

<sup>537</sup> J.R.L. Macdonald, *Soldiering and Surveying in British East Africa, 1891-1894* (London: Edward Arnold, 1897), 10.

<sup>538</sup> Sir Frederick Jackson, *Early Days in East Africa* (London: Edward Arnold & Co., 1930), 319.

<sup>539</sup> J.R.L. Macdonald, *Soldiering and Surveying in British East Africa, 1891-1894* (London: Edward Arnold, 1897), 11. Macdonald reported the departure to the Imperial British East African Company when he left Mombasa. See: “No. 7. Imperial British East Africa Company to Foreign Office.-Received December 28),” *Papers Respecting Proposed Railway from Mombasa to Lake Victoria Nyanza* (C. 6560, 1892), 9.

<sup>540</sup> Sir Frederick Jackson, *Early Days in East Africa* (London: Edward Arnold & Co., 1930), 319.

surveyed the Sabaki River. Macdonald's experiences during this initial march further reinforced a negative opinion of African labor. He absorbed an "Arab contract caravan, with stores for the survey depot at Kibwezi [halfway between the Tsavo depot and Machakos depot], which ought to have reached their destination by this time." Also, "A number of the men had deserted, for the Sabaki route is most unpopular with porters, and they had more loads than they could carry."<sup>541</sup> These two incidents made the caravan system seem unreliable to Macdonald and reinforced the need for a railroad. By early January 1892, over a month before funding for the expedition was approved in the House of Commons, both survey divisions had reached the Tsavo stockade.<sup>542</sup>

Macdonald's experiences on the first leg of his survey were complemented with descriptions of the three major African groups in the coastal region, the Giriama, Duruma, and Teita. This information was not based on personal experience but rather from Imperial British East Africa Company reports. Macdonald paid particular attention to their level of "civilization" focusing mainly on their acculturation to capitalism and free labor. He noted that "The[se] tribes...are all accustomed to receive money payments, and from their dealings with the coast towns understand the value of money. The Tsavo river may be described as approximately the boundary beyond which natives have not hitherto accepted money valuation in return for their services."<sup>543</sup> Additionally, Macdonald believed that the railroad would provide new employment

---

<sup>541</sup> J.R.L. Macdonald, *Soldiering and Surveying in British East Africa, 1891-1894* (London: Edward Arnold, 1897), 21.

<sup>542</sup> J.R.L. Macdonald, *Soldiering and Surveying in British East Africa, 1891-1894* (London: Edward Arnold, 1897), 14-20. "No. 8. Imperial British East Africa Company to Foreign Office.-(Received February 9), *Papers Respecting Proposed Railway from Mombasa to Lake Victoria Nyanza* (C. 6560, 1892), 9. No. 9. Treasury to Foreign Office.-(Received February 22.)," *Papers Respecting Proposed Railway from Mombasa to Lake Victoria Nyanza* (C. 6560, 1892), 9. "No. 10. Imperial British East Africa Company to Foreign Office.-(Received February 23.)," *Papers Respecting Proposed Railway from Mombasa to Lake Victoria Nyanza* (C. 6560, 1892), 10-11.

<sup>543</sup> *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 83.

and mobility to slaves allowing them more opportunities to buy their own freedom and live as free labor. Agricultural lands and practices would expand with the extra security provided by the railroad.<sup>544</sup> For those peoples already in close contact with Europeans, Macdonald saw the potential railroad as a further “civilizing” tool. It did so by increasing security, ending raiding, and providing new employment activities, thereby increasing contact with Europeans and acculturating the non-urban Africans more to British and western economic and social mores.

At Tsavo, Macdonald and Pringle compared their routes and measurements while planning for the next section of the survey from the Tsavo River to the second depot at Machakos. These deliberations were a combination of cartography and economics that was necessary to accomplish the goals of the survey. Important points in the potential railway route were marked by their longitude and latitude “using theodolite or sextant and chronometer, when the weather permits.”<sup>545</sup> Based on meticulous geographic plans he concluded on January 28, 1892 that, “It will be at once apparent that the route from Mombasa, Maunu direct to Tsavo” “is the cheapest, and in my opinion, it is the one to adopt.”<sup>546</sup> Scientific cartography and economics were defining the potential railroad route. The caravan was also reorganized at Tsavo. Mr. Foaker, the other Imperial British East African Company Transportation Officer besides Jackson, went ahead with a small party for Imperial British East African Company’s Machakos stockade. The rest of the party was again split into two to assess the potential routes to Machakos. Lieutenant Twining and Lieutenant Austin left Tsavo on January 24, 1892 to survey the Athi River while Macdonald surveyed the main caravan route between Tsavo and the Nzoi

---

<sup>544</sup> *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 82- 83.

<sup>545</sup> “Inclosure 4 in No. 14. Explanation of Plans,” *Papers Relating to the Mombasa Railway Survey and Uganda* (C. 6555, 1892), 137.

<sup>546</sup> “Inclosure 2 in No. 14. Captain MacDonald, R.E., to Imperial British East Africa Company,” *Papers Relating to the Mombasa Railway Survey and Uganda* (C. 6555, 1892), 137.

Mountain.<sup>547</sup> It was through such meticulous planning, measurements, and discussions that the least expensive viable route was first put together to build a railroad through East Africa.

During the second leg of the journey Macdonald's caravan had first hand encounters with both European missionaries and Africans. Struck by sickness, Macdonald, Pringle and Jackson saw "a doctor at the newly-founded Scottish Mission at Kibwezi."<sup>548</sup> The mission was described as "an oasis in the desert of thorn" that consisted of European style houses, the mission gardens, plantations, a store a school, carpenters shops, the beginnings of a church, and new roads. Kibwezi was a European enclave in the heart of East Africa and Macdonald approved. He recalled that "the whole place has a thriving prosperous work."<sup>549</sup> Much of the construction for the station was done by the local Kamba people. Macdonald rated this group highly although he did not recount any personal contact with the group. Based on reports and stories from company personnel he said that the they

show an aptitude for colonization, unnoticeable in other tribes. From information obtained from Mr. Ainsworth, the Company's Superintendent at Machako's, the Wa-Kamba are most willing to adapt themselves to the circumstances of demand and supply, and to cultivate such European cereals or products, which may be introduced into the country with a good chance of demand.<sup>550</sup>

---

<sup>547</sup> *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 109-110. These plans were also recalled in: J.R.L. Macdonald, *Soldiering and Surveying in British East Africa, 1891-1894* (London: Edward Arnold, 1897), 25-26.

<sup>548</sup> The doctor determined that Jackson was too sick to continue and had to go back to the coast. J.R.L. Macdonald, *Soldiering and Surveying in British East Africa, 1891-1894* (London: Edward Arnold, 1897), 26.

<sup>549</sup> *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 110.

<sup>550</sup> *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 84.

Macdonald said that "As regards their industrial habits, more can be said in their favour than of most other tribes." The Kamba were also being used as labor to build a road from Tsavo to Kibwezi. *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 83-84. P. L. McDermott, *British East Africa of IBEA: A History of the Formation and Work of THE IMPERIAL BRITISH EAST AFRICA COMPANY, compiled with the authority of the directors from official documents and records of the company, New Edition* (London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1895), 397-399.



Like the coastal peoples east of the Tsavo River, contact with Europeans led to a more positive view of the Kamba. The Kamba's geographic proximity and history of interactions with Europeans, similar to the Giriama and other coastal peoples, made them appear more "civilized" to Macdonald.

Leaving Kibwezi, Macdonald related his first real life encounter with indigenous Africans not under his employ. Unlike his description of the Kamba this was an entirely "uncivilized" people which had not acculturated itself to European beliefs and customs. On his way to the Machakos stockade Macdonald decided to take a detour to climb the Nzoi Mountain in order to take scientific measurements for the survey. However, they had trouble finding a guide because of local beliefs about the mountain. Macdonald stated that

[The Africans] were willing enough to point out the path or track from below, but when we asked for guides we found that superstitious fears held them back. A spirit of exceptional powers was supposed to reside on this lofty peak, and they feared to provoke him by intruding on his barren crags. At last, after a good deal of talk and a handsome present, two daring men, who evidently thought we were relations of the dread spirit of Nzoi, agreed to accompany us.<sup>551</sup>

This experience emphasized for Macdonald the contrast between the "scientific" and "rational" European and the "uncivilized" African especially after leaving the "civilized" mission at Kibwezi.<sup>552</sup> Macdonald traveled on to Machakos, reaching the halfway point to Lake Victoria on March 21, 1892 where he endured a five week delay in order to gather enough food for the multiple trips his expedition needed to survey the potential routes to Lake Victoria.<sup>553</sup>

---

<sup>551</sup> J.R.L. Macdonald, *Soldiering and Surveying in British East Africa, 1891-1894* (London: Edward Arnold, 1897), 31.

<sup>552</sup> Johannes Fabian outlines and challenges this dichotomy in: Johannes Fabian, *Out of Our Minds: Reason and Madness in the Exploration of Central Africa* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).

<sup>553</sup> *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 111-112.

Besides the Kamba, Macdonald also wrote about the Kikuyu, Masai, and Galla separating them into two groups, the prey and the predators. The Galla were constantly at war with the Masai but “having neither the disciplined organization, nor the warlike proclivities of the Masai, they are constantly being raided by them, their cattle lifted, and their settlements driven back into the hills.”<sup>554</sup> In Macdonald’s model they were the prey. The Galla had also fought the Kikuyu before the establishment of Imperial British East Africa Company stations in Machakos ended the fighting.<sup>555</sup> It was also hoped that the railroad would bring the other group that suffered from Masai raids, the Kamba, a similar benefit. Already deemed more “civilized” than their neighbors because of the work they did for Europeans at Kibwezi, the railroad would help the Kamba because it “would guarantee an increased and increasing immunity from inter-tribal wars... and result in a large and continuous development of the country.”<sup>556</sup> The major benefit the potential railroad brought to this region and its warring neighbors was security that could end attacks on the Galla and Kamba, the more sedentary agricultural groups from the Masai and Kikuyu.

According to Macdonald the Kikuyu and Masai were raiders and instigators of instability in the region, although he had differing opinions on the two groups. He called the Kikuyu “generally treacherous, unreliable, and intriguing, extremely fond of native liquor, and very excitable when under its influence.”<sup>557</sup> Macdonald thought they were thieves, liars, and degenerates, described in similar terms as the lower classes of Britain. He continued to say:

As regards their industry, much cannot be said. Possessed of an extremely fertile country and blessed with a rainfall that never fails, a minimum of work, and that

---

<sup>554</sup> *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 83.

<sup>555</sup> *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 83.

<sup>556</sup> *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 84.

<sup>557</sup> *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 84.

chiefly accomplished by women or slaves, ensures a harvest far beyond their requirements. The result of this is that the men are lazy, and show little inclination to labour; and the old adage regarding Satan and idle hands seems to be particularly applicable.<sup>558</sup>

Contrasting the Kikuyu were the noble warriors, the Masai. Because the Masai had no agricultural or herding traditions Macdonald did not see a future for them in a post-railroad East Africa. He said, “For the Wa-Kikuyu, it has been shown, a strong government is required. For the Masai some new sphere in life must be found, as their occupation and means of existence by raiding will be destroyed.”<sup>559</sup> Neither group’s way of life should (in the Kikuyu’s case) or could (in the Masai’s case) be saved with the coming of the railroad.

Leaving Fort Smith in Kikuyu, Macdonald personally encountered the Masai. This incident, though, was not as significant or dangerous as the Imperial British East Africa Company and others in London had warned. Macdonald recalled that “before I was out of bed, I heard the Masai hongo song echoing through the camp, and my interpreter rushed in to say that the Masai were advancing in thousands.”<sup>560</sup> Upon investigating, Macdonald found only seventeen Masai who were demanding their hongo (transit dues). Macdonald refused to pay and the Masai left without a fight, showing them to be less dangerous than originally envisioned in Britain. In his report, Macdonald supported his experience with that of an Imperial British East Africa Company employee who stated “I venture to think it a mistake to be more afraid of the Masai than other natives.”<sup>561</sup> He did not give credence to the view that the Masai was a major threat, even though the Masai way of life would be directly threatened by the railroad,

---

<sup>558</sup> *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 85.

<sup>559</sup> *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 88.

<sup>560</sup> J.R.L. Macdonald, *Soldiering and Surveying in British East Africa, 1891-1894* (London: Edward Arnold, 1897), 58.

<sup>561</sup> *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 86.

Macdonald felt that “they [the Masai] would offer any opposition to it [the railroad]. Cases of thieving would occur, as elsewhere, but of organized or even petty opposition there would probably be none.”<sup>562</sup> Regarding the Kikuyu, he also did not believe that they would be an issue or interfere with construction except to steal supplies.<sup>563</sup> This perspective was the exact opposite of how his employers in the Imperial British East Africa Company felt, especially regarding the Masai. By downgrading the threat of the Masai and openly denigrating the Kikuyu Macdonald was arguing against physical threats to the railroad or its underlying “civilizing” mission.

By this point in his expedition, Macdonald was optimistic about the technical progress of his survey and plans for the railroad. He reported to the Imperial British East Africa Company that “I am happy to be able to report a practicable railway route as far as Kikuyu of about 350 miles in length in touch with the centres of population, and costing about 3,000£ per mile.” He described the terrain, paying specific attention to elevations, gradients, and geographic obstacles including rivers, ravines, valleys, and hills of the various five routes he and his party surveyed.<sup>564</sup> Macdonald was also hopeful for the region’s prospects saying that “The two factors wanting for the development of the country appear to be therefore, a settled and assured government, with safety from inter-tribal attacks, and a market for the products. It is considered that the

---

<sup>562</sup> *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 87.

Macdonald said of the Masai and the railroad: “...the construction of a railway would, unless special steps were taken, not be to the advantage of the Masai. Their principle occupation and source of livelihood, “raiding,” would be put a stop to, and the settlement and development of the surrounding countries, and safeguard from internecine war, would so strengthen the hands of their neighbours, that it is feared the result would be either the ultimate extinction of the Masai, or their enforced withdrawal from the country now occupied by them.” See: *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 86.

<sup>563</sup> *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 85.

<sup>564</sup> “Inclosure 14 in No. 14. Captain Macdonald, R.E., to Imperial British East Africa Company (Machakos, March 5, 1892),” *Papers Relating to the Mombasa Railway Survey and Uganda* (C. 6555, 1892), 144-146. Quote on 144.

construction of a railway would guarantee the first of these, and create the second.”<sup>565</sup> Social stability and technological progress through the railroad would lead to a more “civilized” East Africa.

The second half of Macdonald’s trip emphasized the instability of Central Africa. On his way to Lake Victoria, a message came from Uganda reporting that fighting had erupted again and communication with Lugard had been cut off. Macdonald continued on to Lake Victoria, finished the survey, and reached Uganda after hostilities ended. He presented the same social perspective regarding Uganda that he had East Africa. Regarding slavery, he said

It will probably be asked what effect the railway would have on the slave trade in these regions west and north of its terminus on the Lake Victoria. The effect, though indirect, would be undoubtedly great. The easy communication by steamboat, from the terminus of the railway, with Uganda and the Lake districts, and the consequent spread of civilization, would rapidly abolish the milder forms of slave trade now existing near the Lake. The Lake regions settled, becoming civilized, it is allowed that a railway is a most civilizing agent, and engaged in trade and commerce a fresh base of operations would be formed, from whence civilization could attack the headquarters of the slave trade.<sup>566</sup>

Unlike the rest of East Africa, which was reachable by other means, Uganda’s only path of to being “civilized” in Macdonald’s eyes was the railroad. He said “it must be obvious to any who have seen the development that has followed upon the construction for a railway in other countries what an important factor a railway is to the civilization and prosperity of these lake districts, and how almost impossible it would be to assure this civilization by other methods.”<sup>567</sup> A railroad could provide the stability that was lacking and help Britain cement its control.

---

<sup>565</sup> *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 84.

<sup>566</sup> *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 100.

<sup>567</sup> *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 87.

Ultimately, Macdonald proposed to construct the railroad “telescopically” using Indians, rather than Africans.<sup>568</sup> In his plan, railroad construction to be supervised by a European engineer-in-charge in control, a survey division working ahead of the “railhead” laying light rail, two construction divisions (one to lay earthwork and one to build the railroad), a caravan carrying food and supplies, and a police force. The survey division was to consist of four European engineers and officers, sixty two Indians who acted as clerks, draughtsmen, hospital assistants, Jemadars, and Khaassies, and two hundred and ninety one Swahilis who transported supplies and cleared brush. The “earthwork” division consisted of three thousand Indians while the “railroad” division consisted of one thousand seven hundred and forty Indians. Both divisions were supervised by European engineers. African labor was only used as unskilled labor, mainly in the transport of supplies, and Macdonald estimated that two thousand Africans were needed.<sup>569</sup> Indians, being higher in the European hierarchy of races were preferred to Africans for skilled construction work. African labor was relegated to the lowest form of unskilled labor, a process that had started with the missionaries’ use of industrial labor in their conversion methods.

Macdonald’s report was a “civilizing” textbook, a one hundred and twenty four page geographic and engineering survey that combined the latest cartographic techniques, equipment and scientific language with a moral imperial motif. It published in 1893, after the second attempted withdrawal from Uganda by the Imperial British East African Company. Macdonald felt, that “A railway would secure what has been won, and place civilization on a firm basis,

---

<sup>568</sup> “Telescopically” meant that “supplies of every sort, including railway material will be brought up from the base at Mombasa by construction trains; the “construction camp” moving on with the “railhead” as the permanent way is laid.” *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 76

<sup>569</sup> See “Chapter VI. Proposed Method of Construction With Details of Staff,” *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 76-81.

which otherwise would always be wanting [in East and Central Africa].”<sup>570</sup> However, despite the support of the Anti-Slavery Society, which hailed Macdonald’s survey as a “valuable and most interesting document,” which showed “no insuperable difficulties to be overcome” and other moral imperialists, progress on the railroad ground to a halt after the 1892 general election and the new Liberal government.<sup>571</sup> The Liberal Government, whose Radical members had opposed the railroad survey, was focused on Irish Home Rule and ignored all entreaties by the Imperial British East Africa Company to solve the fiscal problems of the Company, leading to its dissolution and the return of its charter<sup>572</sup>.

### **The New Liberal Government, the End of the Imperial British East Africa Company, the Mombasa Railway, 1893-1895**

By 1893, the Imperial British East Africa Company was in a bad fiscal and political position. After the second attempted Uganda withdrawal and the declaration of a free trade zone in the Sultan of Zanzibar’s territories in 1892, the Company faced a new political environment and lost financial income from custom duties. They approached the new Liberal government to readjust their role in East Africa in a free trade environment and alter their treaty with the Sultan of Zanzibar to enable the Company to tax British Indian subjects. These proposed changes, which had been viewed positively by Lord Salisbury the year before, were ignored by the new

---

<sup>570</sup> *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (C. 7025, 1893), 100.

