



Staats- und  
Universitätsbibliothek  
Bremen

## **Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Bremen**

**DFG-Projekt "Digitale Sammlung Deutscher Kolonialismus"**

### **Colonies and calumnies**

**Doering, Hans Georg von**

**Berlin, 1919**

**urn:nbn:de:gbv:46:1-7738**



COLONIES AND CALUMNIES

A REPLY  
TO SIR HUGH CLIFFORD'S  
"GERMAN COLONIES"

BY  
HANS GEORG VON DOERING  
ACTING GOVERNOR OF TOGOLAND

SECOND EDITION



IX.c.6224-5

BERLIN 1919  
DIETRICH REIMER (ERNST VOHSEN)

1927: 739.

IX. c. 6224 Nr. 5

# COLONIES AND CALUMNIES

A REPLY

TO SIR HUGH CLIFFORD'S  
"GERMAN COLONIES"

BY

HANS GEORG VON DOERING

ACTING GOVERNOR OF TOGOLAND

SECOND EDITION



BERLIN 1919  
DIETRICH REIMER (ERNST VOHSEN)



COLONIES AND CALUMNIES



# COLONIES AND CALUMNIES

A REPLY  
TO SIR HUGH CLIFFORD'S  
"GERMAN COLONIES"

BY  
HANS GEORG VON DOERING  
ACTING GOVERNOR OF TOGOLAND

SECOND EDITION



IX.c.6224-5

BERLIN 1919  
DIETRICH REIMER (ERNST VOHSEN)

1927:739.

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION . . . . .	5
THE PENAL CODE IN TOGOLAND . . . . .	13
THE LAND QUESTION IN TOGOLAND . . . . .	37
CONCUBINAGE IN TOGOLAND . . . . .	44
THE LABOUR QUESTION IN TOGOLAND . . . . .	54
THE CASE OF DAGADU . . . . .	76
CONCLUSION . . . . .	86

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED



---

---

## INTRODUCTION.

If, *before* the war, sneers at German colonization were occasionally encountered in certain English circles, it was to be expected that *during* the war, these sneers would transform themselves into a chorus of slander under the systematic fomentation of hatred practised by the British press and politicians. If this spur of hatred incited to a campaign of vilification unprecedented in extent and infamy against a people who had never done England the slightest harm, then, so far as the German colonies are concerned, there came into play that still greater spur to British calumination of an enemy—greed for the possession of his property.

If, — again before the war, — the voices of many English colonial experts were raised in just praise and many a fair or even grudging tribute to German colonial methods and enterprise—what more natural or in accordance with the British interpretation of patriotism than to repudiate one's own words and heap indiscriminate execration upon what one had formerly lauded?

To this evil eminence and denial of their better selves, men like Sir Harry Johnston, John H. Harris, Evans Lewin and others have attained during the war. These detractors have now been joined by Sir Hugh Clifford in a booklet called "German Colonies. A Plea for the Native Races." Its very title reflects that material expediency veiled under a moral pretext by means of which England has always carried

on her raids for plunder as divine crusades for liberty, humanity and all those other blessings the market value of which has suffered such depreciation since the world has seen what interpretation has been placed upon them by the self-acclaimed saviours of civilization.

There is little in which this work differs from other products of British propaganda directed against German colonial methods. The same motive inspires the same form and the same contents, and what this motive is, becomes clear to the thinking reader from the very beginning — in plain terms — robbery. To “justify” the robbery of another man’s possessions, it is only necessary to make his moral unworth clear to all the world. The recipe for this is an old one. It has been one of England’s traditional weapons in all her wars: lie lustily and vituperate with vigour — for you may be sure that some of the mud will stick.

Strange indeed is the psychology of the Briton, of whose spirit, twisted by expediency, a false patriotism based upon the poisonous dogma of “right or wrong, my country,” demands the sacrifice of all mental honesty, all fealty to truth, justice and fair play. That men of lower rank and lesser intellectual integrity should succumb to the ruling passion for defamation during war, might seem inevitable in an age and a country dominated by the criminaloid commercial gutter press, such as that of Lord Northcliffe. Nor is it surprising that what they imbibe from this press they should again give forth. But it must be remembered that so far as the personality of the author of the work before us is concerned, we have to deal, not with the petty vagrom traducers of the colonial highways, such as Mr. Evans Lewin or the Reverend Frank Weston, and their like, but with a

man who occupies a prominent position in the affairs of the British Empire.

Sir Hugh Clifford is the Governor of the Gold Coast Colony. He is also well-known as a writer upon colonial topics. In short the honourable gentleman has a name and a reputation to risk — and to lose.

It is precisely characteristic of the inevitable defeat of the ethical viewpoint whenever it comes into conflict with British policies of rapine, exploitation or aggression, that such men do not scruple to set their names to documents of which, in any other contingency, they would be heartily ashamed. Or that a reputable publishing house such as that of John Murray should not hesitate to set its historic imprint upon a publication of this kind.

The booklet is apparently intended chiefly for American consumption. It is propaganda of the most specious nature designed to persuade the American that England's desire to retain the German colonies is inspired by the purest devotion to the interests of the poor native — that it will in fact be nothing less than an act of noble self-sacrifice. There is a strain of assiduous flattery of America's moral and political institutions, a reference to the ever popular phrase "government of the people, by the people, for the people," even a few fragments of American slang such as "up against it," "make good," etc.

An attempt is made to give the work something of the dignity of an historical treatise by a long and suave disquisition upon the colonization history of different nations throughout the centuries, padded with disproportionately extensive quotations from other writers. This whole historical summary, cunningly designed to mask the real purpose at stake,

is, however, in a historical sense, worthless. For it is vitiated by a grossly grotesque attempt to white-wash and glorify that system of British conquest, aggression, rapine, and extermination which has filled the world with the moaning of countless weak, helpless or savage peoples upon whose bodies the enormous Empire of Britain has been built up and upon whose blood and sweat it still battens at this hour. Well might normal-minded men stand aghast at the unutterable insolence and presumption of a nation whose love for the native races has so lately been demonstrated by shipping them to European battlefields to be slaughtered by the hundreds of thousands in a war which in no wise concerned them — venturing to arraign another land for its ill-treatment of native peoples!

The author strives hard to prove Britain's magnanimity and nobility, and his contempt for the colonization methods of other nations is but thinly veiled. The English who were not pioneers in colonization, but only the exploiters of the colonization work of others (and once again history repeats itself), who merely followed in the footsteps of the Portuguese, the Spanish, the French and the Dutch whom they had robbed of their colonies, are represented as "impelled by no other necessity save the dictates of conscience, a sense of moral responsibility and obligation, and above all by a characteristic love of fair play!" "A characteristic love of fair play!" One might comment instructively upon the remarkable vitality of phrases the falsity and shoddiness of which every record of history reveals with a pitiless clarity.

England is furthermore represented as a nation morally averse to slave-dealing, and one might well

believe this of the English people themselves. And yet it was only after this horrible traffic ceased to be profitable that the English Government permitted itself ("at the dictates of a strong moral impulse," to quote this eulogist) to adopt the role of liberator — profitable in another way. Britain's real attitude towards human slavery was clearly proved during the Civil War in the United States when she sought by every means in her power to bring about the victory of the slave-holding states of the South. No other nation to-day holds in a state of practical bondage for its own selfish ends such untold millions of human beings of other races (Indians, Egyptians, Malays, negroes, etc.) as capitalistic-imperialistic Britain.

The clear historical fact that Germany acquired her colonies by legal and peaceful means, by purchase and negotiation with European powers and native chiefs, and by virtue of the participation of German explorers and missionaries long before Germany entered upon a colonial policy, does not prevent Sir Hugh Clifford from depicting Germany's entry into the colonial world as the raid of a blood-thirsty bandit bent upon robbery. "She came into the non-European world, 'as a roaring lion walketh about, seeking whom he may devour,'" he remarks, biblically. And then, inconsequentially, "her claims were based... solely upon her desire to become in the future a world-state like her neighbours." And once more inconsequentially, "in a word, she was bent upon plundering." This admirable historian becomes almost amusing in his moral indignation over the fact that other nations should venture to have colonial aspirations, or refuse to recognize the divine monopoly of the gluttoned dog in the manger.

Had not the passions of war destroyed all sense of humour in such an opponent, one might wonder that the irony of such reproaches from such lips, should not be self-evident to a subject of the greatest pirate empire the world has ever seen. An equally ready if some what more excusable inclination towards quotations from the Bible might well dispose one to expatiate here upon the parable of the mote and the beam.

Most of the conventional charges and accusations levelled by Sir Hugh Clifford against German colonial administration in Africa have already been answered in full in the reply made by the German Colonial Office to the notorious English Blue Book upon alleged atrocities in German Southwest Africa.<sup>1</sup> To pay any further attention to such charges might therefore savour of the supererogatory. But inasmuch as this author confines his particular attention to the German Colony of Togoland, it might not be amiss to confute him upon the very ground he has chosen, and to leave it to the reader to judge how much of his misrepresentation is due to malice, and how much — to use a charitable interpretation — to sheer ignorance.

The German colonial authorities are well aware that there were many flaws and faults in the process of German colonial administration, especially during the initial years devoted to pioneer work. They have no desire to extenuate these, but only — as proved by their policy before the war — to correct them. But they must reject with scorn and derision the ill-founded and unsubstantiated aspersions of a subject

---

<sup>1</sup> The Treatment of Native and Other Populations in the Colonial Possessions of Germany and England. Published by the German Colonial Office. 1919. On sale by Hans Robert Engelmann, Berlin W. 15.

of that power which has committed the greatest number of crimes and upon the greatest scale and for the greatest period of time against the lives, the possessions, the rights and liberties of subject races in colonial lands.

It is well-known that Togoland lies adjacent to the Gold Coast. It is perhaps less well-known, but as easily verifiable, that Sir Hugh Clifford, eleven months before the outbreak of the war, was received as an honoured guest by the then Governor of Togo, Duke Adolf Friedrich zu Mecklenburg — during a visit of several days to the neighbouring colony.

After the British occupation of the land, British hands were free to ransack the archives of the German authorities, and there can be no doubt that this was done in Togoland as elsewhere. A part of the German population of Togoland continued to live there during the ensuing years, and were thus easily available for any information such as a truth-seeker may have wished to obtain. Nor can lack of time be pleaded by Sir Hugh Clifford, for his book did not appear until 1918. And yet what a pitiful caricature, distorted beyond all recognition, has he succeeded in presenting of this model German colony! It is a concoction of the most incredible superficiality and haphazardness, composed for the greater part of negro gossip and paltry sophistries, and furbished out with an array of hypocritical sentimentalities and a simulated scientific air. The ill-informed disquisition upon German law in the colonies is an almost ludicrous case in point. Nor should it be overlooked that this unprejudiced historian deliberately bases his allegations upon German laws issued prior to 1896, and ignores all subsequent changes and reforms.

The set purpose of the author — to disparage the German colonial administration at all costs, and to represent it as a misfortune for the country and the inhabitants — naturally deprives him of all objective capacity — and even of all regard for the rules of honourable polemics. If conditions in Togo had really been as bad as this Briton would contend, then he and his officials would certainly, in view of the material at their disposal, have been able in the course of four years to prepare an indictment worthy of serious attention. But Sir Hugh Clifford, K. C. M. G., Governor and Commander in Chief of the Gold Coast, was unable to do this and was therefore forced to take refuge in indiscriminate charges and in generalities which are far from glittering. This is in itself an annihilating judgment upon him and his book — and a silent justification of the German administration which he attacks.

In September, 1913, Sir Hugh Clifford made a farewell address at Lome, in which he praised Togo as in many respects a model colony. Today the same Sir Hugh Clifford would represent Togo to be a model of German incapacity for colonizing and ruling the natives. Further comment may be considered superfluous.

In the following pages the salient points and errors of Sir Hugh Clifford's defamatory tract are examined and set right upon the basis of the official data of the German Government and the evidence given in confirmation by the best authorities upon the country in question.