<sup>571</sup> “Mombasa-Victoria Railway Survey,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July & Aug., 1893), 199. The Anti-Slavery Society also reprinted chapter eight, “The Slave-Trade in connection with the Projected Railway,” in the July-August 1893 issue of the *Anti-Slavery Reporter*. See: “Mombasa-Victoria Railway Survey: The Slave-Trade in connection with the Projected Railway,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July & Aug., 1893), 199-206.

<sup>572</sup> For a survey on Irish Home Rule see: Alvin Jackson, *Home Rule: An Irish History, 1800-2000* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

government.<sup>573</sup> With no new income and a hostile government with a significant anti-imperial wing, the Company began to abandon its stations between the coast and Uganda to cut costs. This state of affairs continued until a series of questions in the House of Lords and the House of Commons in 1894 publicized the Liberal Government's refusal to respond to the Company or plan any transportation network in East Africa. This, combined with Anti-Slavery Society lobbying, restarted the process to build the railroad and negotiations to return the Company's royal charter.

Before Macdonald's survey was published for the House of Commons and House of Lords, the continued existence of Imperial British East Africa Company was in question. At a shareholders meeting on May 29, 1893, the company announced that it faced "a crisis in the history of their enterprise, in the issue of which the shareholders were vitally concerned."<sup>574</sup> The Company was going bankrupt from expanding into Uganda without appropriate financial support. The Company had been created with capital suitable administer the coast, not expanding and administering the interior and Uganda. Their reserves were almost empty because they were unable to collect taxes on foreign nationals, mainly British Indians and unable to level customs in the new free trade zone around Zanzibar. But, they still paid the Sultan an annual fee to administer the coast. On top of this, the Company also faced a crisis in leadership when Sir William Mackinnon, the founder and President of the Company since it began, resigned as President due to illness in May. He died a month later on June 22, 1893. The next day, the Company's directors proposed to the government a plan for Britain to buy out the company and

---

<sup>573</sup> "The Imperial British East Africa Company," *The Times* (August, 23, 1894), 2. Details of the correspondence with Salisbury in 1891 can be found in P.L. Mcdermott, *British East Africa or IBEA: A History of the Formation and Work of the Imperial British East Africa Company, New Edition* (London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1895), 351-353

<sup>574</sup> "The Imperial British East Africa Company," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (May & June, 1893), 150.



its royal charter. They offered to sell back the original territory granted by the Sultan for £180,000 plus their efforts in the interior, totaling for ten shillings and six pence for every pound spent by the Company.<sup>575</sup> This offer marked the beginning of the end for the Imperial British East Africa Company.

The Imperial British East Africa Company also made an unsuccessful appeal to the Liberal government to help fund the railroad. In their 1893 shareholder's meeting, the Company reported that they had urged "that the Government should, for a fixed period, set apart a comparatively small portion of the present annual Slave-trade vote to provide a three per cent, guarantee on the cost of a railway as far as Kikuyu, involving "an expenditure of not more than about one and a quarter million." This would allow a railroad to be built and cut Company costs without an additional cost to the government. They also reiterated that "while Belgium, the Cape Government, France, Germany, Italy, and Portugal were all spending large sums for the development of their African possessions, Great Britain alone left such a vast sphere as this to be administered entirely by private firms," playing to nationalist sentiments and worries that Britain was falling behind in Africa.<sup>576</sup> The government did not respond. The Company was unable to gain traction with the new Liberal government. No progress was made on the railroad, and there was no chance of a subsidy.

The Imperial British East Africa Company's relations with the Zanzibar Sultanate and Foreign Office officials also changed under the new government. As we saw last chapter, the British government subsidized the Imperial British East African Company's presence in Uganda in 1893. They sent Sir Gerald Portal, the new Foreign Office Commissioner to Uganda, to

---

<sup>575</sup> P.L. Mcdermott, *British East Africa or IBEA: A History of the Formation and Work of the Imperial British East Africa Company, New Edition* (London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1895), 296-297, 369.

<sup>576</sup> "The Imperial British East Africa Company," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (May & June, 1893), 150.

examine the new territory and the Company's infrastructure between Mombasa and Lake Victoria. Portal left for the Central African kingdom on January 1, 1893 after a "great banquet was given to the members of the [Portal's] Mission by all the English residents at Zanzibar, in a large room of the new English Club, which was opened for the first time on this occasion."<sup>577</sup> The pomp and circumstance reiterated Portal's importance; all developments in East Africa, including progress on the railroad, had to wait for Portal's return and report. The Company admitted this delay in a reported to its shareholders:

The death of the Sultan, since the departure of Sir Gerald Portal, had so changed the relations of the Company to the Sultanate, as to facilitate a defining decision being now come to. Lord Salisbury, on the eve of quitting office, recognised their changed relations, and referred the Company's proposals to Sir Gerald Portal for the expression of his views thereon.<sup>578</sup>

The Liberal government was fully in control of East Africa and the Company's future. Portal passed away on January 25, 1894 from malarial fever after returning to Britain.<sup>579</sup> His report to Parliament damned the Imperial British East Africa Company.

Portal's posthumous report condemned the Imperial British East African Company for failing in its "civilizing" mission. The Company's abandonment of its East Africa stations caused Portal to call the Imperial British East African Company's efforts in East Africa and Uganda a "publicly acknowledged failure."<sup>580</sup> Specifically, Portal emphasized the withdrawals from "Toru, Ankori, Uganda, Usoga, Kavirondo, &c., without notifying to the Kings or Chiefs of these

---

<sup>577</sup> Sir Gerald Portal and Rennell Rodd (ed.), *The British Mission to Uganda in 1893* (London: Edward Arnold, 1894), 23.

<sup>578</sup> "The Imperial British East Africa Company," *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (May & June, 1893), 152.

<sup>579</sup> "Death of Sir Gerald Portal," *The Times* (January 26, 1894), 3.

<sup>580</sup> "No. 9. Sir G. Portal to the Earl of Roseberry -(Received December 6.)," *Reports Relating to Uganda by Sir Gerald Portal* (C. 7303, 1894), 29.

countries any denunciation of the Treaties made with them, under which the Company promised protection in return for certain commercial advantages, and without giving to Signatories of these Treaties any warning of their approaching retreat.”<sup>581</sup> This decision, from a political perspective, destabilized the region by decreasing the faith that these groups had in Britain. Pointing to the recent withdrawal from Witu and the rumored withdrawal from their remaining stations at Kikuyu and Machakos, Portal recommended “that some arrangement should be arrived at, without further delay, by which the Imperial British East Africa Company shall cease to exist as a political or administrative body, either in the interior or within the limits of the Sultan’s territory.”<sup>582</sup> According to Portal the company had failed in its “civilizing” mission and as a representative of the British crown. Setting a precedent of breaking legal agreements without warning put Britain’s entire “civilizing” mission in danger.

As Portal’s report came out the Imperial British East Africa Company began to state their case to the general public. Publishing a pamphlet in April 1894, the Company argued that there were only two options in East Africa. The first was “granting power to the company to “levy taxes on the coast as well as in the interior from all who benefit by the municipal, judicial, and police organizations of the company,” and readjusting their fees to the Sultanate.” The other option was to relinquish the royal charter back to Britain and dissolve the company after an

---

<sup>581</sup> “No. 9. Sir G. Portal to the Earl of Roseberry –(Received December 6.),” *Reports Relating to Uganda by Sir Gerald Portal* (C. 7303, 1894), 33.

The Imperial British East Africa Company’s abandonment of these and other stations between the East African coast and Uganda previously caused concern in the House of Commons. See: “Vitu (House of Commons – July 21, 1893),” *The Parliamentary Debates Authorized Edition, Fourth Series* Vol. 15 (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1893), 205-206. “The British East Africa Company (House of Commons – September 1, 1893),” *The Parliamentary Debates Authorized Edition, Fourth Series* Vol. 16 (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1893), 1705-1706.

<sup>582</sup> “No. 9. Sir G. Portal to the Earl of Roseberry –(Received December 6.),” *Reports Relating to Uganda by Sir Gerald Portal* (C. 7303, 1894), 35.

equitable payment was made to its shareholders.<sup>583</sup> These two options garnered no response from the Liberal government, which was focused on Irish Home Rule. In a special shareholders meeting, the Company unanimously voted to withdraw their 1893 proposal on May 8, 1894.<sup>584</sup> Two days later, J. W. Lowther, a Conservative Party member, inquired about the Company's withdrawn offer to the British government in the House of Commons. In response, Sir Edward Grey stated that "The decision upon this proposal had to be deferred till the policy with reference to Uganda had been determined; and, in the meanwhile, nothing more than a formal acknowledgment could be given."<sup>585</sup> The question of Uganda, which had recently been settled, and Portal's expedition provided the Liberal government with an explanation for not responding to any Company offer or proposal. The Company remained in limbo, more now because no offers were on the table.

This standstill lasted until the Foreign Office was directly questioned about their negotiations with the Company and their position on the railroad on August 20, 1894 in the House of Lords. Lord Kimberly, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in a response to a question by Lord Stanmore said that any improvements or large projects in East Africa were impossible because of the lack of an agreement with the Imperial British East Africa Company.

---

<sup>583</sup> *The Times* reported the existence of the pamphlet in "The British East Africa Company and the Uganda Settlement," *The Times* (April 6, 1894), 15.

<sup>584</sup> P.L. Mcdermott, *British East Africa or IBEA: A History of the Formation and Work of the Imperial British East Africa Company, New Edition* (London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1895), 369. "The Imperial British East Africa Company," *The Times* (August 23, 1894), 2.

The only response the Foreign Office gave the Company on its offer was "I am directed by the Earl of Kimberley to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 12<sup>th</sup> inst., in which your directors ask how negotiations should be conducted with the Sultan of Zanzibar with a view to the withdrawal of your company from its position under his Highness's concession. I am to state, in reply, that the point as to the form which the discussion should take is now under consideration, and that, when it is settled, you will not fail to be at once informed." Reprinted in "The Imperial British East Africa Company," *The Times* (August 23, 1894), 2.

<sup>585</sup> "The British East Africa Company, (House of Commons – May 10, 1894)," *The Parliamentary Debates Authorized Edition, Fourth Series* Vol. 24 (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1894), 756.

He said, “Until we come to terms with them it will be difficult for us to embark on any considerable works of that kind, even if they were thought desirable... the demands of the East Africa Company are larger than we should be warranted in admitting.”<sup>586</sup> This statement was shocking especially since the vice-chairman of the Company had openly stated earlier that month that “The company has failed, and may fairly be called upon to suffer loss. But it would not be fair that the shareholders, who are mostly men of modest means, should receive no compensation.” These shareholders, according to this company officer, were not motivated by financial “gain, but [rather by] the desire to help forward the work of civilization in Africa.”<sup>587</sup> For the government to disregard this work, openly admit that they were not negotiating and state that further investment and projects to improve communication and transportation to Uganda were not a priority sparked a critical response.

A widespread anti-Liberal party response based on their negotiations with the Imperial British East Africa Company appeared from within the Company, in the House of Commons, from the Anti-Slavery Society, and in editorials in *The Times*. The Imperial British East Africa Company held a special meeting on August 22, 1894 to discuss their financial and political situation. During this meeting, Sir Arnold Kemball, Chairman of the Company, detailed the steps they had taken and the lack of response from the Liberal government. He ended on a moral imperial and nationalist response to the Foreign Office’s statements in the House of Lords two days previously. He said, “The Earl of Kimberley’s remarks pointed to the tardy recognition of the means necessary to effect the suppression of slavery, of which, as the public were well

---

<sup>586</sup> P.L. Mcdermott, *British East Africa or IBEA: A History of the Formation and Work of the Imperial British East Africa Company, New Edition* (London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1895), 369. “Uganda. Motion for an Address, (House of Lords – August 20, 1894),” *The Parliamentary Debates Authorized Edition, Fourth Series* Vol. 29 (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1894), 6.

<sup>587</sup> Brassey, “The British East Africa Company. To the Editor of the Times,” *The Times* (August 7, 1894), 3.

aware, the foundations were laid and vigorously maintained by the East Africa Company.”<sup>588</sup> He also wrote a letter to the editor of *The Times* emphasizing the effectiveness of the Company’s work and administration in the region including building Mackinnon road, which reached from Mombasa to Machakos, and subsidizing a European Court of Justice in Mombasa.<sup>589</sup> The Company was attempting to contradict Portal’s report and conclusion that they were unsuccessful administrators by focusing on their accomplishments before they were financially forced to contract their operations back to the coast.

In the House of Commons, W.F. Lawrence questioned the Foreign Office about the Company and government’s negotiations. It was at this point that Sir Grey, speaking for the Foreign Office, openly admitted that “the Government, unfortunately, had reason to suppose that the first estimate of the Company’s claim in regard to the Charter was so large that it would be impossible for the Government to make, in respect to it, any proposal which would have any chance of being accepted by the Company.”<sup>590</sup> Voicing his dissatisfaction with this answer, Lawrence repeated his question the next day to Sir Grey. Grey again repeated that the Company’s offer, which he recalled as being equal to three hundred thousand pounds, was too high for the government. Further pressed and asked if the government had ever communicated that they thought the Company’s first offer was excessive, Grey said “I understand that the

---

<sup>588</sup> “The Imperial British East Africa Company,” *The Times* (August 23, 1894), 2.

<sup>589</sup> “The British East Africa Company and the Government. To the Editor of the Times,” *The Times* (August 23, 1894), 6.

<sup>590</sup> “The British East Africa Company, (House of Commons – August 22, 1894),” *The Parliamentary Debates Authorized Edition, Fourth Series* Vol. 29 (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1894), 280. The entire debate was reprinted in “The British East Africa Company,” *The Times* (August 24, 1894), 6.

Company were certainly aware that the Government were not prepared to accept that offer.”<sup>591</sup>

Saying that a lack of a response was a rejection opened up new lines of attack against the Liberal government because it made them appear unprofessional.

The Anti-Slavery Society also responded to the Foreign Office’s statements, namely Grey’s admittance that the Liberal government was not considering any proposal regarding the railway. In a letter to the editor of *The Times* Rev. Horace Waller pointed out that even though the railroad was not an option according to the Foreign Office, Britain was still organizing a monthly expedition to Uganda and expanding its influence on Lake Victoria by launching steamships. For Waller this “necessitate[d] the use of many thousands of “porters” and their attendants, in the absence of any other method of conveying loads...we hire the men of Arabs, they are but slaves, and return to slavery. Our demand stimulates a supply, and this is met by raids in Central Africa.”<sup>592</sup> The government’s refusal to develop an East African transportation infrastructure, namely a railroad was increasing Britain’s complicity in the slave trade through inaction. The Anti-Slavery Society repeated this argument directly to the Foreign Office in a memorandum that used extracts of Portal’s report. Portal had recommended the creation of a comprehensive transportation system consisting of roads, railways, and steamers between the coast and Uganda under the control of a British Commissioner.<sup>593</sup> The Society stated that they “heartily endorse[d]...the railway, for we are at a loss to understand how the monthly transport service to Uganda and the sending out a steamer and launches, for service on the Lake, as

---

<sup>591</sup> “The British East Africa Company, (House of Commons – August 23, 1894),” *The Parliamentary Debates Authorized Edition, Fourth Series* Vol. 29 (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1894), 375. The entire debate was reprinted in “The British East Africa Company,” *The Times* (August 24, 1894), 6.

<sup>592</sup> Horace Waller, “The British East Africa Company and the Government. To the Editor of the Times,” *The Times* (August 23, 1894), 6.

<sup>593</sup> *Reports Relating to Uganda by Sir Gerald Portal* (C. 7303, 1894), 36-39.

announced by Lord Kimberley [Secretary of the Foreign Office], can possibly be carried out, under existing conditions, without the employment of a very considerable amount of Slave labour.”<sup>594</sup> Both Waller and the memorandum argued that the British was dependent and financially supporting slave labor through caravans to reach the new protectorate without a railroad. They were repeating the argument that a railroad would end British complicity in the East African slave trade.

*The Times* condemned the Liberal government for their lack of response to the Company’s 1893 proposal and not planning any transportation infrastructure in Uganda. They said “We learn, in the first place, from Sir Edward Grey’s reply that no definite offer has been made to the company, and we gather from his silence that no definite answer has ever been returned to the company’s offer. Foreign Office notions of business and of courtesy are obviously peculiar.” They went further, stating that the government created a protectorate in Uganda but not taken any steps to improve transportation or communication between the coast and Uganda because no settlement has been reached with the Company. Instead, “The Government understand by negotiation that the company should put up its property at Dutch auction” meaning that the company should keep lowering its price until the government accepted the offer. Presenting an explanation for this turn of events *The Times* said:

The real meaning of all this miserable evasion of national duties and responsibilities of course is perfectly clear. The Government began with some kind of intention to push Imperial interests, and with the aid of the Opposition Lord Rosebery at first gained some advantage over his Little England supporters. But these gentlemen have put the screw upon him with ever increasing severity, and he has, it would seem, practically ceased to strive for the policy in which he believes. Their object is not disguised. They want to ruin the Uganda Protectorate altogether, and they are vindictive enough to punish the Company by any means,

---

<sup>594</sup> “Uganda. Report by the Late Sir Gerald Portal,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Mar. & April 1894), 79. “Uganda and the Proposed Railway from Mombasa,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July & Aug. 1894), 196. “Proposed Railway from Mombasa,” *The Times* (August 9, 1894), 10.



and to any extent, for having been the means of making that addition to the Empire.<sup>595</sup>

They blamed the hostility of anti-imperialists in the Liberal Party, like Labouchere, also known as Little Englanders, to chartered companies and imperialism for the lack of development in East Africa. The government was condemned for not acting in the best interest of Britain.