---

---

## THE PENAL CODE IN TOGOLAND.

One of the charges brought by Sir Hugh Clifford against the German colonial administration is that Germany "as a matter of deliberate policy," had failed in the supreme duty which devolves upon Europe in its relation to non-European peoples, namely in bestowing upon them the "Reign of Law" as a substitution for "the capricious wills of innumerable and shifting despots." To these "despots," that is to say the German colonial officials, the accuser avers, the native populations were delivered up.

### I.

As a basis for this charge Clifford points to the fact that there existed in Togoland no codified penal law for the natives. This is not to be denied. The German colonial administration did not choose to pursue the path followed by the British colonial administration on the Gold Coast and elsewhere. On the Gold Coast, for instance, the penal code was simply copied from that which was in operation in another colony, namely Nigeria, and in England itself. Germany, on the contrary, had set herself the goal of creating a Penal Code for Natives, which would be based upon the broadest scientific principles, and with due consideration to the best precedents, the prevailing tribal rights and customs and the experiences of neighbouring colonies. But this was a task which Germany could take up only after the frontiers of the Protectorate which had been acquired

during the middle of the 80's, had been definitely settled by agreement with the neighbouring colonial powers during the 90's, and the occupation of the territory in question had been carried through. These measures occupied the time and attention of the German authorities up to the beginning of the present century.

During the first decade of the 20th century the Germans with characteristic thoroughness undertook the extensive preliminary work necessary for the establishment of a complete system of native criminal law. Officials were deputed to undertake long journeys in order to make studies and gather material, and various commissions of this sort visited the neighbouring French and British colonies. The material which was gathered has, for the greater part, been published, and was at the disposal of the author of "German Colonies," had he chosen with "that characteristic love of fair play, etc.," to make use of it.

This great and beneficent work could not be carried to its final conclusion, owing to the outbreak of the war.

*It would be difficult to find in history another example of a colonising power deliberately undertaking so vast and comprehensive a work for the creation of an indigenous code of laws, so soon after its entrance into colonial activity.*

In so far as the interval was concerned (and this interval was regarded solely as a period of transition), there was nothing left to do but to use the German penal code as a guide for the judges in the native courts. But a rigid application of the German criminal law to moral and social conditions so entirely different from those prevailing in the homeland, would have led to the most absurd results. It was therefore

necessary to give the judges of the native courts a certain latitude in the interpretation of the law. This, however, had nothing in common with caprice or arbitrariness. Even in European courts and in European jurisprudence there is always ample play left for the discretion of the judge. And it is precisely English jurisprudence which boasts that it fetters the commonsense of the judge less by means of iron-clad paragraphs than any other penal code in existence.

By means of a suitable selection of judges and their instruction in the peculiar nature of their new duties, the German colonial administration succeeded in placing men upon the benches of the native courts who adhered in principle to the German code, deviating from it only in so far as the native conceptions of the law or their conditions of life rendered this necessary. The results in general were not an increase in the severity of a system of laws devised according to European concepts, but rather as mitigation of this severity. The object in view was gradually to arouse an understanding for European conceptions of law in the natives by means of continued instruction in the essence of these laws.

In a circular letter or order issued by Count Zech, the Governor of Togoland, under date of February 11, 1907, — a letter, by the way, which must have been known to the author of "German Colonies" — this goal is clearly defined. Since a comprehensive codification of laws was not possible, the attempt was made in this proclamation, at least to define in broad outlines the nature of the most important punishable acts. An intelligent consideration of the rooted viewpoints, the customs and the morals of the natives, a solicitude for their own conceptions

of right and wrong and a gradual education in the principles of civilized law, were the outstanding features of this proclamation.

The fact that this elastic system of penal law proved a success and that the natives were content with it, became clear after the occupation of Togoland by the English. The British Commissioner at Misahöhe repeatedly notified the natives that the German laws and regulations were still in force. Wherever these German rules and regulations were suspended, the natives would frequently express their displeasure by declaring in effect that "under German rule they knew where they were at — under English rule they were all at sea." This fact was revealed to me by a missionary who had remained in Togoland after the occupation.

## II.

According to the allegations of Sir Hugh Clifford, every official in the German colonies is supposed to enjoy the privilege of inflicting punishment according to his whim or pleasure, and to decree corporal chastisement under every possible-pretext.

This I declare to be a deliberate and malicious invention.

First of all, the authority to inflict punishment is expressly given only to the judges of the native courts, that is, to the "Bezirksamtmänner" (district commissioners), their representatives and certain sub-officials. For example of the 80 officials resident at Lome only two were equipped with this authority. It is an authority which is also closely limited by definite laws.

According to Paragraph 10 of the Chancellor's

Decree of April 22, 1896, (quoted by Clifford himself), all fines over 300 marks and all-prison sentences over 6 months require the authorisation of the Governor, to whom a report is to be made as soon as the sentence is passed. A sub-official, according to the service order of the Governor dated January 10, 1906, could be invested with authority to pass sentences of penal or disciplinary punishment only within the following limits: — "chain arrest," or gaol with hard labour up to 14 days, money fines up to 40 marks and corporal punishment up to 10 strokes with a switch or cane.

It was strictly decreed that this penal authority was to be granted only to officials whose character and previous conduct were such as to furnish a complete guarantee that the power placed in their hands would be exercised in a just and intelligent fashion. These officials were likewise subject to the most thorough instruction in the duties of their office. It was above all things deeply impressed upon them that under no circumstances were they to impose punishment during any access of excitement, and that no verdict of punishment whatsoever was to be passed until all the circumstances bearing upon the case and the adequate penalty had been duly weighed and considered in a dispassionate and objective manner.

This decree was also known to Clifford for he cites (very mockingly) one of its later clauses, whilst at the same time purposely suppressing any intimation of those regulations which so clearly prove the benevolent spirit which dominates the German code of laws.

It would be following far too closely the methods of this whitewasher of English and blackguarder of German colonial practices were I to assert

that these rules and regulations were never transgressed. It is humanly conceivable that in spite of all restraints and admonitions, some judge or other may occasionally, under the influence of what the Germans call "Tropenkoller," the well-known "spleen" or nervous irritability of the tropics, have permitted his temper to influence his verdict. Surely this human weakness applies to English officials as well as to German? Let that colonial judge, or Governor who, like Sir Hugh Clifford, is without sin in this matter, cast the first stone — or gobbet of mud. The reputation of the German official was in general so high that the most abundant, veracious and irrefutable evidence would be necessary ere any just-minded or well-informed person would dare allege that cases in German colonies in which tropical spleen had influenced judicial verdicts were more numerous than similar cases in British colonies. But here there is no evidence furnished.

The native, moreover, enjoyed the right of appeal to the Governor against every decision of his judges. This right was not neglected by the natives. The traducer of German colonial law and administration might have easily acquainted himself with such cases, cases in which the Governor modified the verdict of his officials, had he been really concerned about arriving at the truth — something which he might easily have attained by a search of the official court archives which his countrymen had confiscated.

Clifford's statement that the sentencing of a native required no previous examination whatever, is likewise made out of whole cloth. The regulation which this British propagandist himself quotes in his brochure, — to the effect that a protocol of the sentences

passed must be submitted to the Governor, repudiates this statement, for a subsequent investigation of the separate punishments would be impossible if the proofs of the guilt of the culprit could not be presented in writing.

The author of "German Colonies," is assiduously concerned in avoiding any allusion to certain stipulations of the Chancellor's Order of July 12, 1907 (Dernburg), stipulations which must surely have been known to him. For these decree that a protocol must be drawn up regarding every case in which sentence of corporal punishment had been passed. This protocol must testify that the accused has been duly heard and examined in connection with the trespass of which he has been accused and that all evidence tending to prove his innocence has been brought forward.

In order to postulate the brutality of the Germans and then paint it as black as possible, Clifford furthermore suppresses the fact that in all cases in which a punishment by whipping of more than 15 lashes, or a punishment by caning of more than 10 strokes was decreed, the protocol must establish the reasons why the sentence was passed. The facts as proved and the trespass recognized as punishable must be given; likewise the circumstances which determine the degree of the punishment meted out.

Had Sir Hugh Clifford been as diligently occupied in establishing the truth by means of native evidence as in raking up matter for calumny, he might, by asking the first native he met upon the streets, have learned how great was the time and trouble which the German colonial officials had devoted to the question of the native palavers. These proceed-

ings and trials always took place in full publicity. Chiefs and other natives of rank rendered good service in these negotiations.

### III.

The most violent and unfair assaults made against the German administration of law in the colonies by the enemies and exploiters of Germany are based upon the use made of punishment by whipping. Here our blithe calumniator indulges himself in a more than generous measure of spiteful distortions and malicious misrepresentations of the truth.

The first thing we would wish to establish is the clear and indisputable fact that this form of punishment is extensively employed in the British colonies of West Africa. Careful investigation proves that  $\frac{1}{7}$  of all sentences passed in North Nigerian courts were sentences of punishment by the lash. It is incomprehensible how Sir Hugh Clifford could possibly have declared that corporal punishment was "of course," forbidden by law, save for a few specified offences. Paragraph 74 of the English Criminal Code of the Gold Coast, declares the following forms of punishment to be legal:

1. The death penalty.
2. Imprisonment.
3. Punishment by flogging.
4. Punishment by caning.
5. Fines, etc.

Sir Hugh Clifford indulges in a particularly petty form of chicanery when he ventures to conclude that because corporal punishment happens, quite acci-

dentally, to be mentioned first in the list of permissible punishments (in the Chancellor's Order of April 23, 1896) this form of punishment must consequently be the most frequent in the German colonies. According to the same thimble-rigging logic we might conclude, upon the order of punishments given in the English list, that the death penalty was the most frequent in the English colonies. No Governor of an English colony can claim to be ignorant of the frequency and the cruelty with which flogging is carried on in English prisons.

It is, of course, a question open to debate as to whether it be expedient, in view of the moral conceptions of uncivilized peoples, to apply corporal punishment in a greater or lesser degree. Numerous English colonial authorities might be cited who estimate the educational value of a well-regulated code of corporal punishment very highly. The opinions of English judges might also be cited, who in open session expressed regret that they were unable to make more copious use of physical punishment. Nor must it be forgotten that it is only a few years ago that England abolished flogging in her navy and, succumbing to the sensational and hysterical "White Slave" crusade, re-introduced flogging of her own white subjects!

As a general rule the natives show a thorough understanding for a moderate system of corporal punishment, whereas they regard the English system which subjects them to heavy and often ruinous fines, with great aversion and distrust. Characteristic of this is a saying extant among the natives of Togoland with reference to the law: "the German gives; the Englishman takes."

The danger of too great a restriction of corporal

punishment by law becomes obvious to all who have travelled in English colonies and observed to what an extent unrestrained and brutal private flogging supplants the official chastisement. It is precisely the Britons of the Gold Coast who stand in evil odour among the people of Togoland in all that concerns flogging.

The rigid rules by means of which the administration of physical punishment in German colonies is regulated, must be known to Clifford, since even he is forced to acknowledge that no woman, Arab or Indian can be lawfully flogged, and lads under sixteen years of age can only be whipped. "These, however," he remarks, pettily, "were comparatively recent innovations." The remark is characteristic of the malevolence and dishonesty with which the entire work is permeated. For these alleged "recent" innovations are to be found in the self-same Order of the Chancellor (1896) which had already been quoted by Clifford. This Order contained the first legal regulation of native law in the German colonies. And this is a record of which Germany may well be proud. For it would be difficult to find in the colonial history of any other nation another instance in which a colonial power had issued humane decrees of this kind *during the second decade of its colonial activity!* Hence these innovations, instead of being "recent," were in reality, remarkably *early* regulations.

Clifford emits another malicious untruth in declaring that it was seldom that a lesser number of strokes than 25, the legal maximum in punishment by whipping, was administered. The exact contrary is true. The infliction of the maximum punishment became less and less frequent. The proviso that every sentence which

called for more than 15 strokes necessitated a detailed justification duly written down and submitted to the Governor with the Protocol, operated in this direction. I have already called attention to the fact that most staff officials were empowered to impose corporal punishment only to the extent of ten strokes by lash or cane.