This coverage, the questions from Ministers of Parliament, and the condemnation in *The Times* restarted the railroad building process. The Anti-Slavery Society submitted a memorial to the Foreign Office “express[ing] the feeling of general disappointment which has arisen from the decision by Her Majesty’s Government to postpone indefinitely the adoption of measures which would lead to the construction of a railway from the East Coast of Africa to the Victoria-Nyanza, as declared in Sir Edward Grey’s speech.”<sup>596</sup> The Foreign Office replied to the Anti-Slavery Society memorial by stating

Lord Rosebery is not, however, aware that Her Majesty’s Government have announced any intention of indefinitely postponing the construction of a railway from the East Coast of Africa to the Victoria-Nyanza. What he has said is that it is a matter for consideration and mature judgment, and that under the circumstances of the present year it did not seem requisite to take immediate steps for its construction.<sup>597</sup>

Rosebery’s acceptance of the need for the railroad, a reversal from the previous Foreign Office, showed the effect of the public criticism against the Liberal Party for their inaction regarding the Imperial British East Africa Company and the proposed railroad. It also intimated a split in the

---

<sup>595</sup>“Leading Articles,” *The Times* (August 24, 1894), 7. This article was reprinted in P.L. Mcdermott, *British East Africa or IBEA: A History of the Formation and Work of the Imperial British East Africa Company, New Edition* (London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1895), 373-378.

<sup>596</sup> “Proposed Railway from Mombasa to the Victoria-Nyanza,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July & August, 1894), 192. In the memorial they also included Macdonald’s chapter on the effect of the railway on slavery in East Africa from his survey.

<sup>597</sup> “Proposed Railway from Mombasa to the Victoria-Nyanza,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (July & August, 1894), 194-5.

Liberal Party as the anti-imperial sentiment that had stopped efforts in East Africa was no longer visible.

The pressure created by moral imperialists, Conservative party House of Commons members and the press caused the Liberal Prime Minister, Lord Rosebery, to restart the bureaucratic process to construct the railroad. By early 1895, he formed a committee to “consider generally the improvement of communication between Mombasa and the Victoria Nyanzia by means of a railway, and the best method of carrying the improvement into effect”<sup>598</sup> was formed. The committee consisted of Sir Percy Anderson of the Foreign Office, Sir Montagu Ommanney, Crown Agent for the Colonies, Sir Alexander Rendel, Consulting Engineer to the Secretary of the State of India, Sir John Kirk, former Consul General of Zanzibar and Director of the Imperial British East Africa Company, and Colonial Colville, Her Majesty’s Acting Commissioner for Uganda. Consulting with Macdonald’s second in command, Captain Pringle, because Macdonald was in India, this committee of government officials, moral imperialists, and engineers recommended several changes to the initial survey because “whilst the scheme set forth in this [Macdonald’s] Report is sound in its general features, it may be somewhat diminished in scope and cost, without detriment to the objects it has in view.”<sup>599</sup> Lessening the cost of the railroad made the project more appealing and with the backing of the Liberal party leadership, the process to build the railroad was now moving forward again.

The government also entered into negotiations for the Imperial British East Company’s charter and assets in East Africa. On November 14, 1894, the Foreign Office made its first offer

---

<sup>598</sup> *Report of the Committee Appointed to Consider the Question of Railway Communication with Uganda* (7833, 1895), 2. The committee was formed in early 1895 according to *Memorandum Relating to the Uganda Railway Bill* (C. 8049, 1896), 3.

<sup>599</sup> *Report of the Committee Appointed to Consider the Question of Railway Communication with Uganda* (7833, 1895), 2.

to the Company, fifty thousand pounds for the charter and one hundred and fifty thousand pounds for “the Concession territory[.]. . . improvements made by the Company during seven years’ tenancy, and of goodwill.”<sup>600</sup> Considering the Company had invested over four hundred and fifty thousand pounds in East Africa this offer was extremely low. The Company responded with a counterproposal that embodied “the view expressed by Lord Brassey in *The Times* in the month of August last, that compensation representing an amount which will give the shareholders an annuity of 2 per cent, upon their entire outlay.” This meant that the government would issue Zanzibar £450,000 in bonds, the same amount as what the Company invested in East Africa. The company would then collect 2% in interest for its shareholders.<sup>601</sup> The government refused this offer, suffering a backlash again in *The Times* who said that the government was acting “in the spirit of a huckster,” and after three months of communication between the Company and the government, the Company agreed to put the government’s offer to its shareholders.<sup>602</sup> The public criticism had restarted the liquidation process but the government was still acting in the same manner, dictating the terms of negotiations.

Facing no other option the Imperial British East Africa Company grudgingly agreed to accept the government’s offer. At a meeting on March 27, 1895, Company shareholders adopted

---

<sup>600</sup> P.L. Mcdermott, *British East Africa or IBEA: A History of the Formation and Work of the Imperial British East Africa Company, New Edition* (London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1895), 380.

<sup>601</sup> “The British East Africa Company and the Government,” *The Times* (December 21, 1894), 6.

<sup>602</sup> Details of the negotiations can be found in “The British East Africa Company and the Government,” *The Times* (December 21, 1894), 6. “The British East Africa Company and the Government,” *The Times* (January 12, 1895), 6. “The British East Africa Company and the Government,” *The Times* (January 14, 1895), 6.

Quote from “Leading Articles: The British East Africa Company,” *The Times* (January 22, 1895), 7. This article was reprinted in P.L. Mcdermott, *British East Africa or IBEA: A History of the Formation and Work of the Imperial British East Africa Company, New Edition* (London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1895), 383-386.

That same day *The Times* published the proceedings of an Imperial British East Africa Company shareholders meeting that resolved to set a conference meeting with the Foreign Office. “Imperial British East Africa Company,” *The Times* (January 22, 1895), 6.

two resolutions. The first resolution was that “the Directors be, and they are hereby, authorized to accept the proposals made to them by Her Majesty’s Government for the Surrender of this Company’s Charter and Concession, and for the sale and cession of its property, assets, and rights in East Africa...for a sum of 250,000£.” The second resolution expressed shareholder unease with the sale because the Foreign Office’s offer “takes no account of the Company’s outlay in acquiring and holding Uganda.”<sup>603</sup> The Company, which had taken up the occupation of Uganda against their will, was being told that their work was worthless. They were not happy. However, as the official history of the company succinctly stated,

The prosecution of the Company’s work had been rendered impossible through the line of action taken by her Majesty’s Government, by the disallowance of ordinary resources of administration, and the continuance of hampering disabilities. Every proposal of the Company during two and a half years had been ignored or postponed, to the paralysis of its work, the gradual exhaustion of capital, and the discrediting of its administration. For the assets there was no market save the one, and inadequate as to the Government offer was felt to be, it was wisest to accept it as a whole.<sup>604</sup>

The argument that had begun between the anti-imperialists in the Liberal Party and the moral imperialists in the Imperial British East Africa Company over Macdonald’s Uganda Railroad survey had finished with the end of the Company.

The Imperial British East Africa Company and the Uganda Railroad’s destinies were still entwined. In a motion to issue a grant to the Imperial British East Africa Company on June 13, 1895 to defray final costs of their retirement from East Africa, anti-imperialists raged against the company and the railroad in a debate that lasted past midnight. Labouchere focused on the company’s shareholders and directors. He pointed out that

---

<sup>603</sup> *Correspondence Respecting the Retirement of the Imperial British East Africa Company (C. 7646, 1895)*, 22. “The Imperial British East Africa Company,” *The Times* (April 12, 1895), 9. The Imperial British East Africa Company,” *The Times* (May 3, 1895), 8.

<sup>604</sup> P.L. Mcdermott, *British East Africa or IBEA: A History of the Formation and Work of the Imperial British East Africa Company, New Edition* (London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1895), 387.

They had been made baronets, knights, and such-like things, which were the delight of all business philanthropists; but, not satisfied with this, they now wanted the country to give them £50,000 for a Concession which they could not work, and which they had received from Zanzibar for absolutely nothing... Whenever the question was one which affected rich men the Government were always ready to help them; but if it had been two or three hundred poor men who had lost their money they would have had to whistle a long time before they got £50,000.<sup>605</sup>

This was a direct attack on philanthropists in the Company using class language. Labouchere also attacked his own party for their newfound support of the Uganda Railroad, in many cases switching their position from the previous year. He focused primarily on the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who now supported the railroad after, according to Labouchere, giving a speech the previous year stating that “of all the absurd, ridiculous things ever imagined by the mind of man, the absurdist and most ridiculous was that of spending money to build a railway between the coast and Uganda.”<sup>606</sup> The Exchequer responded by saying that Labouchere was misquoting his position which had changed after Uganda became a protectorate necessitating the railroad. The Radical wing’s influence in the Liberal Party, along with their opposition to chartered companies and the railroad, was marginalized.

This vicious debate between the Radical wing of the Liberal Party and party leadership was interrupted by Burdett-Coutts, the Imperial British East Africa Company director and Conservative Party member who had been involved in the survey debate three years beforehand. He pointed out that the debate was not about Uganda or about the railroad but rather about the Company. He went on to defend the work of the Company and repeat that the Company was unjustly treated by the Foreign Office in the negotiations to return its royal charter. He also

---

<sup>605</sup> “Orders of the Day. Supply. British East Africa (House of Commons, June 13 1895), *The Parliamentary Debates Authorized Edition, Fourth Series* Vol. 34 (London: Waterlow & Sons Limited, 1895), 1108-1109.

<sup>606</sup> “Orders of the Day. Supply. British East Africa (House of Commons, June 13 1895), *The Parliamentary Debates Authorized Edition, Fourth Series* Vol. 34 (London: Waterlow & Sons Limited, 1895), 1106.

endorsed a railroad, saying that because Roseberry's Government announced its support of the railroad they had to responsibility to fund the project in the next year. Ending his speech he said "no one could say that the light of hope had not already dawned upon the darkest part of Africa, and in future years it would be remembered that those who carried it there were not the Government who sat upon the Benches opposite, but the British East Africa Company who had sacrificed their own interests to a great public and national necessity."<sup>607</sup> In Burdett-Coutts and other Imperial British East Africa Company supporters minds the Liberal Party was at fault for the Company's failure and had not acted in Britain's best interests.

The chartered company model of imperialism, where the British government delegated responsibility of ruling a territory to a for-profit company, was dead in East Africa. After finishing the debate, the House of Commons voted 249 to 51 to pay the Imperial British East Africa Company's charter. This vote was one of the last of the Liberal government. The next month during a general election, a Conservative and Liberal Unionist coalition government won control of the government and started building the Uganda railroad. Beginning with request for £20,000, a new Railway Commission was formed within the Foreign Office to oversee construction. Their first act was to appoint George Whitehouse chief engineer of the railway.<sup>608</sup> With this beginning, moral imperial interest in the railroad waned. Information in the *Anti-Slavery Reporter* is remarkably sparse after this point, only reprinting questions regarding the railroad by Joseph Pease in the House of Commons, a resolution by the London Chamber of Commerce endorsing the railway, and an announcement in the *Daily News* after the committee's

---

<sup>607</sup> "Orders of the Day. Supply. British East Africa (House of Commons, June 13 1895), *The Parliamentary Debates Authorized Edition, Fourth Series* Vol. 34 (London: Waterlow & Sons Limited, 1895), 1138.

<sup>608</sup> Charles Miller, *The Lunatic Express: The Building of an Impossible 600 Mile Railway Across East Africa* (Nairobi: Westland Sundries, 1971), 322.

report was published.<sup>609</sup> After five years of lobbying for the railroad, it fell off the moral imperial radar.

### **Conclusion: Building the Railway, 1896-1901**

The Uganda Railroad was built over five years by thousands of Indian laborers overseen by Europeans, bringing the land between the East African coast and Uganda into regular contact with Britain and the rest of the world. The Uganda Railway Act authorized a maximum of three million pounds to be spent by the Secretary of State for the construction of the railroad “whether incurred before or after the *passing of this Act*” and required yearly reports to a committee in the House of Commons.<sup>610</sup> Despite new obstacles in Britain, India, and East Africa, railroad construction progressed, redefining transportation and commerce in East Africa. Similar to the survey, railway construction was well underway before the passage of the Uganda Railway Act, authorizing expenditures for the railway, in the House of Commons in July 1896. The caravan system became obsolete and the locus of commercial power in the region was moved from the coast in Mombasa to a new settlement surrounding the railroad headquarters near the Nyrobi River, what became Nairobi, the center for European settler culture in British East Africa in the twentieth century. During this process Africans remained in the lowest positions, mainly being used as porters on supply chains, reinforcing their position at the bottom of Britain’s racial “civilization” hierarchy.

---

<sup>609</sup> “Parliamentary,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan – May 1895), 32-33. “The London Chamber of Commerce and Slavery and the Slave Trade,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. – May 1895), 39. Quote reprinted in, “Mombasa and Victoria Nyanza Railway,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. – May 1895), 56.

<sup>610</sup> *Uganda Railway. A Bill to Make provision for the Construction of a Railway in Africa, from Mombasa to the Victoria Nyanza, through the Protectorates of Zanzibar, British East Africa, and Uganda* (305, 1896), 1.

Indian labor, not African, built the railroad. This drew the concern of the Anti-Slavery Society, which was in the last stretch of their abolition campaign. They stated that “We believe that by the abolition of Slavery, free African labour may be readily obtained, and we must confess that we do not favour the idea of importing British India Coolie labour to work on the railway on the mainland, or in the clove or other plantations of the island.” However, they also had no opposition “to Coolie labour if the labourers come of their own free will, and enter into contracts only directly with the people who employ them.”<sup>611</sup> The Anti-Slavery Society was sending a mixed message, promoting the abolition of slavery while not opposing of contracted Indian labor. Whitehouse ultimately staffed the railroad with over two thousand contracted Indians, including masons, carpenters, smiths, clerks, surveyors, draughtsmen, and others. Indians, not Africans were involved in building shelters, constructing workshops, and handling inventory needed to build the railroad.<sup>612</sup> These, and other, jobs were deemed unsuitable for Africans, and garnered no complaint from the Anti-Slavery Society.

African labor on the railroad was relegated to the least skilled jobs, which meshed with the opinions of men like Macdonald as well as the missionaries who had only provided industrial educations to their converts as too uncivilized and incapable to be anything other than unskilled labor. These opinions were widespread among the British. Whitehouse at first only used African labor as porters. His reports back to Britain stated that Africans were “at first for the most part limited to porters unused to any form of work but carrying loads and quite unable to use pick or spade.”<sup>613</sup> In late 1898 to early 1899, Sir Guilford Molesworth, the original assessor of the

---

<sup>611</sup>“Annual Summary: Railway from Mombasa to the Victoria Nyanza,” *Anti-Slavery Reporter* (Jan. – Feb. 1896), 7.

<sup>612</sup> *Report on the Progress of the Mombasa-Victoria (Uganda) Railway, 1896-97* (C. 8435, 1897), 3.

<sup>613</sup> *Report on the Progress of the Mombasa-Victoria (Uganda) Railway, 1896-97* (C. 8435, 1897), 4.



railroad in 1891, observed while inspecting the railway that “The idea of organized labour is utterly foreign to most of the tribesmen and the country is under the rule of numerous petty Chiefs, who only possess authority over a limited following. The native has a strong home instinct and dislikes work at any distance from his own district.”<sup>614</sup> The racial trope that Africans were incapable of anything other than the most menial, unskilled labor had taken a firm hold in East Africa after a generation of anti-slavery and missionary rhetoric that labeled Africans as helpless slaves and capable of only an industrial education.

Not only were Africans deemed unsuitable for work on the railroad, so was the East African port of Mombasa infrastructure. Whitehouse rejected the town and center of East African commerce on the coast as the railroad terminus and with it the already existing East African transportation network. Instead he preferred to build his own terminus and harbor at Kilindini on the other side of Mombasa Island.<sup>615</sup> This choice was particularly significant in foreshadowing the future direction of the protectorate and rejecting the region’s multi-cultural past. Mombasa harbor, professed to be the best in the region in the beginning in the 1870s, was deemed unfit as the main point of the railway and entry point into British East Africa. In his review of the railroad, Molesworth agreed with Whitehouse’s decision to not use Mombasa harbor. He described the harbor as “a small Arab seaport with absolutely no facilities for landing stores, a cramped anchorage, and insufficient accommodation with no possibility of extension.”<sup>616</sup> Within Mombasa, “the custom-house and streets [were] small and cramped.” The streets leading the

---

<sup>614</sup> *Report on the Uganda Railway by Sir Guilford Molesworth. K.C.I.E. Dated March 228, 1899 (C. 9331, 1889), 20.*

<sup>615</sup> Charles Miller gives Whitehouse’s rationale in: Charles Miller, *The Lunatic Express: The Building of an Impossible 600 Mile Railway Across East Africa* (London: Macmillan Company, 1971), 328-330.

<sup>616</sup> *Report on the Uganda Railway by Sir Guilford Molesworth. K.C.I.E. Dated March 228, 1899 (C. 9331, 1889), 11.*

custom-house were narrow and winding, similar to preindustrial cities, and completely unsuitable for a modern railway and steamer port. The rejection of Mombasa was also a rejection of the old social and political system of East Africa. In contrast Kilindini had “an excellent harbour, completely land-locked, with a capacious and well protected anchorage,” allowing Europeans complete control of the land and of the future.<sup>617</sup>

Natural barriers and difficulties limited progress during the first years of construction. Malaria, ulcers and sickness, thought by the Europeans to be caused by the rough terrain, spread among the European staff and Indian workers. Surveying and bridging the numerous ravines, including the building of a viaduct from Mombasa Island to the coast with a sick staff, slowed construction. Survey parties, active throughout the three hundred and ten miles from Mombasa through Kikuyu country, had staked out one hundred and fifteen miles of the railroad line by March 1897 and by March 1898 they had completed two hundred sixty three miles of the survey. The landscape was described as “difficult country” consisting of “small rivers met with at long intervals, the country is waterless and covered with dense impenetrable thorny scrub, while the surface is much broken and intersected with ravines.”<sup>618</sup> Exacerbating the problems in building the railroad was an “abnormally heavy rainfall during April and May 1897” causing damage to the embankments and “much sickness and mortality among the coolies and others employed,” which filled the hospitals and caused sickness among the medical staff and a lack of drinking water during the dry season.<sup>619</sup> In 1898, railroad building was delayed when man-eating lions stalked and terrorized Indian workers building of a permanent bridge in Tsavo.<sup>620</sup>

---

<sup>617</sup> *Report on the Uganda Railway by Sir Guilford Molesworth. K.C.I.E. Dated March 228, 1899 (C. 9331, 1889), 24.*

<sup>618</sup> *Report on the Progress of the Mombasa-Victoria (Uganda) Railway, 1897-98 (C. 8942, 1898), 2.*

<sup>619</sup> *Report on the Progress of the Mombasa-Victoria (Uganda) Railway, 1897-98 (C. 8942, 1898), 2.*

The difficulties of building the railroad in East Africa were exacerbated by the decision to depend on non-African labor and supplies. Plague restrictions limited the number of Indian laborers coming to East Africa as laborers while an engineering strike meant that no locomotives were coming from Britain. In India, an outbreak of the bubonic plague in Bombay in 1896 created emigration restrictions and limited the number of Indians who traveled to could be contracted to work on the railroad.<sup>621</sup> This issue was solved in 1898 when plague “restrictions were modified for the railway coolies.” Because of this bureaucratic move, the number of Indian laborers, “mostly from the hardy tribes of the Punjab” doubled from six thousand to thirteen thousand laborers between 1897 and 1898.<sup>622</sup> Meanwhile, in Britain, the Amalgamated Society of Engineers struck for an eight hour workday as well as the ability to negotiate wages and working conditions during July 1897.<sup>623</sup> In his report to Parliament, Molesworth, commented that “The engineering strike has not only delayed the delivery of locomotives but has also caused innumerable delays in the delivery of other appliances urgently required for progress.”<sup>624</sup> To make up for this lack, second hand locomotives were imported from India. The railroad’s

---

<sup>620</sup> Lieutenant-Colonel Patterson, *The Man-Eaters of Tsavo and Other East African Adventures* (London: Macmillan and Co, Ltd, 1914).