The assertion that the infliction of corporal punishment "could be ordered by a German official on almost any pretext without any risk of intervention by a higher authority," is so crass and venomous a slander upon the entire body of German officials that it will suffice to stigmatise it as a monstrous and by no means cunning falsehood. The chivalrous and veracious knight goes so far as to impose a particularly gross fairy-tale upon his uninformed victims. "It was a common practice," he writes, "for a German trader to inform the nearest official that such and such a native had insulted him —and this sufficed — without any further enquiry or trial, to cause the individual named to be awarded five-and-twenty lashes."

No proof of this charge is given, for none can be given, and we must decline, in view of the purpose which inspires the whole of his indictment, to accept the word of the Governor of the Gold Coast as a sufficient guarantee! The statement must be nailed down as another mean and deliberate lie. From what sources did this defamer of German colonial law derive his information? Was the wish father to the thought, or was this yarn conveyed to him by some assiduous, disgruntled negro, diligently bent upon currying favour and well aware how welcome such slanders of things German would be to the British?

The merchants of Togoland, far from being able to

use the administrative apparatus for their own ends, were disposed rather to complain that the authorities did not proceed with sufficient severity against those recalcitrant or lawless natives against whom charges had been made. Even in the case of disciplinary measures, the authorities were always concerned to make a thorough investigation of the case, demanding the requisite proofs and shaping their decisions only upon the basis of the facts established.

Under the influence of the fatherly solicitude displayed for the welfare of the natives by Count Zech, the Governor of Togoland, whose noble work was appreciated and honoured far beyond the confines of the colony he administered, the application of corporal punishment was limited in practice more and more. In its place fines and punishment by detention were imposed wherever possible. Punishment by flogging was confined more and more to offences in which brutality was a marked feature, or to offences against public morality, or to habitual offenders or dangerous rogues. In relation to the population of Togoland and the great concourse of shady elements along the coast, the number of punishments by flogging was by no means large. It is probable that occasionally some degraded Gold Coast native received his well-merited chastisement in Lome, only to return to the English colony and complain of the cruelty of the German authorities in the neighbouring land.

Sir Hugh Clifford glibly affirms that torture for the purpose of extorting confessions from natives had been "pretty freely" resorted to by German officials. This is a deliberate falsehood. It will prove interesting to examine upon what a basis of deceit and sophistry the British propagandist ventures to base his charges.

Very trickily he juggles and misapplies the Chancellor's Order of Feb. 27, 1896, which forbids that any measures other than those permitted by the German Court Regulations be employed for the purpose of obtaining confessions or declarations in proceedings at law where natives are concerned.

Another detached paragraph of the same order forbids the infliction of any extraordinary punishment, especially in cases where the guilt is only presumptive.

We quote these two paragraphs as translated in the English propaganda work:

"In proceedings at law where natives are concerned any measures for the purpose of obtaining confessions or declarations other than those allowed by the German Rules of Court are forbidden."

"The infliction of unusual punishments, particularly in cases of suspected guilt, are (*sic*) likewise prohibited."

These two clauses which deal with two distinct and separate things, are now joined together by Clifford in the attempt to make it appear that only the "extraordinary" punishments were forbidden for the purpose of inducing confessions, and not likewise the generally admissible punishments, such as whipping. This clumsy bit of fakery is obvious at first glance to all who have even a superficial knowledge of legal technicalities and forms of expression. Since all chastisement by whipping and every other form of physical force for inducing confessions is naturally forbidden by the German Penal Code in Germany, the same must also apply to the German colonies, subject provisionally to the same code.

Such is the clear, unmistakeable significance of the first clause of the Order in question. The second clause

has absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with the obtaining of confessions and testimony and simply prohibits the use of all so-called "extraordinary" punishments, which are condemned by all modern standards of jurisprudence.

"Extraordinary" (*ausserordentliche*) punishments or Penalties is an artificial legal expression (*poenae extraordinaries*) and is a term applied chiefly to cases of presumptive guilt. When therefore the propagandist knight drags forth an order issued two months later by the Chancellor (April 22, 1896) in order to define the expression "extraordinary punishments" and to offer these "extraordinary" punishments as the antithesis to the admissible punishments of the other order, we cannot but accuse him of arrant speciousness and of speculating upon the juristic ignorance of his readers. It is to such mental and dialectic crookedness that the author of "German Colonies" must have recourse in order to prove that torture was practised in Togoland — an abstract demonstration, as it were, upon an academic formula — since the plain, clear pathway of facts and realities was not open to him. Only thus and not otherwise was he able to advance even a scintilla of "proof" for his monstrous charges.

If Sir Hugh Clifford really wish to find sufficient authentic material for his disquisitions upon the gentle uses of torture, let him seek for it at home — as applied, for example, very recently, in the case of Conscientious Objectors in English gaols, or let him turn his attention to a colony adjacent to Togoland, that of French Dahomey, not to speak of the treatment meted out to the unfortunate German missionaries and their families in Africa and in India by the British humanitarians.

## V.

Sir Hugh next endeavours to shock his readers by detailed descriptions of the "formidable whip" with which corporal punishment in Togoland was carried out. As a matter of fact, the German "rope end," as countless experts upon the different African colonies have testified, is of all disciplinary instruments in use, by far the most humane. At all events, it is infinitely less harmful than the "cat" employed in the English colonies. Even the maximum corporal punishment inflicted by the "rope end" could never produce such horrible effects upon the delinquent as is invariably the case with the use of the English cat. And these terrible effects are not merely incidental, but *purposely* designed, as confessed by the Overseer of the English Prison at James Town to Dr. Asmis, of the German Colonial service. The English flagellation is *intended* to cause the blood to flow, the German in accordance with regulations, is immediately interrupted as soon as the skin bursts.

It is not likely that the maximum penalty by whipping in the German colonies has been more frequently imposed during late years than the terrible punishment of the "cat" in English colonies. In addition to this it must not be forgotten that punishment by means of the so harmless sounding "cane" in the English colonies was, to say the least, fully as harmful as the German punishment by whipping. The "cane" employed in the prison at Warri in South Nigeria was, for example, a stout crooked stick of wild-apple wood. This punishment by caning was frequently administered without regard to age — at all events, it was not confined to young delinquents as in the German colonies. The official statistics of the disciplinary cases of the English Prison at Warri might throw much interesting light upon this subject.

Our author professes much virtuous astonishment over the fact that packets each containing 10 of these official "rope-ends" were found in the government storehouse at Lome. What clearer proof of the wholesale flagellations carried on by the barbaric Hun? Has Sir Hugh never set foot inside a certain room in the prison at James Town and seen the imposing and orderly stores of "cats," all bearing upon their handles the official stamp of the Colonial Office in London, not to speak of the ropes for carrying out the death penalty by hanging, the ankle-irons and the handcuffs, all in such abundant quantities as far to exceed the demand of the German colonies for many years? Has the humanitarian Sir Hugh never seen the execution of that mediaeval form of punishment known as the "shot drill," which forces the culprit to lift heavy stone balls from the ground to the level of his chest, or that "crank labour" which obliges the wretched prisoner to turn a crank fastened to the wall until he sinks to the ground in exhaustion?

Is he unaware of the report of the School Inspector of Accra (Gold Coast) who was sent to Togoland in the year 1908 in order to gather information as to the model school system in vogue there?

Is he likewise oblivious to the fact that sick natives of the Gold Coast streamed in vast numbers to Togoland, that land of oppression and iniquity, in order that they might be treated by the German doctors there? — a state of things which the English government at Christiansborg sought to hinder in the interests of English prestige?

Is he unaware of the vast difference in the criminal statistics of the Gold Coast and those of Togoland — all in favour of the latter colony, despite the fact that some three-fourths of the crimes committed on the Gold

Coast never reach court? If these things be unknown to him, let him abide in seemly silence and not arrogate to himself a right to pass judgment upon the German colonial administration of Togoland.

But if these things be known to him, he stands convicted of as treacherous and dishonest a bit of vilification for ulterior purposes (in this case the robbery of the property of the German people) as has ever been laid at the door of a Briton seeking by way of defamation to construe a moral pretext to cover naked and insatiable greed.

## VI.

In making comparisons between Togoland and the neighbouring English colonies of the West Coast, it must never be forgotten that the German colony has been under German administration only since a few decades, whereas the English in comparison, enjoyed an advantage of over half a century quite apart from the fact that England had at her disposal a general colonial experience in the tropics extending over several hundred years. Judged by a scale such as this, every fair-minded person must concede that what was accomplished in this German colony represents an astonishing achievement. Even Clifford acknowledges that the administration there succeeded in abolishing deeply-rooted barbaric customs. The English colonial administration, in spite of the far longer period of time at its disposal, has achieved far less in this direction.

For example, the notorious judgment by idols and the immoral Yewe cult were strictly forbidden in German territory, and as a matter of fact completely suppressed, whereas the British Government was unable to extirpate either. Nor was it much concerned

about these abominations. The obscene dance known as the "Sibi-Saba" no longer occurs in Togo — in British territory, on the contrary, it was frequently met with before the war. The English were certainly averse to the dance, but the crafty men of Peki and other places merely gave the dance another name and the Sibi-Saba flourished more than ever.

It was no secret among the natives that life and property were better protected in Togoland than on the Gold Coast. And it was a common occurrence that negroes from the Gold Coast expressed their envy of and astonishment at conditions in Togoland and made comparisons utterly unfavourable to their own country. Natives from Peki or the Gold Coast who frequently came to Togoland as carriers, would as a matter of principle, travel two by two whilst in British territory, but no sooner had they crossed the German frontier than they would unconcernedly proceed alone.

There is a well-known saying that a little child may be sent with a bowl full of gold from Lome to Atakpame in Togoland and risk no single coin, whereas on the Gold Coast one is not safe from robbers even in a fortress-like stone house. In Togoland almost every offence is punished, even though it be after years, whereas on the Gold Coast even murder is forgotten as soon as the first hue-and-cry has subsided.

After Togoland, as a result of the war, had been blessed with British rule, there was a sudden end to public security. The natives soon become aware of this and said: "Once we could send a child forth at night whither we would throughout the entire land, but now a grown man scarcely dare go from one village to another in the broad of day without being attacked, beaten, robbed, kidnapped or killed."

The fact that a very far-reaching penal authority was assigned to the native chieftains in the English colonies was of very doubtful value to the native population.

Despotism, bribery and corruption of the worst description were the inevitable results of this system. Countless examples might be cited of cases in which native chieftains in British colonies had brought about the impoverishment, mortgaging and enslavement of their unhappy tribal brethren by the imposition of outrageous fines, often as high as £ 100, solely for the benefit of their own pockets. It was only in 1910 that the British Government finally determined to curtail the tyrannical power of these chieftains by issuing certain restrictive laws.

Another innovation, however, of which Britain has little occasion to be proud, is still in full force. This is the feudal institution of the debtors' prison, and in a particularly aggravated form. The law in vogue in the Gold Coast Colony expressly forbids that a native who has been incarcerated for debt, be given the opportunity of attaining his liberty by the work of his hands.

The alleged advantages of the English method of court procedure prove, upon closer inspection, to be merely illusory. The English, for instance, have introduced the custom of permitting the natives to take the oath in court. The natives swear by their idols. He who is familiar with African psychology will at once be able to realize what evil results must follow from this among a people who regard falsehood not as something wrong, but as the most convenient and popular weapon in the battle of life, a weapon to be brought into play upon all occasions and to be employed with studied skill and without reserve.

Our German natives became familiar with the pecu-

liar blessings of the oath, after Togoland fell into the hands of the English. A single instance of this, out of many, will suffice. A native of the Ho-Akowhe district had threatened another with some dire fate that was soon to befall him. Shortly afterwards the man who had been threatened was shot in the bush. The murderer was known to everybody, and not merely because of the threats he had made. And yet he was not sentenced in court — but was permitted to swear by his idols. After he had been locked up for three days, he was called before the judge, who declared to him that inasmuch as his gods had not slain him, he must be innocent. He would therefore be obliged to pay only the costs of the trial and the burial — after which he was to consider himself free.