<sup>621</sup> See: Myron J. Echenberg, “City of Plague: Bombay, 1896,” *Plague Ports: The Global Urban Impact of the Bubonic Plague, 1894-1901* (New York: New York University Press, 2010), 47-78.

<sup>622</sup> *Report by the Mombasa-Victoria (Uganda) Railway Committee on the Progress of the Works, 1898-99* (C. 9333, 1899), 3.

<sup>623</sup> The union failed to win the eight hour workday but made some progress on their other issues when the strike ended in January 1898. See: R. O. Clarke, “The Dispute in the British Engineering Industry 1897-98: An Evaluation,” *Economica, New Series*, Vol. 24, No. 94 (May, 1957), 128-137. For more on the importance of the eight hour workday during this time period see: G. S. Cross, “The political economy of leisure in retrospect: Britain, France and the origins of the eight-hour day,” *Leisure Studies*, Volume 5, Issue 1 (January 1986), 69 – 90.

<sup>624</sup> *Report on the Uganda Railway by Sir Guilford Molesworth. K.C.I.E. Dated March 228, 1899* (C. 9331, 1889), 13.

dependence on outside labor and supplies emphasized its intrusive force. Once these unanticipated problems were solved swift progress was made building the railroad.

As the railroad was being built it was also its first steps in fulfilling its role as a “civilizing” force, replacing caravans as the main transportation into the interior. The railroad made significant progress, opening one hundred miles of rail from Kilindini on Mombasa Island to the Voi River for the transport of goods on December 15, 1897 and then allowing passengers on February 1, 1898.<sup>625</sup> By the end of the year, paying railroad traffic increased to over five million rupees as the railroad reached further and further into the interior. The new railroad also played an important role in putting down a mutiny in Uganda. “During the first part of the year [1898], an abnormal amount of transport work was thrown on the railway, through the movement of troops towards Uganda, owing to the mutiny of the Soudanese in that Protectorate.”<sup>626</sup> Approximately twenty one thousand people (troops and porters), one thousand animals, and one thousand six hundred tons of stores avoided the previously hard marches through the Athi Desert and other difficult terrain by using the railroad. The government report noted that “the time saved, as compared with the old method of marching, enabled the reinforcements for Uganda to arrive at their destination in time to avert serious disaster.”<sup>627</sup> This fulfilled the British government’s image of the railroad as “civilizer.” By replacing the African transportation system

---

<sup>625</sup> *Report on the Progress of the Mombasa-Victoria (Uganda) Railway, 1897-98* (C. 8942, 1898), 4.

Even before the railroad had opened to the public it had been used by a CMS party who traveled in it for the first fourteen miles of their journey. “Editorial Notes,” *The Church Missionary Intelligencer. A Monthly Journal of Missionary Information* Vol. 23 (Jan 1897), 65.

<sup>626</sup> *Report by the Mombasa-Victoria (Uganda) Railway Committee on the Progress of the Works, 1898-99* (C. 9333, 1899), 9.

<sup>627</sup> *Report by the Mombasa-Victoria (Uganda) Railway Committee on the Progress of the Works, 1898-99* (C. 9333, 1899), 10.

they were able to discipline the region and inhabitants more efficiently and enforce Britain's will on the region.

Kilindini was not the only location in British East Africa's social geography that was elevated in importance by the construction of the Uganda Railroad. The harsh conditions through the Athi Desert, which made up the first leg of the railway, ended at the Nyrobi River (mile three hundred twenty seven of the railway). At Nyrobi, the landscape changed to being "well wooded, cultivated and intersected by numerous streams."<sup>628</sup> The station was "about 5,500 feet above the level of the sea, which insures a comparatively salubrious climate; there is ample space of level ground for all requirements, and excellent sites for the quarters of officer and subordinates, on higher ground above the station site. There is a fairly good supply of water, but a reservoir and tanks will have to be constructed."<sup>629</sup> For these reasons, Nyrobi station was chosen as the location for the principle workshops and depots for the Mombasa-Victoria Nyanza railroad insuring that it became the main location for European settlement and a second commercial center for British East Africa while the railroad was being built and when it was finished and reached Lake Victoria in 1901.

The settlement around the Nyrobi railroad station was the source of a new force in East Africa that lessened moral imperial influence. A European settlement grew up around the Nyrobi railroad station and Nyrobi River, introducing the third element of Lester's three colonial discourses, settler capitalism. In the conclusion we will see how this nascent settlement created their own organizations and set their own goals for the development of the new British protectorate. The settlers, mainly from Britain and South Africa, introduced their own ideologies

---

<sup>628</sup> *Report on the Uganda Railway by Sir Guilford Molesworth. K.C.I.E. Dated March 228, 1899 (C. 9331, 1889), 7.*

<sup>629</sup> *Report on the Uganda Railway by Sir Guilford Molesworth. K.C.I.E. Dated March 228, 1899 (C. 9331, 1889), 23.*

about race and new settlement patterns to British East Africa. Organized under the Farmers' and Planters' Association, later known as the Colonists Association, these settlers embodied a different kind of imperial ideology, namely settler capitalism, which inserted itself in the governmentality (geopolitical strategy), moral imperial binary to create Lester's triad of imperial ideologies in East Africa.

## Conclusion

### **Unintended Consequences: The Introduction of Settler Capitalism and the fall of Moral Imperial Influence in East Africa, 1902-1906**

In the eleven years that it took to build the Uganda Railroad, moral imperialists never foresaw its consequences, a new white settler society that changed the political and social dynamic of East Africa. Before this point development in East Africa had been guided by the tension between British moral imperialism and geopolitical strategy. Originally inspired by explorers like David Livingstone in the middle of the nineteenth century, moral imperialism was a key ideology for British expansion into East Africa for a generation. This ideology, which can be found in anti-slave trade treaties, international conferences, military blockades, labor regulations, missionary activities, Sultanic decrees, and the building of the Uganda Railway, provided an emotional counterpoint to the geopolitical policymaking impulses of the Foreign Office and encouraged greater involvement by Britain in East African affairs. After the abolition of the legal status of slavery throughout British East Africa, including Zanzibar, and the building of the Uganda Railroad, white settlers immigrated to East Africa and introduced settler capitalism, complete with its own causes and rhetoric, which completed Lester's triad of imperial ideologies.

The post-Uganda Railroad British East African Protectorate was in serious financial trouble. The protectorate's economy was leaned heavily towards imports by a rate of four to one. Even more worrying was that the protectorates income of £95,000 fell fall short of the

protectorates expenditures of £311,000. Considering the over £5 million it cost to build the railroad, the protectorate could not afford to continuously ask and depend on government subsidies. The Commissioner for the East African Protectorate, Sir Charles Eliot, sought to solve this economic imbalance and fill the government coffers by encouraging immigration. His plan depended heavily on the Uganda Railroad, which he saw as “the backbone of the East African Protectorate, but a backbone is as useless without a body as a body is without a backbone.”<sup>630</sup> East Africa lacked any valuable natural resources, so Eliot sought agriculturally producing settlers to create the “body” of the protectorate.

The new European settlers embodied Lester’s third colonial ideology, settler capitalism, which differed significantly from previous conceptions of capitalism supported by the Foreign Office and moral imperialists. Historian Dane Kennedy, in his book *Islands of White: Settler Society and Culture in Kenya and Southern Rhodesia, 1890-1939*, insightfully explained that “The success of white settlement was measurable by its ability to command local resources and subjugate indigenous peoples to the needs of the white economy.”<sup>631</sup> In East Africa, this nascent white economy did its best to devise means of control over land ownership and subjugating Africans into a pliable labor force that mimicked slavery as much as possible. This stood in stark contrast to the efforts of both the Foreign Office and moral imperialists the previous generation. Their vision of capitalism included free labor and free trade to oppose slave institutions and open up new markets for Britain. The settlers had a difference vision, one in which resources and non-Europeans became tools for their own enrichment.

---

<sup>630</sup> Statistics and quotation found in: Charles Miller, *Lunatic Express: The Building of an Impossible 600 Mile Railway Across East Africa* (London: Macmillan Company, 1971), 447.

<sup>631</sup> Dane Kennedy, *Islands of White: Settler Society and Culture in Kenya and Southern Rhodesia, 1890-1939* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1987), 4.



To achieve these goals, settlers quickly organized after arriving, starting their own newspaper in Nairobi, the *Africa Standard*, and a settler civic organization, the Planters' and Farmers' Association. Founded on November 15, 1902 and January 14, 1903, *The African Standard* and the Planters' and Farmers' Association were a part of a nascent civil society among the white settlers in and around Nairobi.<sup>632</sup> The editors of *The African Standard* optimistically proclaimed in their first issue that "we have seen one of the richest countries, pastoral and agricultural, it has been our lot to happen upon either in South Africa, America, Asia, or even Europe. We feel that such a country, with such enormous potentialities, is bound to attract settlers." The mention of South Africa first is especially telling. East African settlers idolized the commercial, legal, and social system of South Africa, a region known for its policies of racial control. From the start, these men, whether openly involved in the Planters' and Farmers' Association or not, condemned the legal and financial system of British East Africa and argued in favor of a system based upon South African law. Originally connected to India legally and financially, British East Africa had previously adopted much of India's legal code and financial system (the rupee).

The Planters' and Farmers' Association worked to create a commercial infrastructure to support the transport of agricultural products for export to other white settlers in Africa. When the Association was first mentioned in *The African Standard*, the paper commented, "The result [of the forming of the Association] is the formation of a policy which is to be active and

---

<sup>632</sup> "Ourselves," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (November 15, 1902), 4. W. MacLellan Wilson, "Correspondence: The Planters' Meeting," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (July 18, 1903), 3.

Other organizations formed during this period include the East Africa Turf Club and the Mombasa Chamber of Commerce. See: "East Africa Turf Club," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (May 19, 1903), 5. "East Africa Turf Club," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (May 23, 1903), 5. "The Mombasa Chamber of Commerce. Rules and Bylaws," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (June 16, 1903), 2.

practical, and one which will probably add to the somewhat limited number of exports from this country.”<sup>633</sup> The Planters’ and Farmers’ Association was taking steps in order to create an export market for the goods of the Nairobi farmers. Specifically the editors argued that “producers in the East Africa Protectorate selling their goods in the South African market at a much cheaper rate than they could be introduced from Europe, while as for quality the Nairobi potato cannot be surpassed.”<sup>634</sup> This was necessary for two reasons, to create an income for settlers and because the railroad was operating at a financial loss because no goods were traveling from the hinterland and Central Africa to the coast. On March 4, 1903, an association agent was sent to Lourenço Marques, the capital of Portuguese East Africa, with a sample of East African produce, primarily potatoes. The agent’s trip was deemed a success. He sold all the potatoes for “around £12 per ton and ordered more from East Africa.”<sup>635</sup> This marked the beginning of an agriculturally producing British East Africa in contact with other white settler societies in Africa.

In order to continue to produce agricultural goods settlers needed to create and control an agricultural labor force. After Eliot’s implementation of the Crown Lands Ordinance of 1902, which allowed settlers to claim freeholds in East Africa similar to in other white settler regions like Canada. This ordinance was seen as the birth moment for white settler society, encouraging settlers to immigrate and claim land in the Ukamba province.<sup>636</sup> These new immigrants were

---

<sup>633</sup> “Advance East Africa. The Export of Produce. Sensible Move by the Planters and Farmers Association. An Agent Gone to Delgado Bay,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (March 5, 1903), 1.

<sup>634</sup> Quotes from: “The Potato Industry,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (December 11, 1902), 4. For an analysis on the cost of production and transportation of potatoes see: “The Potato Traffic” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (December 11, 1903), 7.

<sup>635</sup> “Ukamba Province. Planters and Farmers Association,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (April 18, 1903), 3. Quote from: “Planters and Farmers Association,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (April 23, 1903), 5.

<sup>636</sup> M.P.K. Sorenson, *Origins of European Settlement in Kenya* (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), 55-58.

focused on new issues. Between 1901, when the Uganda Railway was finished, and 1906, when a governing body for the newly christened British East Africa Colony was created, white settlers took various steps to oppose regulations on themselves while subjugating Africans. They labeled Africans as criminals as part of a process to construct a society based on their self-perceived racial superiority and proletarianize Africans into their own personal labor force which they could economically control and profit from. To protect their nascent society, the Planters' and Farmers' Association opposed any nonwhite immigration to the Ukamba province surrounding Nairobi including a plan by the Colonial Office to settle Eastern European Jews in East Africa and internal immigrations by Indians from the coast to the Ukamba province. Instead, they modeled themselves after South Africa to bring new settlers from the southern colony to strengthen their white settler society.

### **White Settlers, Government Regulations, and the Criminalization of the African**

The new settlers sought to mimic the white settler society in South Africa as closely as possible, creating a society in which Africans and white settlers were in close physical proximity but were socially and economically segregated. Compared to South Africa, which had over a century of history and efforts at controlling and subjugating Africans for the benefit and profit of the white settlers, East Africa was an uncontrolled frontier.<sup>637</sup> Settlers fumed at government regulations and policies that supposedly hampered their work, judicial courts that found for Africans, and African land practices which allowed Africans to graze their animals and use their new claims if they were unfenced. Settlers also began to rhetorically strike back, creating distinct

---

<sup>637</sup> Alan Lester, *Imperial Networks: Creating Identities in Nineteenth-Century South Africa and Britain* (London: Routledge, 2001), 48-66.

separations between themselves and Africans by criminalizing Africans and creating a sense of distrust by settlers towards non-Europeans. This was the first step of settler efforts to proletarianize Africans, limit their movements, and create a labor class dependent on white settler plantations.

Early letters in *The African Standard* reflected attitudes towards race that were prevalent in South Africa. For example, a letter to the editor of the *African Standard* specifically asked “What is a Native?” and the writer commented that “I always thought that *native* when applied to Africa meant one who had African parents, and cannot understand where the fun lies when “folks” in East Africa call Indians, natives. Well, if an Indian is a native of Africa so is an Australian, German, Eurasian; in fact all the people the world over, including anthropoid apes and Gorillas. The shade of Darwin!!”<sup>638</sup> This attack on Indians, the settlers’ commercial competitors, and their history and place in East Africa was one of the first steps by the settlers in order to exclude Indians from land ownership in the Ukamba province and maintain their monopoly on production and labor in that region. It was also an attack on the Indian’s place in East Africa. Previously, they had played a key role in the region’s economy, serving as the financial foundation as merchants, custom officials, and lenders. The letter was an attack on this system, denying over a century of history of Indian involvement in East Africa.

White settler attacks on Indians were not limited to issues of land ownership but also focused on the economic role of Indians in the protectorate. Another letter to the editor bluntly pointed to “the employment of Indian instead of European engine drivers” as a microcosm of what he thought was the protectorates main problem, namely that “The country is run too much according to Indian methods. If it is to be a white man’s country would it not be better to follow a little more in the wake of the administrations of South African Colonies who have now had so

---

<sup>638</sup> Enquirer, “What is a Native? To the Editor, “African Standard”,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (January 8, 1903), 15.

many years of experience in similar territory, which they brought to a state of prosperity.”<sup>639</sup>

This was an attempt to remove Indians from a key part of the transportation infrastructure needed to transport goods and people through East Africa in favor of white labor. Mimicking South Africa racial segregation would create a limited social, economic and political space for Indians that could limit or remove them as competition to white settlers.

Settlers also used many of the policies and regulations created by the government prior to their entry to argue against any restrictions of white men. A prime target were East Africa’s game and hunting regulations, which settlers argued were discriminating against them in favor of government officials. A letter to the editor of the Standard stated that “The British taxpayer, the employer, pays, Rs. 750 for a sportsman’s license, the public officer, otherwise the employee, has the same license given him for Rs. 150, and further, can get a 14 days license for a nominal sum, giving him all the advantages accruing to the Rs.750 license.”<sup>640</sup> These regulations grew resentment by the settlers towards government officials. Hunting, which in East Africa meant by safari, mini-caravans under the control of the hunter, was a sign of distinction and being in control of a caravan meant claiming and maintaining a perceived dominance over African porters.<sup>641</sup> Charging settlers more to get a license was a way of creating a separation between

---

<sup>639</sup> Going Home, “Correspondence” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (June 6, 1903), 3.

<sup>640</sup> Thos. A. Wood, “The Game Laws. To the Editor, “African Standard,”” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (January 1, 1903), 5. The African Standard announced the new regulations in “The Game Regulations,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (December 24, 1902), 8.

<sup>641</sup> James Clifford described the structure of a typical hunting safari when he said: “A host of servants, helpers, companions, guides, and bearers have been excluded from the role of proper travelers because of their race and class, and because theirs seemed to be a dependent status in relation to the supposed independence of the individualist, bourgeois voyager. The independence was, in varying degrees, a myth. As Europeans moved through unfamiliar places, their relative comfort and safety were ensured by a well-developed infrastructure of guides, assistants, suppliers, translators, and carriers...” James Clifford, *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), 33-34.

white settlers and government officials. The new Game Ordinance also addressed some settler concerns when it allowed the Commissioner to “in special cases grant, at a fee of 150 rupees, a sportsman’s licence to a person entitled to take out a settlers licence.”<sup>642</sup>

There were more important debates and disagreements between settlers and government officials than those around game regulations, namely those involving crime and the courts. One settler, originally from the Transvaal, categorized himself as “a republican, firebrand or blowhard, as it suits the mood of various Govt. officials to style me” and complained about being “robbed of sheep at least six times—the last time out of an iron building inside the Municipal area of Nairobi” and another settler almost being murdered “by native thieves.” This former South African man’s statements show a clear antipathy towards government officials and the start of a rhetorical and legal campaign to control Africans, the ones he blamed for robbing him. He blamed the government for his situation saying, “The Govt. taxes us but takes no trouble to protect us; in fact we are not wanted here, that is plain. The charge of dacoity against white men is a hobby with some of the officials here, and as their two previous attempts to obtain convictions have resulted in ludicrous failures the chances are again in favor of the accused.” Upset at government officials perceived favoritism towards Africans in the courts, he concludes that “I was one [a uitlander of the Transvaal] for ten years and I wish I was back there – far easier than being an East African uitlander, competing against niggers and half breeds.”<sup>643</sup> These

---

<sup>642</sup> “Preservation of Game,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (May 23, 1903), 5. Game regulations changed throughout 1903, creating a special license to hunt male buffalos, elands, and giraffes, defined land as game reserves, and categorized animals as huntable or not. “Game Regulations of East Africa,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (May 23, 1903), 4.