Verdicts such as these excited feelings of deep concern in the natives of Togoland. The Germans might have been strict, but they were just — as to the English, no one knew how to take them. The fears of the Togoland-ers were soon to be realized. The most heathenish atrocities, as for example, assassination by poison, which had become almost unknown under German rule, soon began to revive and to an extent which terrified even the natives.

As to flogging — to which the British are supposed to entertain such an aversion — the natives soon discovered that they had been flung from the frying-pan into the fire. As early as August and September of 1914, public floggings were carried out in the market-place at Palime, and in so cruel a manner that the natives were horrified at the brutality of the Briton who supervised the "job." They declared that in comparison with this evidence of British penal "kultur," the rule of the Germans had indeed been mild. The

Britons were not content with the administration of the maximum of 25 strokes, but in cases of a repeated punishment dispensed 36 strokes or more. This, happened, for instance, at Atakpame, whilst I was still sojourning there as a prisoner of war.

At Misahöhe an English official of high rank investigated a quarrel regarding the frontiers between the tribes of Akpafu and Sandrokofu. In the forest of the "Six Paramount Tribes" in the Nkonja Mountains, two natives were anxious to communicate something to this English official. The Englishman however did not wish to hear them. One of the natives knelt down before him and begged pathetically to be heard. Hereupon this official seized a piece of gourd-vine, about one metre long and of the thickness of a child's arm, which happened to be lying at hand and in the presence of a German who had been summoned as a witness, and who afterwards reported the incident to me, began to beat both men in the most unmerciful manner and without the slightest reason. The significance of this bit of brutality and wanton cruelty lies in this: that this Briton was merely *applying in a German colony, a custom or license which, — despite all formal laws relating to a prohibition of corporal punishment, — was more or less a common practice in British colonies.* Even in the bureaucratic little colony under jurisdiction of Sir Hugh Clifford, many cases of severe flogging might be cited. For instance, towards the close of 1917, as testified by Dr. Karl Huppenbauer of Aburi, formerly a physician in the service of the Basel Mission on the Gold Coast from 1913 to Jan. 1914, there was an important trial at Kibbi under the jurisdiction of Major Irvine, in the course of which sentences of flogging from 12 to 60 strokes were passed. In addition to this, the most arbitrary interpre-

tation of the so-called Sanitary Laws took place, amounting in many cases to sheer extortion. For example, a District Commissioner by name of Ballantyne whilst crossing a street in Mampong noticed that water was trickling from a courtyard in which a negress was bathing. He immediately ordered her to be fined £ 4. The successor of this worthy, one Whitaker, likewise indulged a penchant for petty persecutions of this nature.

It is well-known that English courts frequently decree punishment by flogging in cases in which only punishment by caning is permissible. A British official in Nigeria openly confessed to a German confrère before the war that he simply took no notice of the regulations forbidding the flogging of black soldiers, and proved it by striking one of them on the spot!

The *African Telegraph* of December, 1918, quotes the following monstrous story from the *Gold Coast Leader*, a paper edited by English natives.

Despite the quaintness of the English there is not the slightest reason for doubting the authenticity of this narrative since it accords fully with many other similar reports:

“When en route to Maiduguri I stayed for a couple of days at Bauchi where I eyed with painful surprise two women, having been stripped entirely naked in an open market, being flogged 25 lashes each. Solicitously I hastened near and enquired from one of the spectators as to the cause of this eyesore and by whose order. “By order of Mr. Fitzpatrick”, he said, “because they were arrested a few days back in the forenoon, and sent to the Alkali by Mr. Fitzpatrick to be extremely punished for having passed through the residency. To satisfy his master, the Alkali, without hearing of the case, sentenced the accused to six months’ imprisonment

with hard labour each. Immediately on hearing this, Mr. Fitzpatrick sent for the Alkali and openly pronounced that these unfortunate women, while serving their time should receive 25 lashes each in an open market every month. As this seemed to me entirely dubious, I enquired a second time from an English-speaking citizen who also related the like statement.

"Not very long ago every person throughout the British Empire was more or less acquainted with the downright fact of the Jones, Baro and Zaria whippings, and again women are now being flogged at Bauchi entirely naked in an open market for the mere reason that they had passed through the residency."

Mr. Philip Snowden, M. P., one of the few English publicists who have been able to keep their mentality and their morality free from the rabies of Teutophobia during the war, comments upon this as follows in the *Labour Leader* of April 3, 1919: "If the facts are as stated, it is high time we ceased to talk about the superiority of British Colonial Government over that of Germany, or even of Belgium."

It is indeed high time, Sir Hugh Clifford.

Mrs. Mary Gaunt, who travelled up and down the West Coast of Africa, refers in her book "Alone in West Africa", to the frequency with which floggings are "administered *sub rosa*." Dr. Asmis, who enjoyed exceptional opportunities for studying English prison practices at Lagos and Accra, testifies that in no other prisons was there so much unnecessary and illegal flogging as precisely in these two.

To sum up a judgment upon the German administration of Togo as a whole, I need do no more than refer to the opinion expressed at Lome in 1914 by an Englishman to a neutral, after he had studied the official

archives at Misahöhe—namely, that it would be impossible for the English to carry on the administration of the colony in the same excellent fashion as the Germans.

The course pursued in the colony by the countrymen of this astute gentleman during the war, proves beyond any manner of doubt how correct was the judgment he uttered at the beginning of it.

---

---

## THE LAND QUESTION IN TOGOLAND.

Sir Hugh Clifford, K. C. M. G., Governor and Commander in Chief of the Gold Coast, declares that the German colonial administration confiscated extensive tracts of land, the property of the natives, in favour of German planters, and that it urged upon the natives the acceptance of sums of money for this land, as well as forced them by threats of flogging to work upon the confiscated lands — a system which came near to being regular slavery.

This presentation is in all points a misleading one and dictated by malice and calumny.