<sup>643</sup> T, “A Growl From Nairobi,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (November 22, 1902), 7. Uitlander means foreigner in Afrikaans and Dutch and was used to refer to a British subject living in either the Orange Free State or the Transvaal.

complaints were indicative of many of the settlers and set a tone for the debates over race in East Africa.

The nitlander's complaint about Nairobi's Provincial Court and others finding against settlers in favor of Africans was a common one. A case in 1903 where a settler found "a Somali allowed his sheep and goats to stray upon the ground of a settler." He seized three of the Somali's animals when the man refused to move his animals off his property and was sued in court for the animals. The court found that because the settler's claim had not been finalized he was a "tenant-at-will." He was ordered to "return...these animals or their price, together with the actual costs of the case." The important point about cases like these were the settlers focus on limiting access to land and instill a new property system that disenfranchised non-Europeans. The courts and government officials were standing in the way of complete settler control over the land by disagreeing with them and enforcing policies that were contrary to the settler's goals. Settler outrage can be seen in the *African Standard* after the decision. The editors found it outrageous that "natives and cattle are at liberty to roam at will on the growing crops! The absurdity of the law on this matter is very apparent, and something should be done at once to remedy the grievance." Especially absurd to the paper was that "the doctrine laid down that "unless a person fence he cannot take any action for trespass" at once destroys all security of tenure."<sup>644</sup> Settlers were enraged that the regulations did not favor them against Africans and others who were there before them. In reaction to these cases settlers categorized non-Europeans in the context of crime (especially in Nairobi).<sup>645</sup>

---

<sup>644</sup> "Another Hardship for Settlers. No Protection Against Natives," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (March 7, 1903), 3.

<sup>645</sup> "Correspondences. Police Protection (?). A Reign of Terror in Nairobi," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (February 12, 1903), 8.

These cases and settler complaints had an effect on the government. The Sub-Commissioner for the Ukamba Province circulated a notice stating that “Crime in and about Nairobi at night time is apparently increasing, and there is reason to believe that irresponsible natives both resident and non-resident are to a great extent responsible for same.” Settler complaints were having an effect although the commissioner also placed some of the blame on the settlers. He pointed to two reasons for the rise in the crime rate. First, “they [the police] have noticed that at different houses natives, &c., who are apparently not servants, are allowed to live in, or frequent the servants quarters. This custom is undoubtedly one that assists a native or Indian in carrying out his criminal intentions.” Second, the notice “advise[d] persons not to engage any unknown boy, even though he has a character chit, without sending him over to the police officer for inquiry. It is becoming a common practice to forge character chits and also to steal them.”<sup>646</sup> Settlers believed they had to remain vigilant against non-Europeans. The commissioner’s characterizations helped frame and strengthen the rhetoric of a racial hierarchy by encouraging increased control and surveillance by white settlers against Africans and Indians. By demonizing non-Europeans, white settlers were reminding their peers to maintain a specific social order.

However, these crimes could also be viewed as African resistance to the incursion of the Europeans and European land practices.<sup>647</sup> Some cases that reached Nairobi’s Provincial court that focused on conflicts between European settlers and their African neighbors include cases

---

<sup>646</sup> “Police Protection” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (February 26, 1903), 3.

<sup>647</sup> Indigenous resistance to western incursions and land practices is best described in: James C. Scott, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).

Examples of resistance to changes in land use practices in other parts of the world besides Africa can be found in: Ramachandra Guha, *The Unquiet Woods: Ecological Change and Peasant Resistance in the Himalaya* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989). Karl Jacoby, *Crimes Against Nature: Squatters, Poachers, Thieves, and the Hidden History of American Conservation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001).



over the seizure of African-owned livestock on European owned land by settlers where the court found for the African.<sup>648</sup> This particular case was similar to the previous cases because it involved grazing of African livestock on unfenced settler claimed land. Considering the short time the settler existed on the land, these incidents could either be resistance to said claims or simply the continuation of grazing practices that predated European settlement. These disputes also led to violence. An African struck the mother-in-law of John Ainsworth, a prominent settler and founder of the Planters' and Farmers' Association, over land.<sup>649</sup> He insisted that "the land did not belong to Europeans but was his property, &c., which was being stolen from him."<sup>650</sup> His statements showed that there was an active resistance towards settler incursions.

The cases between Africans and settlers caused the Planters' and Farmers' Association to act. The association sent a deputation to Eliot in March 1903 to condemn the light sentencing of Africans for these crimes and advocate for punishments comparable to those of South Africa, yet again modeling their vision of British East Africa after their peers to their south. They had the support of *The African Standard*. The deputation discussed four changes in the law to address settler grievances against Africans and the legal system. The first change was to make fencing "the discretion of the owner" and giving the owner of the property the right to impound animals if the owner of the animals did not remove them when asked by the owner of the property. The second change was to grant settlers the right to dig irrigation trenches and if there was any dispute it would be settled by the "Land Officer, and 5 representatives to be nominated by the E.

---

<sup>648</sup> "Another Hardship for Settlers. No Protection Against Natives," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (March 7, 1903), 3.

<sup>649</sup> Robert M. Maxon, *John Ainsworth and the Making of Kenya* (Lanham, MD : University Press of America, 1980).

<sup>650</sup> "Ukamba Province. Attack of a European Lady by a Native Near Nairobi," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (April 18, 1903), 3.

F. [European Farmers] and Planters Association.” The third change was that trees planted in “avenues, or as shelter for coffee, or other plants requiring shade” be recognized as forest land. The final change was “For the free grant of at least part of the area (640 acres) granted to settlers to compensate them, so to speak for the heavy expenses pioneer settlers are put to in testing the land, finding markets for produce and so forth.”<sup>651</sup> These proposed changes would change the law to benefit the settlers giving them greater control and claim to their lands in cases involving Africans. Moreover, the second change was demanding a greater role for settlers in the administration of the region. Eliot did not accept their recommendations. However, other changes to the ordinances were adopted throughout 1903.<sup>652</sup>

During the first years of settlement, the settlers engaged in conflicts with the provincial government about the regulations and laws they lived under. Settlers believed that these policies were discriminatory towards them, not protecting their property, unnecessarily taxing them, and favoring Africans, Indians and government officials through legal and other means. In response, settlers engaged in a form of population control, spreading fear among their ranks of African theft thereby attempting to increase surveillance and control of non-Europeans by Europeans and trying to change the law to favor settlers over Africans and Indians. These were not the only population control measure that the settlers took. In the next section, we will see how they sought to influence and eliminate non-white immigration to the protectorate and limit the movement of Indians inside the protectorate.

---

<sup>651</sup> “The Land Laws, and Other Things,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (March 14, 1903), 2.

<sup>652</sup> “The Planters and Farmers Association,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (March 21, 1903), 2. “Ukamba Province,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (March 24, 1903), 4. “Crown Lands Rules,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (April 21, 1903), 5. “Crown Lands Rules,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (May 5, 1903), 3. “Crown Lands,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (May 32, 1903), 4.

## **Unwanted Neighbors: The White Settler Response to Jewish Immigration and Indian Landownership**

Immigration was a key issue for the government and the settlers, although they had different perspectives on who was or was not wanted in East Africa. For the government, immigration was necessary to make the railroad a profitable business. Built into a region with no industry or large scale agriculture, the railroad was only pulling goods one way, towards the settlers without an equal amount of goods and people coming back to the coast. New immigrants would help equal out this equation and make the railroad more profitable. For the settlers, white immigrants, especially from South Africa, increased their power and influence in the protectorate while any non-white movement into the protectorate or from the coast to the Ukamba province challenged their ideology and worldview. These differing perspectives caused a conflict over the issue immigration, especially as the Colonial Office proposed a settlement plan using Eastern European Jews and settlers opposed Indians on the coast purchasing land in Ukamba.

Starting in the fall of 1902 Joseph Chamberlain, the Secretary of State for the Colonial Office was planning an offer to the Zionist Congress that would allow them to create a Zionist state in East Africa. Eastern European Jews, at this time, were living in abject poverty within Eastern European ghetto communities. This proposal had several benefits for the Colonial Office and Britain. It would solve the immigration and population problems of East Africa while allowing Britain to solve a vexing problem in Europe, namely anti-Semitism. The proposal was officially sent to the Zionist Congress during the 1903 Zionist Congress in Basel and sparked a strenuous debate among Zionists. The congress passed a resolution two hundred ninety five to

one hundred seventy eight to fund an exploratory committee to examine the territory.<sup>653</sup> This effort by the Colonial Office could be viewed within a moral imperial vein because it would move a discriminated group into a new region where they could form their own nation-state.

White settlers staunchly opposed Chamberlain's proposal. Dr. Atkinson, a prominent member of the Planters' and Farmers' Association commented "The proposal is foolish, even for the Foreign Office. We don't encourage English poor: why invite pauper aliens." Atkinson and other members of the Association quickly formed the Anti-Zionist Immigration Committee with Lord Delamere as chairperson of the new organization dedicated to keep Jews out of British East Africa in reaction to Chamberlain's proposal.<sup>654</sup> *The African Standard* also came out firmly against the Jewish settlement plan. Characterizing the proposed Jewish immigrants as "Russian and Roumanian Jews" they exclaimed:

We know them! The long-greasy-frock-coated gentlemen, who would sell you a coat or anything else—who drop into a bar and produce from the manifold pockets of their rags anything from a comb or piece of soap—for neither of which have they any use – to a watch or a revolver. "Peruvians" of the worst kind. And these are the men who are to have the pick of the agricultural land. Agriculturalists, forsooth! It is pretty safe to argue that within six months of their arrival five out of every ten of them will, under the specious term of traders, be swindling the natives, and that the other five will have gone back to their native country with enough money to start an "old-clo" shop.<sup>655</sup>

---

<sup>653</sup> Robert G. Weisbord, *African Zion: The Attempt to Establish A Jewish Colony in the East Africa Protectorate* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1968).

<sup>654</sup> Quote from "Bloodshed!," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (August 29, 1903), 4.

For other settler responses see: "Indignation in Nairobi. Mass Meeting at Nairobi to protest against the threatened Jewish invasion of British East Africa," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (September 5, 1903), 3. "The Threatened Jewish Invasion," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (September 5, 1903), 4, 6.

<sup>655</sup> "The Threatened Jewish Invasion," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (September 12, 1903), 4.

For the settlers Jews were clearly not welcome to immigrate. This attack combined anti-Semitic imagery and language as well as attacks against a Jew's capability for industry. The attack was clearly based on racial terms and characterizations, just as the attack on the Omani Arabs during campaigns against the slave trade and Africans during the building of the railroad. The paper maintained this attack in a slew of articles with titles like "Jewdrops From Nairobi," "The Jewish Question Again," "More Jewganda Dewdrops, or Petticoat Lane Pars," and Israel Zangwill's Senility."<sup>656</sup> It also evoked protective language over agricultural land, focused on how Jewish immigration would lead to the "retardation of East Africa" rather than its "advancement," create a large non-white voting block in the future, and provided crucial rhetorical support to the Anti-Zionist Immigration Committee.<sup>657</sup> Jews were more than an economic threat; they were a future political threat that endangered the future of white settlement.

One member of the East African moral imperial establishment sent a mixed message against the proposal. Bishop Peel of the Church Missionary Society in Mombasa referred to the settlement plan in a sermon and pointed out "that the Lord Jesus Christ had recognised that there was a peculiar place for the Jews in the world, and he urged that their sympathies as Christians

---

<sup>656</sup> "Jewdrops from Nairobi," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (October 10, 1903), 3. "The Jewish Question Again," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (October 10, 1903), 8. "More Jewganda Jewdrops, or Petticoat Lane Pars," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (October 17, 1903), 2. "Israel Zangwill's Senility. An Address to the East End Aristocrats," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (October 17, 1903), 3.

<sup>657</sup> This argument was repeated again and again in *The African Standard*. In another editorial the paper stated that "It appears to be patent that Lord Lansdowne has in a most delightfully free handed manner handed over to a lot of pauper aliens the fairest portion of this, our country, without consulting even the commissioner. And of course the settlers are never consulted...we come to the conclusion that Lord Lansdown has, on his bended knees, beseeched the foreign pauper Jew to come and squat on what should be a heritage of England." "The New Jerusalem," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (September 19, 1903), 6.

See also: "The Retardation of East Africa," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (November 7, 1903), 4. For the *African Standard's* coverage of the debate over the East African Settlement proposal can be found at: "More Jewdrops. The East African Scheme," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (October 24, 1903), 6. "To Zion, Via Jewganda," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (November 28, 1903), 4.

must be with the Jews in consequence.”<sup>658</sup> Far from the settlement of Nairobi, the reverend was attempting to moderate the language against Jews. Privately, though, Peel warned Eliot that an influx of Jews would damage the Christianization of Africans in the region because they had no reason to see Africans converted and would make the process harder because they would take economic advantage of the natives.<sup>659</sup> Within that same sermon, he inferred, although did not openly state these beliefs when he asked his congregation to “pray for their rulers at Home and here that wisdom may be vouchsafed to them. It would never do to bring ruin to British and other settlers, and perhaps stagnation to heathen tribes, by giving all the best land along our strategic and commercial railway to the Jewish refugees who are coming.”<sup>660</sup> Peel was walking a fine line, appeasing his own personal beliefs as well as public sentiment while dealing with a moral imperial issue. Two months later he published an article clarifying his views. In it, the Bishop referenced biblical and historical events to argue that “There can be no autonomy for the Jews except in Judea.”<sup>661</sup> Since this was also the position of many people within the Zionist Congress, the Bishop was able to maintain his moral imperial identity and appease his congregants who opposed Jewish immigration.

Besides the threat of large-scale Jewish immigration, white settlers also were focused on protecting agricultural land from another East African group, Indians already in East Africa.

Some Indians had found ways to buy land in the Ukamba Province. *The African Standard*

---

<sup>658</sup> “The Threatened Jewish Invasion. Reverence by the Bishop,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (September 12, 1903), 4.

<sup>659</sup> Robert G. Weisbord, *African Zion: The Attempt to Establish A Jewish Colony in the East Africa Protectorate* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1968), 99-100.

<sup>660</sup> “The Threatened Jewish Invasion. Reverence by the Bishop,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (September 12, 1903), 4.

<sup>661</sup> Retland Norlin, “The Jews-Past, Present and Future,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (November 21, 1903), 2.

reported that “An enterprising Indian Merchant has acquired the Shambas on the Nairobi River, sold under the hammer at the sale of J. W. Ward’s belongings under the Bankruptcy Law, so that ...we are to have the Indian Settlers there after all, in spite of promises made by Government to the contrary.”<sup>662</sup> Indians were being condemned by the white settlers for purchasing land and threatening settler control in and around Nairobi. This led to a demonization of the Indian population by settlers, who actively sought to further restrict them from owning land in the newly opened areas by the Uganda Railroad (which Indians built). In a 1904 editorial, *The African Standard* contextualized the issue when they said:

In the dark days, a little while since, when even the Foreign Office was willing to give away the pick of the country to pauper aliens...many of our loyal British Indian did apply for and did obtain grants of land in the area which has now been exclusively reserved for Europeans. This they still hold, and many of them are working their property, the result being a sandwiching of Indian and Europeans which has roused the ire of a large number of the settlers.<sup>663</sup>

This opposition to non-white land ownership was the settlers way of stifling any competition, both economic and for labor. It closely mirrored the discrimination that Indians had faced in the South African colony of Natal.<sup>664</sup>

Sparked by this controversy and rumors that the protectorate was to be moved to the Colonial Office, the East African Indian population began to organize. M.G. Dharap wrote a letter to the editor arguing that “It is said that a specified portion of land reported to be the best for cultivation is reserved only for Europeans; while Indians are allowed to buy land in those quarters where there is ever disadvantage so far as soil, climate, protection from natives, and to

---

<sup>662</sup> “Ukamba Province,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (April 18, 1903), 3.

<sup>663</sup> “Colour and the Land,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (April 23, 1904), 4.

<sup>664</sup> Robert A. Huttenback, *Gandhi in South Africa: British Imperialism and the Indian Question, 1860-1914* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1971), 1-26. B. Pachai, *The International Aspects of the South African Indian Question, 1860-1971* (Cape Town: C. Struik (pty) Ltd., 1971), 1-20.

crown all, facilities for agricultural purposes are concerned.”<sup>665</sup> With the introduction of white settlement, Indians had become second class citizens and the South Asian community in East Africa was well aware of this shift. Citing that Indian labor built the Uganda Railroad, he continued:

Indians as British subjects ought to be given a preference over the French or German settlers in British land; but the unhappy aspect of the affair is that they are altogether discarded in distribution of land... Obviously there is no valid reason to show why Indians are denied a favour which is gladly extended to persons of other nationalities. I cannot therefore resist the temptation of adding that such a sort of system is faulty, and constitutes an unusual departure from the fundamental principles of British Rule.<sup>666</sup>

This rhetoric matched the Indian response to white settler social and economic persecution in the South African territory of Natal. Indians were organizing and demanding their rights as British citizens in both South Africa and now East Africa. The next month, the rumors of making the British East Africa Protectorate a colony were deemed false.<sup>667</sup>

East African white settlers faced a different environment from their South African counterparts when attempting to persecute Indians. Unlike Natal, Indians had been in East Africa for over a hundred years, predating the beginnings of white settlement. Thomas Wood, an original member of the Planters and Farmers Association and outspoken critic of the Zionist Settlement plan set the tone to Indian’s in East Africa. Wood proclaimed that “the Indian has no grievance; he has drawn good wages on the Uganda Railway which have been promptly remitted to India every month. Indian merchants do the big bulk of the trade of this country.” For him, the

---

<sup>665</sup> M.G. Dharap, “Correspondence. Indians and the Land,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (January 23, 1904), 5.

<sup>666</sup> M.G. Dharap, “Correspondence. Indians and the Land,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (January 23, 1904), 5.

<sup>667</sup> “The African Protectorates and the Colonial Office,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (February 6, 1904), 6.



Indian's historical role in East Africa as the financial and merchant class more than compensated for the limited economic rights that they were now facing with white settlement. Wood ended by stating "if the British taxpayer, the man who has paid the piper, cannot call the tune to the extent of reserving a section of the country for people of his blood and race" and that the "Indian must be reasonable."<sup>668</sup> This argument, that Indians had no landowning rights in the best part of the country because Britain paid for the railroad raised a hostile response from the Indian community. One letter that was censored by the *African Standard* because it deemed it "abusive," argued "If labour from England had been imported [to build the railway] much more time would have been lost in drinking whiskey, beer, &c."<sup>669</sup> The two racial groups, Indians and white settlers, were now in permanent conflict in East Africa.

White settlers made it clear during the debates over Jewish immigration and Indian land ownership in the Ukamba province that they were seeking to create a homogenous white settler society in Nairobi with no competition from other groups. The opposition to both potential threats was fast and unrelenting, playing on settler fears and prejudices, without, in the case of the Zionist Congress, taking into account internal opposition by the immigrating group. These debates again reinforced the contentious relationship between the government and the settlers and the distrust that settlers had towards the Foreign Office. Settler opposition to the Jewish immigration scheme, which was rejected by the Zionist Congress in 1905, did not solve the underlying problem. The protectorate was demographically and economically stagnating due to a lack of immigration. Refusing to accept non-whites, Nairobi's white settlers sought new

---

<sup>668</sup> Thos. A. Wood, "Correspondence. Indians and the Land," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (January 30, 1904), 6.

<sup>669</sup> "Correspondence. Indians and the Land," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (February 6, 1904), 8.

immigrants that were acceptable to them. The *African Standard* noted that "It may be that the dissatisfaction among the Jews themselves over the suggested East African Zionist Scheme has effectually scotched the idea, and given encouragement to South Africans."<sup>670</sup> The next section will look at white immigration to East Africa.

### **The "Desirable" Immigrant: South Africans Arrive in East Africa**

Settlers in Nairobi took steps to encourage immigration as they were discouraging Jews from coming to East Africa and Indians from coming into the Ukamba province. Their "desirable" immigrant came from either Britain or South Africa, was white, Christian, and had either capital or agricultural experience. These efforts had an internal effect on the settlers. As the settlers organized to lobby the Foreign Office, they institutionalized and organized the Planters' and Farmers' Association into a formal structure. This lobbying included efforts to increase East Africa's commercial ties to South Africa by loosening restrictions and regulations. The second effect was that when South Africans arrived in 1904, white settler ideology of settler capitalism, sentiments of racial superiority, and criticisms of the government were drastically strengthened helping to cement settler society in East Africa.

Shortly before the 1903 Zionist Congress, Lord Delamere reached out to potential new settlers to immigrate to East Africa through an essay competition. He organized an essay competition to promote the Protectorate. Delamere offered "three prizes of £10, £7.10 and £5 for the three best Essays on "The advantages that this country offers to the white settler for

---

<sup>670</sup> Quote from: "Our Settlers," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (January 16, 1903), 4.

The *African Standard* reprinted a series of articles in the Jewish press that opposed settling in East Africa. See: "The Jewish Scheme," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (January 2, 1904), 2-3.

Agriculture, Planting and Stock Raising.”<sup>671</sup> Pointing to the success the Planters’ and Farmers’ Association had in exporting produce to South Africa he rhetorically asked:

A question which must deeply interest every white man in this country, and more especially those of us who have taken up land here, is why settlers of our own race do not come here more readily. An agricultural homestead of 640 acres is to be got on easier terms than in any other British Colony, and other land is equally cheap. Also, whereas in most countries land is mapped out in blocks, here the settler can take up his land very nearly where and how he likes it....Why do these settlers not come here?

Delamere’s image of East Africa was that of an agricultural paradise, ideal for settlement. The question was why was there less than satisfactory immigration. He blamed settler complaints and said that they should “do our best to put the real advantages of the country before our fellow white men?”<sup>672</sup> The *African Standard* supported this contest, but disagreed on Delamere’s reasons for why settlers were not coming to the protectorate. Instead the paper blamed strict regulations, land laws, and the inefficiency of the Protectorate’s government. The winners were announced on June 27, 1903.<sup>673</sup> This essay contest and his call for settlers to actively help with promoting the protectorate to potential immigration made him a natural leader of the white settlers.

Two months after the winners of his essay contest were announced, the Planters’ and Farmers’ Association began to institutionalize, call for reform and reach out to South Africa. Delamere was nominated and won the position of president in the first election of officers and the organization agreed to start collecting an entrance fee after December 31, 1903. The new

---

<sup>671</sup> Delamere, “Lord Delamere’s Suggestion. For the Advancement of East Africa. Prizes for an Essay,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (May 16, 1903), 2.

<sup>672</sup> Delamere, “Lord Delamere’s Suggestion. For the Advancement of East Africa. Prizes for an Essay,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (May 16, 1903), 2.

<sup>673</sup> “Lord Delamere’s Offer. The Names of the Winners,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (June 27, 1903), 5.

organized Planters' and Farmers' Association immediately began to work on tying East Africa closer to South Africa. They planned a deputation to the Collector of Customs to discuss various issues regarding shipping to South Africa. This included learning the names of large produce importers and the best way to ship produce, investigating what market openings there are for various products, getting the best terms to ship on South African railroads, coordinating banking facilities in South Africa and East Africa, and requesting "the removal of customs duty on seeds and agricultural implements imported into British East Africa."<sup>674</sup> The settlers were actively aligning themselves with their peers in Africa, attempting to tie themselves into the South African economy.

The efforts to promote East Africa and open up its economy were successful, attracting a large contingent of South Africans who arrived in East Africa in March 1904. In contrast to their reaction to proposed Zionist settlers, the *African Standard* was positive to the news of hundreds of white settlers arriving in the protectorate. "The men who are coming are *bona fide* farmers from South Africa, with capital behind them, and they are the men we want in this, an ideal agricultural country." They also thanked themselves, saying "we pride ourselves a little in having made the capabilities of the country known."<sup>675</sup> Delamere's message and promotional efforts had caught on. The influx of settlers overwhelmed Nairobi, causing tent cities to pop up throughout the town as the South Africans awaited their land grants. Nairobi itself was growing up, as "Houses of substantial stone construction are being erected on the new Kikuyu Road, extending from the sub-Commissioner's house on both sides of the line, and not an inch of land is available

---

<sup>674</sup> "Planters & Farmers Association," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (August 22, 1903), 3.

<sup>675</sup> "The Making of East Africa. Settlers with Capital Arriving by Hundreds," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (March 12, 1904), 7.

in the township proper, nor is there a house to let.”<sup>676</sup> White settler society was taking shape in East Africa but the protectorate was not ready for such a large influx of settlers. East Africa’s infrastructure could not handle the new immigrants.

The large number of South Africans strengthened settler positions towards the government, safety, and other races. The *African Standard* used the immigration as an opportunity to mock the government, noting that while the South Africans arrived with “their capital, and in many cases their agricultural implements, and horses and stock” for the intent of settling the government responded by “publish[ing] all their Ordinances” in the Official Gazette.<sup>677</sup> They were emphasizing the lack of help by the government to aid in immigration. The heavily influx also caused the *African Standard* to look to return to issues of settler protection, stating “with the advent of white settlers to the elevated plateaux reached by the Uganda Railway, the duty of protecting those settlers is one that needs to be prominently kept before the notice of the Government.”<sup>678</sup> This statement, in the context of the crime in Nairobi and economic competition from Indians was especially telling and troubling for *The African Standard*. The paper stated that “South Africans do know what trouble has been caused by the intermixing of the races commercially, in America such a state of affairs is absolutely impossible, and the subject is anathema to Australians.”<sup>679</sup> The influx of South Africans created

---

<sup>676</sup> “The Scramble for the Land. Mr. Barton Wright Besieged. Sir Charles Eliot and Mr. Ainsworth Busy. Tentfontein Going Strong,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (April 3, 1904), 6.

<sup>677</sup> “The Making of East Africa,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (March 19, 1904), 7.

<sup>678</sup> “The Government and White Settlers,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (March 20, 1904), 4.

<sup>679</sup> “Colour and the Land,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (April 23, 1904), 4.

new reasons to work towards instituting a racial hierarchy with whites at the top and other races with limited legal and economic rights in order to form and protect white settler society.

Like the *African Standard*, the Planters and Farmers Association reacted to the influx of South Africans as a positive development for East Africa and their organization. During their April 1904 meeting, fourteen new members joined the Association and it was agreed that the entrance fee was withdrawn. One member stated that since “The association was the only representative unofficial organization in the country...[it was] hoped that all new settlers would identify themselves with us, and that by having unity and enthusiasm, we would surmount all difficulties.” The South Africans were welcomed because East African white settler society believed that they would strengthen their demands and power in the protectorate. The Association immediately came to the aid of South Africans having issues with getting land grants from the government. The protectorate simply did not have the resources to process all the new applications. The Planters and Farmers Association condemned this state of affairs stating that “People had come here on the invitation of the Government to settle, and what was the result? They were hung up indefinitely, waiting until land should be granted.” Conflicts between the settlers and the Foreign Office had escalated with the arrival of the South African immigrants. Some settlers started looking beyond the Foreign Office and demanded that the Land Department be moved to the Colonial Office. This move, however, would cause even more delays for the new settlers because the Colonial Office would have to create a new bureaucracy before granting land to the South Africans.<sup>680</sup>

Criticism of government bureaucracy was also occurring within the Foreign Office. Sir Charles Eliot resigned as the Commissioner of British East Africa Protectorate over land policies

---

<sup>680</sup> “Planters and Farmers Association of B. E. A.,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (April 10, 1904), 3.

coming from London. After resigning he called on the Prime Minister “to hold a public enquiry into the circumstances of my resignation... Lord Lansdowne [Secretary of the Foreign Office] ordered me to refuse grants of land to certain private persons while giving a monopoly of land on unduly advantageous terms to the East Africa Syndicate. I refused to execute these instructions.”<sup>681</sup> The conflict over land in East Africa had reached the internal politics of the Foreign Office with the London based officials seeking to bring a large agricultural company to the protectorate while their Commissioner and the settlers sought individual landowners. The Planters’ and Farmers’ Association resolved to support Eliot’s call for an enquiry.<sup>682</sup> The *African Standard* spent the rest of the year investigating and reprinting the lack of an investigation, and subsequent Parliamentary Paper that Eliot claimed “obscured the main issue.”<sup>683</sup> These articles

---

<sup>681</sup> “Resignation of Sir Charles Eliot. Who Calls on the Premiere For a Public Enquiry. And Gives His Reasons for Resignation,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (June 25, 1904), 7.

<sup>682</sup> “Sir Charles Eliot’s Resignation. Planters’ Association Resolution. Lord Delamere’s Testimony. Sir Charles Uphill Fight. Handsome Appreciations from the “White Man’s Country”,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (July 2, 1904), 7.

<sup>683</sup> Quote from: “The Case of Sir Charles Eliot. The Late Commissioner on his Defense,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (September 3, 1904), 2. “Sir Charles Eliot’s Resignation,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (September 10 20, 1904), 5.

See also: “British East Africa. Sir Eliot’s Resignation. Some Striking Strictures on Foreign Office Methods,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (August 6, 1904), 2. “Sir Charles Eliot. Official Correspondence,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (August 20, 1904), 2. “Sir Charles Eliot. Official Correspondence,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (September 3, 1904), 9. “Sir Charles Eliot. Official Correspondence,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (September 10, 1904), 9. “Sir Charles Eliot. Official Correspondence,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (September 17, 1904), 9. “Sir Charles Eliot. Official Correspondence,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (September 24, 1904), 9. “Sir Charles Eliot. Official Correspondence,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (October 8, 1904), 9. “Sir Charles Eliot. Official Correspondence,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (October 15, 1904), 9. “Sir Charles Eliot. Official Correspondence,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (October 22, 1904), 2. “Sir Charles Eliot. Official Correspondence,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (October 29, 1904), 10. “Sir Charles Eliot. Official Correspondence,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (November 5, 1904), 2.

and a tell all book by Eliot about Foreign Office missteps painted the Foreign Office in a more negative light and moreover built a consensus among the settlers about land and other issues.<sup>684</sup>

Meanwhile, the newly arrived South Africans began to strengthen anti-Indian and African sentiment and called for a strengthening of white settler ideology and organization. A new settler, who referred to himself as “One From the South,” wrote in to the *African Standard* stating that the furor over the resignation of Sir Charles Eliot had brought the new settler to the “conclusion that a crisis has been reached in the administration of the East African Protectorate, and that in fact it has reached the point when some change must be made.” The settler called for “white league” to protect the interests of the settlers and a voice for settlers on a legislative council.<sup>685</sup> This call for racial unity and a legislative council closely mirrored white settler society in South Africa. The Secretary of the Planters’ and Farmers’ Association assumed that the writer was in Mombasa because the writer had not heard of the association, which now numbered over one hundred and forty settlers. He defined the association as a “White Association” and was “recognized by the Government as being the representative body of the settlers.”<sup>686</sup> Members like the letter writer strengthened the Association and reinvigorated their demands to the Foreign Office.

By the end of 1904, the protectorate’s government was in a tenuous situation. Overwhelmed by the new South African immigrants and their demands, without Eliot who had

---

<sup>684</sup> “Emperor of East Africa. Costly Mismanagement at the Foreign Office,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (May 13, 1905), 10.

<sup>685</sup> One from the South, “Correspondence. A White League and United Action,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (October 15, 1904), 13. The *African Standard* agreed with the call for a legislative council in: “The Coming Legislative Council,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (October 15, 1904), 4.

<sup>686</sup> “The Suggested White League,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (October 22, 1904), 3.



overseen the protectorate for close to five years, and still lacking significant income, they sought to increase taxes and the requirements for a land grant. The Planters' and Farmers' Association also vigorously opposed these changes because they viewed the new laws "as calculated to discourage settlers, and retard the development of the country."<sup>687</sup> Focused on these new regulations and the new labor tax, the Association elaborated on how settlers were discouraged. They stated that "Settlers who are now endeavouring to develop their holdings are heavily handicapped by the exorbitant charges now current for freight and transport, and until the country is sufficiently developed to change these conditions, the association earnestly deprecates adding to the already heavy burden which the settler has to bear."<sup>688</sup> The Foreign Office was unable to appease the settlers and run the protectorate, marking the beginning of the end of their rule in East Africa.

### **The New East African Dynamic: The Colonists Association, Indians, and the Colonial Office**

With the South African immigrants, a new dynamic arose in East Africa especially after oversight of the Protectorate was moved to the Colonial Office. The move from the Foreign Office to the Colonial Office did not mean a self governing East Africa because the Governor and the Legislative Council were both appointed from London. However, the existence of these new political offices in East Africa changed the dynamic of East African politics, diminishing the influence of London-based moral imperial tactics and campaigns. The Anti-Slavery Society,

---

<sup>687</sup> "Planters and Farmers Association of British East Africa," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (March 5, 1904), 5.

<sup>688</sup> Quote from: "Planters and Farmers Association of British East Africa," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (March 5, 1904), 5. "Settlers' Prospects in British East Africa. The Government's Discouraging Methods," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (June 18, 1904), 3.

Church Missionary Society, Universities' Mission to Central Africa, and Imperial British East Africa Company's influence was either diminished or disappeared during this period. Local East African organizations gained new prominence due to their proximity to the Governor and Legislative Council and old organizations took on new roles in the new political environment. At the same time, an organized Indian population conflicted with the settlers. Settlers also continued their complaints against government regulations and interference, which embodied both governmentality and moral imperialism.

The Planters' and Farmers' Association transformed itself into the Colonists' Association on January 3, 1905 in response to rumors that the administration of British East Africa was to be transferred to the Colonial Office.<sup>689</sup> At their first meeting under their new name, the Colonists Association passed a resolution during that their executives "take such steps as they deem best by application to the Secretary of State for the Colonies to obtain for White Colonists in British East Africa, such representation as their numbers and importance entitles them to, on any Council which may be formed for the Government of the Colony."<sup>690</sup> They had the support of *The African Standard*.<sup>691</sup> Considering the disagreements that the settlers had had with the Foreign Office their support was not surprising. A transfer to the Colonial Office was viewed as a panacea to the settler complaints about Foreign Office regulations. News reached East Africa about the official transfer of administration for their protectorate from the Foreign Office to the

---

<sup>689</sup> "Colonists Association of B. E. A. A Most Successful Meeting," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (January 7, 1905), 6. "The Colonists Association of British East Africa. Annual Meeting at Nairobi," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (January 14, 1905), 4-5.

<sup>690</sup> "The Colonists Association of British East Africa. Annual Meeting at Nairobi," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (January 14, 1905), 5.

<sup>691</sup> "The Time Has Come," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (March 18, 1905), 6.

Colonial Office in May 1905.<sup>692</sup> This transfer allowed East Africa to join the British South African colonies, including the new Boer colonies that joined the Empire at the end of the Boer War and were working towards establishing their own civil governments, in the Colonial Office.

The newly named Colonists Association sent an address to the Secretary of State for the Colonial Office reissuing many of their complaints and demands to the new administrative body. In it, they outlined the potential of the protectorate from the settlers' perspective while focusing on six main issues. These were the "Indian laws," "Transport," "Defense," "The Native Question," and "The Currency and Representation."<sup>693</sup> Motions passed during the meeting where the address was approved included "That no white man in future should be arrested by a black man" and "That the Association should write to H.M. Commissioner, detailing the circumstances of cases in which white men have been handled by black policemen, requesting him to represent to the Home Government the urgent necessity of providing a white police force."<sup>694</sup> These changes, if put into effect, would create set two sets of rules and laws, one for whites and one for everyone else. *The African Standard* viewed these demands as an impetus for "reform" stating that since "with the advent of the reforms advocated, this country will advance with rapid strides;

---

<sup>692</sup> *The African Standard* reported: "Henceforward the Foreign Office—save for the Protectorate of Zanzibar, which stands on a somewhat different footing from any of our other African protectorates—will cease to be responsible for the administration of any British possessions in tropical Africa. The protectorates which are today transferred from the Foreign Office to the Colonial Office are East Africa, Uganda, and Somaliland, and simultaneously the Protectorates Department of the Foreign Office will be abolished, and Sir Clement L. Hill will retire from the post of Superintendent of African Protectorates, which he has held since 1900." "Transfer of Protectorates. Administrative Changes. East Africa, Uganda, Somaliland," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (May 20, 1905), 11.

<sup>693</sup> Quote from: "Settlers' Grievances. Indian Laws and Indian Coinage. Colonists Meeting in Nairobi. Representation Wanted," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (July 29, 1905), 4.

A copy of the address that was presented to the members of the Colonial Association can be found in: "The Colonists Association. Proposed Address to the Colonial Secretary. The Grievances of East African Colonists," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (July 8, 1905), 3-5.

<sup>694</sup> "Settlers' Grievances. Indian Laws and Indian Coinage. Colonists Meeting in Nairobi. Representation Wanted," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (July 29, 1905), 4.

it will be a country fit for a white man, and the very nature of such progressive movements will be an inducement for a large influx of white immigrants.”<sup>695</sup> The Colonists Association and *The African Standard* bluntly and clearly stated their demand for racial superiority over the Africans and Indians in East Africa, demands that would be resisted by Indians and Africans in different ways throughout the colonial era.

The debate between the white settlers and Indians continued under the Colonial Office. The settlers continued their argument to restrict the Indian population’s ability to purchase and develop land. A letter to *The African Standard* argued, “The Indian does not pioneer new districts, he has too much respect for his skin, he leaves this exploit to the enterprising European, but eagerly follows in his footsteps and then—undersells him.” The writer wanted to insure that the Indian population remains restricted to the role of trader because to “with poorer classes he [the Indian] is probably of some service to the country.”<sup>696</sup> This was an economic argument that would, if put into effect, limit Indians as the middle class serving the white landowning settlers. The Indian community in Mombasa responded with a moral argument. “Indians are the victims of sufferance, they will continue to suffer, but they will always be thankful to the British Government for educating them, civilizing them and last but not least they look to Governing authorities for maintenance and protection in their hour of need.”<sup>697</sup> The government did not come to their aid.

---

<sup>695</sup> “Reform,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (July 29, 1905), 6.

<sup>696</sup> Alfred Woodhouse, M.I.M.M., “Should Settlement of Indians be Encouraged,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (June 3, 1905), 9.

<sup>697</sup> Ironhouse, “Should Settlement of Indians be Encouraged,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (June 17, 1905), 2.

Indians chose to form their own organization and take steps to protect themselves after the transfer to the Colonial Office. A year after the Colonists Association meeting, “a public meeting of the leading Indians of British East Africa...took place...for the purpose of considering ‘the question of protecting the Rights of Indian Residents in East Africa’.”<sup>698</sup> They were no longer depending on Britain. Over one hundred and eighty “Indian Professional men and Merchants” attended the meeting in April 1906 that was called for by Mr. A. M. Jeevanjee.<sup>699</sup> Jeevanjee began the meeting by stating

A short time ago certain English Settlers in Nairobi had petitioned the Government to reserve certain areas of town and agricultural land for Europeans only. It was the Colonists’ Association which authorized this petition and the Indians can only look upon this petition as an attempt to drive us out of the only good land areas of this country. Now as you know we have been in this country for over 200 years and have developed trade and agricultural according to our lights and possibilities whereas the majority of the petitioners have only been in this country a year or two and few of them have done really any good with such land as they have secured.

We do not ask for preferential rights, we only ask that no distinction be made between the European and Indian Settler, we ask for the same rights as we have in South Africa and Elsewhere [this was a misquote by the reporter, they were demanding the same rights in East Africa and South Africa that they had elsewhere]. The Question therefore for us to consider at this meeting is, how are we to fight against the principles adopted by the Colonists’s Association of Nairobi?<sup>700</sup>

---

<sup>698</sup> “A Mass Meeting. Indian Settlers Show their Hand, Mr. Jeevanjee asks why should Foreigners have Preference in Public Matters over British Indians in a British Protectorate. Rs. 20,000 Raised in Half-an-Hour. Practice Versus Theory. A Steamship Service Guaranteed,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (April 7, 1906), 7.

<sup>699</sup> Jeevanjee was the owner of A. M. Jeevanjee & Co. which was established in East Africa in 1890 and had offices in Bombay, Karachi City, Mombasa and Nairobi. Information from an ad in the *East African Standard*: “Ad,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (April 7, 1906), 11.

<sup>700</sup> “A Mass Meeting. Indian Settlers Show their Hand, Mr. Jeevanjee asks why should Foreigners have Preference in Public Matters over British Indians in a British Protectorate. Rs. 20,000 Raised in Half-an-Hour. Practice Versus Theory. A Steamship Service Guaranteed,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (April 7, 1906), 7. The correction appeared in: “The Mass Meeting of Indians,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (April 14, 1906), 7.

He was clearly enunciating a series of Indian demands to the Colonial Office in reaction to new demands by the Colonists Association and asking for equal rights to those of European descent. The Indians, in a sign of their economic might, then raised twenty thousand rupees in order to hire a professional “from Bombay for a period, and that when engaged he should devote the whole of his time in carrying out the correspondence between the Indians of East Africa and the Protectorate, Home and Indian Governments and in watching over and protecting the interests of the Indian Settlers in East Africa.”<sup>701</sup> This man would hopefully serve as a counterweight to Colonists Association demands to the Colonial Office.

Meanwhile, missionaries had continued their conversion and education efforts in East Africa. As we saw previously in Freretown, education, first in the classroom and then industrial education was a key part of missionary conversion methods. The government, although recognizing the need to educate Africans for the future of the protectorate, did not have the infrastructure or funds necessary to create their own infrastructure. Eliot, in 1902, gave a speech to a mixed race student body at the CMS High School in Mombasa, which had been founded in 1875 and had the reputation of being the best educational institution in East Africa. The CMS High School and others served as training grounds for Africans and helped create a pan-ethnic East African identity while training Africans as workers and eventually teachers. Following Eliot’s resignation and the protectorate’s transfer to the Colonial Office, the new government began a systemic analysis of East Africa’s educational infrastructure and made recommendations which led to a more coherent education system in East Africa (which still included missionary

---

<sup>701</sup> “A Mass Meeting. Indian Settlers Show their Hand, Mr. Jeevanjee asks why should Foreigners have Preference in Public Matters over British Indians in a British Protectorate. Rs. 20,000 Raised in Half-an-Hour. Practice *Versus* Theory. A Steamship Service Guaranteed,” *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (April 7, 1906), 7.

education).<sup>702</sup> Education served as constant evidence of the moral imperial influence in East Africa, even as slavery was abolished by the Legislative Council in 1907 ending the interest of the Anti-Slavery Society in the region.

By July 1906, the Colonial Office responded to the Colonists Association petition, rejecting many of the settlers' demands, including financial requests, a change of the legal system and replacing the African police force with a European one. But the Colonial Office responded positively to two demands, legalizing the British sovereign next to the Indian rupee and agreeing that the establishment of a legislative council was "desirable" and advised the Commissioner to create one.<sup>703</sup> The Executive Council was made up of the "Commissioner," "Colonial Secretary and Deputy Commissioner," "Officer Commanding the Troops," "Crown Advocate," "Treasurer" and Auditor. The Legislative Council consisted of five members, all government officials, and a non-voting group of six settlers "nominated by the Crown, which non-officials will represent the mercantile, planting and general communities."<sup>704</sup> This legislative council was appointed by the Colonial Office, meaning that settlers did not gain political control of the protectorate but could officially make suggestions. This new body set the foundation for the political structure of East Africa under Britain, finalizing a new political dynamic.

The moral imperial/geopolitical dynamic, where London based organizations lobbied the Foreign Office for changes in East Africa, was now fully dismantled. The Anti-Slavery Society no longer had concerns in East Africa, the Imperial British East Africa Company no longer

---

<sup>702</sup> A special thanks for Mwangi Njagi who made drafts of his dissertation on educational policy and colonial and post-colonial Kenyan politics available to me.

<sup>703</sup> "Colonists Association. Lord Elgin's Despatch. Legislative Council Guaranteed. His Excellency's Reproof. The President's Reply," *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (July 7, 1906), 7.

<sup>704</sup> "Our New Constitution. Executive and Legislative Councils. 6 Non-official Members" *The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus* (August 11, 1906), 2.

existed and many of its officers now worked for the Protectorate, and missionaries were now firmly integrated into the new Protectorate as focused on their educational and conversion efforts. In its place was a white settler society focused on changing the laws and regulations of East Africa in order to cement their place on top of a racial hierarchy that excluded Indians from land ownership and subjugated Africans as their own personal labor force. White settler requests were usually denied by the government, whether that was the Foreign Office or the Colonial Office appointed governor and Legislative Council and they were never able to achieve independence from the Colonial Office. They were, however, able to partially subjugate and control Africans to create an African shareholder class with no economic or political rights on their plantations. Meanwhile the Indian community organized themselves against the incursion on their rights by the Colonists Association, eventually collaborating with missionary educated Africans to create anti-colonial sentiment in East Africa throughout the first half of the twentieth century, afterwards ending with the Mau Mau revolt in the 1950s and Kenyan independence.



## Bibliography

### *Primary Sources*

#### *Books*

*The Mombasa Mission of the Church Missionary Society Containing Letters from Bishop Royston of Mauritius, Mr J. R. Streeter, &c* (London: Church Missionary House, 1879).

*The Mombasa Mission, East Africa, With an Account of the Church Missionary Society's Work Among the Freed Slaves at Frere Town. Illustrate* (London: Church Missionary House, 1885)

*The Slave-Trade Conference at Brussels and the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society* (London: 55, New Broad Street, E.C., 1890)

Fotheringham, L. Monteith, *Adventures in Nyassaland: A Two Years Struggle with Arab Slave-Dealers in Central Africa* (London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington, 1891)

Frere, Bartle, *Eastern Africa as a Field for Missionary Labour. Four Letters to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury* (London: John Murray, 1874)

Krapf, J.L., *Outline of the Elements of the Kisuáheli Language, with special reference to the Kinika dialect* (Tübingen: L.F. Fues, 1850).

Krapf, J.L., *Vocabulary of Six East-African Languages (Kisuáheli, Kinika, Kikámba, Kipokómo, Kihíáu, Kigálla)* (Tübingen: L.F. Fues, 1850).

Harrison (Mackay), Alexina, *A. M. Mackay, Pioneer Missionary of the Church Missionary Society to Uganda* (London: Hodder and Soughton, 1890)

Jackson, Sir Frederick, *Early Days in East Africa* (London: Edward Arnold & Co., 1930)

Krapf, Johannes Ludwig, *Vocabulary of Six East-African Languages (Kisuáheli, Kinika, Kikámba, Kipokómo, Kihíáu, Kigalla)* (Farnborough : Gregg, 1967, 1850).

Krapf, Johannes Ludwig, *A Dictionary of the Suahili Language* (New York, Negro Universities Press, 1969, 1882).

Krapf, Johannes Ludwig and Johannes Rebmann, *A Nika-English Dictionary* (London, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1887).

Lindsay, David, *Remarks on the Opening of Trade and Cultivation of Tropical Products in the Kingdom of Usabara, East Africa* (1885).

Livingstone, David and Charles, *Narrative of an Expedition to the Zambesi and its Tributaries; and of the Discovery of the Lakes Shirwa and Nyazza. 1858-1864* (London: J. Murray, 1865)

Macdonald, J. R. L., *Soldiering and Surveying in British East Africa, 1891-1894* (London: Edward Arnold, 1897)

Mackenzie, Donald, *A Report on Slavery and the Slave Trade in Zanzibar, Pemba, and the Mainland of the British Protectorate of East Africa* (London: British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, 1895)

McDermott, P. L., *British East Africa of IBEA: A History of the Formation and Work of THE IMPERIAL BRITISH EAST AFRICA COMPANY, compiled with the authority of the directors from official documents and records of the company* (London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1893)

P.L. Mcdermott, *British East Africa or IBEA: A History of the Formation and Work of the Imperial British East Africa Company, compiled with the authority of the directors from official documents and records of the company, New Edition* (London: Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1895)

New, Charles, *Life, Labours, and Wanderings in Eastern Africa. With an Account of the First Successful Ascent of the Equatorial Snow Mountain, Kilima Njaro; and Remarks Upon East African Slavery* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1874)

Patterson, Lieutenant-Colonel, *The Man-Eaters of Tsavo and Other East African Adventures* (London: Macmillan and Co, Ltd, 1914)

Pease, Joseph A., *How We Countenance Slavery in East African British Protectorates* (London: British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, 1895)

Portal, Sir Gerald and Rennell Rodd (ed.), *The British Mission to Uganda in 1893* (London: Edward Arnold, 1894)

Pruen, S. Tristram, *The Arab and the African: Experiences in Eastern Equatorial Africa During a Residence of Three Years* (London: London, Seeley and Co., 1891)

Rodd, Sir James Rennell, *Social and Diplomatic Memories, 1884-1893* (London: Edward Arnold & Co., 1922)

#### *Periodicals*

*The African Standard, Mombasa Times & Uganda Argus*

*Anti-Slavery Reporter*

*Central Africa: A Monthly Record of the Work of the Universities Mission*

*Church Missionary Intelligencer: A Monthly Journal of Missionary Information*

*Daily Telegraph*

*Fortnightly Review*

*The Geographical Journal*

*Journal of the Royal Geographical Society of London*

*The Nineteenth Century*

*Proceedings of the Royal Geographic Society and Monthly Record of Geography*

*The Times*

#### *Government Reports*

*Report Addressed to the Earl of Clarendon by the Committee on the East African Slave Trade, Dated January 24, 1870, C. 209 (1870), LXVI, 899.*

*Report from the Select Committee on Slave Trade (East Coast of Africa); Together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, Appendix and Index, 420 (1871), XII, 4.*

*Correspondence Respecting Sir Bartle Frere's Mission to the East Coast of Africa. 1872-73., C. 820 (1873), LXI, 767.*

*Protocols and General Act of the West African Conference, c. 4361 (1885), LV, 133.*

*Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar, C. 4609 (1886), LVII, 1.*

*General Act of the Conference of Berlin. Signed February 26, 1885, C. 4739 (1886), XLVII, 97.*

*Correspondence With British Representation and Agents Abroad, and Reports From Naval Officers and the Treasury, Relative to the Slave Trade, 1885, C. 4776 (1886), LXII, 515.*

*Further Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar [In continuation of "Africa No. 1, 1886:" C. 4609], C. 4940 (1887), LIX, 15.*

*Further Correspondence Relating to Zanzibar, C. 5315 (1888), LXXIV, 367.*

*Correspondence Respecting Suppression of the Slave Trade in East African Waters, C. 5559 (1888), LXXIV, 93.*

*Reports of Slave Trade on the East Coast of Africa: 1887-88, C. 5578 (1888), LXXIV, 1.*

*Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar, C. 5603 (1888), LXXIV, 255.*

*Further Correspondence Respecting Germany and Zanzibar, C. 5822 (1889), LVI, 749.*

*Translations of Protocols and General Act of the Slave Trade Conference Held at Brussels, 1889-1890; With Annexed Declaration, C. 6049 (1890), L, 41.*

*General Act of the Brussels Conference 1889-1890; with Annexed Declaration, C. 6048 (1890), L, 1.*

*Anti-Slavery Decree Issued by the Sultan of Zanzibar, Dated August 1, 1890, C. 6211 (1890), LVII, 1099.*

*General Act of the Brussels Conference, 1889-90; With Annexed Declaration, C. 6048 (1890), L, 1.*

*Papers Respecting Proposed Railway from Mombasa to Lake Victoria Nyanza, C. 6560 (1892), LVI, 585.*

*Papers Relating to the Mombasa Railway Survey and Uganda, C. 6555 (1892), LVI, 599.*

*Further Papers Relating to Uganda, C. 6847 (1893), LXII, 335.*

*Paper Respecting the Traffic in Slaves in Zanzibar, C. 7035 (1893), LXXXV, 533.*

*Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey, C. 7025 (1893), LXII, 1.*

*Reports Relating to Uganda by Sir Gerald Portal, C. 7303 (1894), LVII, 641.*

*Correspondence Respecting Slavery in Zanzibar*, C.7707 (1895), LXXI, 143.

*Correspondence Respecting the Retirement of the Imperial British East Africa Company*, C. 7646 (1895), LXXI, 189.

*Report of the Committee Appointed to Consider the Question of Railway Communication with Uganda*, 7833 (1895), LXXI, 371.

*Memorandum Relating to the Uganda Railway Bill*, C. 8049 (1896), LIX, 391.

*Correspondence Respecting Slavery in the Zanzibar Dominions*, C. 8275 (1896), LIX, 395.

*Uganda Railway. A Bill to Make provision for the Construction of a Railway in Africa, from Mombasa to the Victoria Nyanza, through the Protectorates of Zanzibar, British East Africa, and Uganda*, 305 (1896), VII, 565.

*Instructions to Mr. Hardinge Respecting the Abolition of the Legal Status of Slavery in the Islands of Zanzibar and Pemba*, C. 8394 (1897), LXII, 697.

*Abolition of the Legal Status of Slavery in Zanzibar and Pemba*, C. 8433 (1897), LXII, 707.

*Report on the Progress of the Mombasa-Victoria (Uganda) Railway, 1896-97*, C. 8435 (1897), LXII, 689.

*Report on the Progress of the Mombasa-Victoria (Uganda) Railway, 1897-98*, C. 8942 (1898), LX, 551.

*Report on the Uganda Railway by Sir Guilford Molesworth. K.C.I.E. Dated March 228, 1899*, C. 9331 (1889), LXIII, 611.

*Report by the Mombasa-Victoria (Uganda) Railway Committee on the Progress of the Works, 1898-99*, C. 9333 (1899), LXIII, 671.

#### *Parliamentary Debates*

*Hansards Parliamentary Debates, Third Series* Vol. 221 (London: Cornelius Buck, 1874)

*The Parliamentary Debates, Fourth Series* Vol. 7 (1892), 191.

*The Parliamentary Debates Authorized Edition, Third Series* Vol. 25 (London, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1894)

## Secondary Sources

### Books

Alpers, Edward A., *Ivory and Slaves: Changing Pattern of International Trade in East Central Africa to the Later Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975).

Anderson, David, *Histories of the Hanged: The Dirty War in Kenya and the End of Empire* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2005).

Anderson, Gerald H., *Biographical dictionary of Christian Missions* (New York : Macmillan Reference USA, 1998).

Austen, Ralph A. and Jonathan Derrick, *Middlemen of the Cameroons Rivers: The Duala and their Hinterland, c. 1600-1960* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

Baker, Geoffrey L. , *Trade winds on the Niger: the saga of the Royal Niger Company, 1830-1971* (London: Radcliffe Press, 1996).

Barclay, Oliver, *Thomas Fowell Buxton and the Liberation of Slaves* (York: William Sessions, 2001).

Bennett, Norman R., *A History of the Arab State of Zanzibar* (London: Methuen & Co, 1978).

Bennett, Norman Robert, *Arab Versus European: Diplomacy and War in Nineteenth-Century East Central Africa* (New York: Africana Publishing Company, New York, 1984).

Bethell, Leslie, *The Abolition of the Brazilian Slave Trade: Britain, Brazil and the Slave Trade Question, 1807-1869* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970).

Blaught, J. M., *The Colonizer's Model of the World: Geographical Diffusionism and Eurocentric History* (New York: The Guilford Press, 1993).

Bolt, Christine and Seymour Drescher (ed.), *Anti-Slavery, Religion, and Reform: Essays in Memory of Roger Anstey* (Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1980).

Bowen, H.V., *The Business of Empire: The East India Company and Imperial Britain, 1756-1833* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

Brown, Christopher Leslie, *Moral Capital: Foundations of British Abolitionism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).

Cain, P.J. and A.G. Hopkins, *British Imperialism: Innovation and Expansion, 1688-1914* (London: Longman, 1993)

- Chase, Malcolm, *Chartism: A New History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).
- Clifford, James, *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1997)/
- Cooper, Frederick, *Plantation Slavery on the East Coast of Africa* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977).
- Cooper, Frederick, *From Slaves to Squatters: Plantation Labor and Agriculture in Zanzibar and Coastal Kenya, 1890-1925* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980).
- Cooper, Frederick, *On the African Waterfront: Urban Disorder and the Transformation of Work in Colonial Mombasa* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987).
- Cooper, Frederick and Ann Laura Stoler (ed.), *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997)
- Coupland, Sir Reginald, *The British Anti-Slavery Movement, Second Edition* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc, 1964: 1933).
- Coupland, Sir Reginald, *East Africa and Its Invaders: From the Earliest Times to the Death of Seyyid Said in 1856* (New York, Russell & Russell Inc., 1965).
- Coupland, Sir Reginald, *The Exploitation of East Africa 1856-1890: The Slave Trade and the Scramble* (Northwestern University Press, 1967).
- Cowling, Maurice, *1867: Disraeli, Gladstone and Revolution: The Passing of the Second Reform Bill* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1967).
- Driver, Felix, *Cultures of Exploration and Empire* (Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers, 2001).
- Echenberg, Myron J., *Plague Ports: The Global Urban Impact of the Bubonic Plague, 1894-1901* (New York: New York University Press, 2010).
- Elkins, Caroline, *Imperial Reckoning: The Untold Story of Britain's Gulag in Kenya* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2005).
- Erdem, Y. Hakan, *Slavery in the Ottoman Empire and its Demise, 1800-1909* (London Macmillan Press, 1996).
- Evans, Eric J., *The Great Reform Act of 1832* (London: Methuen, 1983).
- Fieldhouse, D.K., *Economics and Empire, 1830-1914* (London, Macmillan, 1973, 1984)
- Galbraith, John S., *Mackinnon and East Africa 1878-1895: A Study in the 'New Imperialism'* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1972).

Glassman, Jonathon , *Feasts and Riot: Revelry, Rebellion, and Popular Consciousness on the Swahili Coast, 1856-1888* (London: James Currey, 1995).

Gregory, Robert, *India and East Africa: A History of Race Relations Within the British Empire, 1830-1939* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).

Guha, Ramachandra, *The Unquiet Woods: Ecological Change and Peasant Resistance in the Himalaya* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).

Hale, Ralph, *Buxton the Liberator* (London: Hutchinson & Co., 1946).

Hall, Catharine, *Civilizing Subjects: Colony and Metropole in the English Imagination, 1830-1867* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002).

Harlow, Vincent and E. M. Chilver (ed.), *History of East Africa, Volume II* (Oxford: Calrendon Press, 1963)

Harris, John H., *A Century of Emancipation* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1933).

Helly, Dorothy O., *Livingstone's Legacy: Horace Waller and Victorian Mythmaking* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1987).

Herd, Harold, *The March of Journalism: The Story of the British Press from 1622 to the Present Day* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1952).

Hill, M.F., *Permanent Way: The Story of the Kenya and Uganda Railway, Being the Official History of the Development of the Transport System in Kenya and Uganda* (Nairobi: East African Railways and Harbours, 1950).

Hobson, J.A., *Imperialism: A Study*, (London: James Nisbet & Co., Limited, 1902).

Hollingsworth, L. W., *Zanzibar Under the Foreign Office, 1890-1913* (London: Macmillan, 1953).

Holmes, Timothy, *Journey to Livingstone: Exploration of an Imperial Myth* (Edinburgh, UK: Canongate Press Ltd, 1993).

Huttenback, Robert A., *Gandhi in South Africa: British Imperialism and the Indian Question, 1860-1914* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1971).

Jackson, Alvin, *Home Rule: An Irish History, 1800-2000* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

Jacoby, Karl, *Crimes Against Nature: Squatters, Poachers, Thieves, and the Hidden History of American Conservation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001).



Jenkins, T. A., *Parliament, Party and Politics in Victorian Britain* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996).

Jones, Greta, *Social Darwinism and English Thought: The Interaction Between Biological and Social Theory* (Sussex: Harvester Press, 1980).

Kane, John, *The Politics of Moral Capital* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

Kennedy, Dane, *Islands of White: Settler Society and Culture in Kenya and Southern Rhodesia, 1890-1939* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1987)

Keppel-Jones, Arthur, *Rhodes and Rhodesia: the white conquest of Zimbabwe, 1884-1902* (Kingston [Ont.] : McGill-Queen's University Press, 1987).

Kirby, M. W., *Men of Business and Politics: The Rise and Fall of the Quaker Pease Dynasty of North-East England, 1700-1943* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1984).

Klingberg, Frank J., *The Anti-Slavery Movement in England: A Study in English Humanitarianism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1926).

Kuper, Adam, *The Invention of Primitive Society: Transformations of an Illusion* (London: Routledge, 1988).

Langer, William L., *The Diplomacy of Imperialism* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956).

Law, Robin, *The English in West Africa, 1691-1699* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

Low, D.A., *Lion Rampant: Essays in the Study of British Imperialism* (London: Frank Cass, 1973).

MacKenzie, John M. (ed.), *Imperialism and Popular Culture* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986).

Mayer, Arno J., *The Persistence of the Old Regime: Europe to the Great War* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1981).

Metcalf, Thomas R., *Imperial Connections: India in the Indian Ocean Arena, 1860-1920* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007).

Miller, Charles, *The Lunatic Express: The Building of an Impossible 600 Mile Railway Across East Africa* (Nairobi: Westland Sundries, 1971).

Moore, James R., *The Post-Darwinian Controversies: A Study of the Protestant Struggle to Come to Terms With Darwin in Great Britain and America, 1870-1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).

Nwulla, Moses D. E., *Britain and Slavery in East Africa* (Washington D.C.: Three Continents Press, 1975).

Oliver, Roland, *The Missionary Factor in East Africa* (London: Longman Group Limited, 1970: 1951).

Oliver, Roland and Gervase Matthew (ed.), *History of East Africa, Volume I* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963)

Oliver, Roland, *Sir Harry Johnston & the Scramble for Africa* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1964).

Orde, Anne, *Religion, Business and Society in North-East England: The Pease Family of Darlington in the Nineteenth Century* (Lincolnshire, U.K., 2000)

Pachai, B., *The International Aspects of the South African Indian Question, 1860-1971* (Cape Town: C. Struik (pty) Ltd., 1971).

Page, William, *Commerce and Industry: a historical review of the economic conditions of the British empire from the Peace of Paris in 1815 to the declaration of war in 1914, based on Parliamentary debates* (London: Constable and Co, 1919).

Pease, Joseph Gurney, *A Wealth of Happiness and Many Bitter Trials: The Journals of Sir Alfred Edward Pease, A Restless Man* (York, England: The Ebor Press, 1992)

Pettitt, Clare, *Dr. Livingstone, I Presume? Missionaries, Journalists, Explorers and Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007).

Ponsonby, Edward Charles, *Granville Sharp and the Freedom of Slaves in England* (London: Oxford University Press, 1928).

Porter, Bernard, *Critics of Empire: British Radicals and the Imperial Challenge* (London: Macmillan, 1968).

Preston, Antony and John Major, *Send a Gunboat! A Study of the Gunboat and its Role in British Policy, 1854-1904* (London: Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd., 1967).

Rai, Kauleshwar, *Indians and British Colonialism in East Africa, 1883-1939* (Patna, India: Associated Book Agency 1979).

Ranger, T. O. and John Weller (ed.), *Themes in the Christian History of Central Africa* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975).

- Reed, Colin, *Pastors, Partners and Paternalists: African Church Leaders and Western Missionaries in the Anglican Church in Kenya, 1850-1900* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997).
- Rich, E. E. , *The history of the Hudson's Bay Company, 1670-1870* (London, Hudson's Bay Record Society, 1958-59).
- Robinson-Dunn, Diane Liga, *The harem, slavery and British imperial culture: Anglo-Muslim relations in the late nineteenth century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006).
- Rockel, Stephen J., *Carriers of Culture: Labor on the Road in Nineteenth-Century East Africa* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2006).
- Robinson, Ronald and John Gallagher, *African and the Victorians: The Official Mind of Imperialism* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1961).
- Rodney, Walter, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa* (Washington D.C.: Howard University Press, 1982:1971).
- Said, Edward, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978).
- Said, Edward, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1993)
- Soctt, James C., *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).
- Scott, James C., *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1998).
- Sheriff, Abdul, *Slaves, Spices & Ivory in Zanzibar: Integration of an East African Commercial Empire into the World Economy, 1770-1973* (London: James Currey, 1987).
- Simpson, Donald, *Dark Companions: The African Contribution to the European Exploration of East Africa* (New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 1975).
- Sorrenson, M.P.K., *Origins of European Settlement in Kenya* (London: Oxford University Press, 1968).
- Strayer, Robert W., *The Making of Mission Communities in East Africa: Anglicans and Africans in Colonial Kenya, 1875-1935* (London: Heinemann, 1978).
- Stock, Eugene, *The History of the Church Missionary Society: Its Environment, its Men, and its Work, Volume II* (London: Church Missionary Society, 1899).

- Stocking, George W. Jr., *Victorian Anthropology* (New York: The Free Press, 1987).
- Taylor, Stephen, *Storm and Conquest: The Battle for the Indian Ocean, 1808-10* (London: Faber and Faber, 2007).
- Temperley, Howard, *White Dreams, Black Africa: The Antislavery Expedition to the River Niger, 1841-1842* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991).
- Thompson, Dorothy, *The Chartists: Popular Politics in the Industrial Revolution* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984).
- Thompson, E.P., *The Making of the English Working Class* (New York : Pantheon Books, 1964: 1963).
- Thorold, Algar Labouchere, *The Life of Henry Labouchere* (London, Constable and Company, Ltd, 1913).
- Trench, Charles Cenevix, *Men Who Ruled Kenya: The Kenya Administration, 1892-1963* (London: Radcliffe Press, 1993).
- Turley, David, *The Culture of English Anti-Slavery, 1780-1860* (London: Routledge, 1991).
- Vandervort, Bruce, *Wars of Imperial Conquest in Africa 1830-1914* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998).
- Weisbord, Robert G., *African Zion: The Attempt to Establish A Jewish Colony in the East Africa Protectorate* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1968).
- White, Landeg, *Magomero: Portrait of an African Village* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- White, Luise, *Speaking With Vampires: Rumor and History in Colonial Africa* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).
- Williams, Eric, *Capitalism and Slavery* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1944).
- Wilson, Kathleen (ed.), *A New Imperial History: Culture, Identity, and Modernity in Britain and the Empire, 1660-1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

#### *Theses and Dissertations*

- Robert J. Cummings, *Aspects of Human Portage with Special Reference to the Akamba of Kenya: Towards an Economic History, 1820-1920* (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California – Los Angeles, 1975).

Robinson-Dunn, Diane Liga, *Imperial Identities: Anglo-Muslim Relations and Politics of Orientalism in British-occupied Egypt and Victorian England, 1870-1900* (Ph.D. Dissertation, State University of New York at Stony Brook, 1999).

Kingsley Kenneth Dyke Nworah, *Humanitarian Pressure Groups and British Attitudes to West Africa, 1895-1915* (Ph.D. Dissertation: University of London, 1966).

#### *Articles*

Adas, Michael, "Social History and the Revolution in African and Asian Historiography," *Journal of Social History* Vol. 19 No. 2 (Winter 1985), 335-348.

Anderson, David, "Master and Servant in Colonial Kenya, 1895-1939," *Journal of African History* 41 (2000), 459-485.

Baker, J.N.L., "Sir Richard Burton and the Nile Sources," *The English Historical Review* Vol. 59 No. 233 (Jan. 1944), 49-61.

Baker, J.N.L., "John Hanning Speke," *The Geographical Journal* Vol 128, No. 4 (Dec. 1962), 385-388.

Becker, Dr. A. and Iris Davies (trans.), "The Capture and Death of the Rebel Leader Bushiri: Excerpts from Aus Deutsch Ost Afrikas Sturm-und Drangperiode," *Tanganyika Notes and Records* (March 1963), 2-9.

Beidelman, T.O., "The Organization and Maintenance of Caravans by the Church Missionary Society in Tanzania in the Nineteenth Century," *The International Journal of African Historical Studies* Vol. 15, No. 4 (1982), 601-623.

Cawood, Ian, "The 1892 General Election and the Eclipse of the Liberal Unionists," *Parliamentary History* Vol. 29, pt. 3 (2010), 335-357.

Clarke, R. O., "The Dispute in the British Engineering Industry 1897-98: An Evaluation," *Economica, New Series*, Vol. 24, No. 94 (May, 1957), 128-137.

Cross, G. S., "The political economy of leisure in retrospect: Britain, France and the origins of the eight-hour day," *Leisure Studies*, Volume 5, Issue 1 (January 1986), 69 – 90.

Cummings, Robert J., "A Note on the History of Caravan Porters in East Africa," *Kenya Historical Review*, Vol, 1, No 2 (1973), 110-134.

Brantlinger, Patrick, "Victorians and Africans: The Genealogy of the Myth of the Dark Continent," *Critical Inquiry* Vol. 12, No. 1 (August 1985), 166-203.

Darwin, John, "Imperialism and the Victorians: The Dynamics of Territorial Expansion," *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 112, No. 447 (June 1997), 614-642.

Fieldhouse, David, "Can Humpty-Dumpty be put together again? Imperial History in the 1980s," *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* Vol. 12, Iss. 2 (1984), 10-23.

Frankl, P.J.L., "An Arabic Deed of Sale from Swahili Mombasa Dated 1292/1875," *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* Vol. 20, No. 1 (1993), 33-41.

Gavin, R.J., "The Bartle Frere Mission to Zanzibar, 1873," *The Historical Journal* Vol. 5, No. 2 (1862), 122-148.

Harwood, Thomas F., "British Evangelical Abolitionism and American Churches in the 1830s," *The Journal of Southern History*, Vol. 28, No. 3 (August 1962), 287-306.

Hopkins, A. G., "Back to the Future: From National History to Imperial History," *Back to the Future: From National History to Imperial History*, *Past & Present*, No. 164 (Aug., 1999), 198-243.

Kieran, J.A., "Abushiri and the Germans," *Hadith* (1970) 157-201.

Lant, Antonia, "The Curse of the Pharaoh, or How Cinema Contracted Egyptomania," *October*, Vol. 59 (Winter 1992), 86-112.

Lester, Alan, "Imperial Circuits and Networks: Geographies of the British Empire," *History Compass* Vol. 4, No. 1 (2006), 124-141.

Maclear, J. F., "The Evangelical Alliance and the Anti-Slavery Crusade," *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 42, No. 2 (Spring 1979), 141-164.

Martin, B. G., "Notes on Some Members of the Learned Classes of Zanzibar and East Africa in the Nineteenth Century," *African Historical Journal*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (1971), 525-545.

Maynard, Douglas H., "The World's Anti-Slavery Convention of 1840," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 47, No. 3 (December 1960), 452-471.

Maynard, Douglas, "Reform and the Origins of the International Organization Movement," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 107, No. 3 (June 1963), 220-231.

Munro, J. Forbes, "Shipping Subsidies and Railway Guarantees: William Mackinnon, Eastern Africa and the Indian Ocean, 1860-93," *The Journal of African History*, Vol. 28, No. 2 (1987), 209-230.

Nwulla, Moses D. E., "The Role of Missionaries in the Emancipation of Slaves in Zanzibar," *The Journal of Negro History* Vol. 60, No. 2 (April 1975), 268-287.

Peers, Douglas M., "Is Humpty Dumpty Back Together Again?: The Revival of Imperial History and the Oxford History of the British Empire," *Journal of World History* Vol. 13, No. 2 (Fall 2002), 451-467.

Prasch, Thomas, "Which God for Africa: The Islamic-Christian Missionary Debate in Late-Victorian England," *Victorian Studies* (Autumn 1989), 51-73.

Ranger, Terence, "The 'New Historiography' in Dar es Salaam: An Answer," *African Affairs* Vol. 70, No. 278 (January 1971), 50-61.

Rowe, J. A., "The Purge of Christians at Mwanga's Court: A Reassessment of this Episode in Buganda History," *Journal of African History*, Vol. 3 (1964), 55-72.

Thompson, James, "Modern Britain and the New Imperial History," *History Compass* Vol. 5, No. 2 (2007), 455-462.

Twaddle, Michael, "The Muslim Revolution in Buganda," *African Affairs*, Vol. 71 (January, 1972), 54-72.

Wrigley, C.C., "The Christian Revolution in Buganda," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 2 (Oct., 1959), 33-48.

#### *Book Chapters*

Michel Foucault, "Governmentality," in James D. Faubion (ed), *Power, Volume 3* (New York: The New Press, 1994), 219-220.

Stoler, Ann Laura and Frederick Cooper, "Between Metropole and Colony: Rethinking a Research Agenda" in Frederic Cooper and Ann Laura Stoler (ed.), *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 1-56.

Wallerstein, Immanuel, "The Three Stages of African Involvement in the World-Economy," in Peter C.W. Gutkind and Immanuel Wallerstein (ed.), *The Political Economy of Contemporary Africa* (London: Sage Publications, 1976), 30-57.

Wallerstein, Immanuel, "The Colonial Era in Africa: Changes in the Social Structure (1970)," in Immanuel Wallerstein, *Africa and the Modern World* (Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, Inc., 1986), 13-36.