Once again Clifford makes use of a slippery subterfuge. He ventures to apply the Native Land Laws which are in vogue in the southern part of the Gold Coast Colony and in Ashanti, but are not recognized even in the northern part of this colony, indiscriminately to the whole of Africa and to Togoland where other laws and views were operative. There exists in Southern Togoland no tribal land which may be sold by the chiefs in the name of their tribes. All land in that district is personal property, or is divided among the various clans, and only the elders of these clans are entitled to dispose of it by sale. But great tracts of land to which no one lays claim exist side by side with those pre-empted. There are no fixed lines of demarcation between the districts occupied by hostile tribes, but merely zones of uninhabited wilderness. But even within the inhabited tribal districts there was so much room that the concept of property, especially the concept of landed pro-

perty was, as a matter of course, scarcely developed. Every man, even though he may have belonged to another tribe, was free to take whatever land was not already occupied by another and to make use of it as he deemed best. The sale, leasing, renting or granting of land were things utterly unknown in these parts. It was the custom to change the tillage land every five years, since the soil of the plains soon becomes depleted.

It is true that at the beginning private associations of planters acquired a disproportionate amount of land. The German Colonial administration did not at that time enjoy sufficient experience to enable it to estimate clearly what damage would be caused by such acquisitions. Nor were the natives aware of the disadvantages which might accrue to them from the selling of their tracts of land. Since they did not know how to utilize the land save in so far as it was subject to their own limited cultivation, they had cherished the belief that the strangers would likewise find it impossible to cultivate these large areas.

It is not true that the Government persuaded the natives to agree to these former sales of land. And it is equally untrue that the Government had anything to do with the payments for this land. Later, when the cultivation of certain food-plants — in particular, cocoa, — began to be taken up by the natives, and the European plantations began to develop upon the land that had been purchased, the natives began to repent of the sales, and sought to free themselves from the contracts by simply repudiating them, or by pretending that they had been forced to sign them.

It was at this stage that the Government intervened with all its power in favour of the natives. Not only did the Government itself refrain from undertaking any

appropriation in favour of the whites, but it decreed that all further sales of land over 1 hectare in extent were to be dependent upon its distinct and express approval. This ruling coincided with the laws bearing upon the sale of land in English colonies.

In addition to this the Government spared neither time nor labour nor expense in the interests of the natives in order to do away with the disadvantages resultant from the former sales of land, or at least to mitigate these as far as possible. After difficult and lengthy negotiations the authorities succeeded in bringing about adjustments between the white purchasers and the natives by means of which the natives recovered the greater part of the land in question and the Europeans were compensated by grants of land in unoccupied districts. The representatives of the land-owning class declared themselves in agreement with this solution of the question. In view of the complicated conditions prevailing in the matter of clan-ownership, it was naturally not always possible to consider the wishes of every individual native. Some of them were obliged to look for compensation to some of their tribal relatives who had been particularly fortunate in obtaining damages during the negotiations. This, however, was necessary only in two districts, Nyangbo and Gadja. It was these disgruntled natives who now incited their fellows, after the occupation of the colony by the English, to protest anew against the agreements which had been definitely concluded.

The settlement described in the foregoing, which is obviously that against which the Cliffordian incriminations are levelled, pertains chiefly to the Agu Plantation. The small tract of land which was assigned to the plantation by way of compensation or exchange, was deter-

mined by the natives themselves. In payment for the palm-trees upon this tract of land, the company, upon the advice of the Government Commission, paid the natives a sum of money which had not even been demanded by them. After they had already signed the agreement, the natives suddenly refused to accept *this particular money*. Nevertheless, after a palaver with a member of the Commission, they finally agreed to accept the money.

Let us compare these humane and benevolent efforts of a young colonial power to bring about a just regulation of the land question and to redeem past errors — let us compare them with the brutal dispossession and expropriation of which the Belgians and Frenchmen made themselves guilty in the Congo and the British in Rhodesia and elsewhere — all for the sake of greed and gain. Nor are the hands of England any cleaner on the Gold Coast than elsewhere, for here too the charge of land robbery may be levelled against her. For example, the natives at Aburi refused to sell land which the English desired for the extension of the Botanical Gardens there — whereupon it was simply confiscated, despite all protests.

When the British overwhelmed Togoland, they did not scruple, in order to swell their budgets, to confiscate and sell German plantation property — land which, (according to the opinions of the chivalrous gentlemen so assiduous in upholding native right) only the negroes might justly claim. And it was precisely the Agu Plantation land, for the possession of which the natives were once more particularly clamorous and insistent, which the British invaders bluntly declared to be government, — *British* government property. The former owners were more than disillusioned by this unique proof of the superiority of English rule.

If we consider these charges of Sir Hugh Clifford's in detail, we find ourselves at first disposed to do them at least the honour of refuting them as specific slanders, falsehoods or misrepresentations. But when we contemplate them from a comprehensive viewpoint of general moral justification, we cannot but be appalled by the overweening insolence of a Britisher, a subject of that empire whose bloated bulk has steadily waxed during the centuries through the most callous conquest, robbery and annexation of the territory of other peoples, venturing to level an accusation of such a nature against the colonial administration of the Germans. If relativities still count for anything one might well say that here, at the very worst, it is not a case of the pot calling the kettle black, but of a tall smoke-stack venturing to asperse a cottage chimney. It is not only a case of the beam in one's own eye and the mote in that of one's neighbour, but of a beam, so to speak, in the eye of a giant, as compared with the mote in that of a dwarf.

Or if the specious arguments of expediency, superior civilization and the like, the cant about the white man's burden, interpreted in practice purely from the viewpoint of the imperialist profiteer, may furnish a conventional excuse for Britain's unscrupulous robbery of the land of weak or backward races in every quarter of the globe, in what category of infamy must we place her present attempt to deprive the highly-cultured, industrious and efficient German people of the few scattered colonies to the development of which they have devoted their enterprise, their skill and their resources?

But this insolence, which is the ill-famed offspring of British arrogance and stupidity, is characteristic of that odious vice of the English at which Carlyle pointed his withering words and denunciatory finger. The wolf,

rigged up in the imposingly benevolent periwig and gown — appointing himself judge, jury and executioner over the sheep — and the sheep's property! John Bull, the bum-bailiff of the world — the universal moralist burglar, the pious pirate *en gros*, damning the petty misdemeanours of others? Scorn, which only the humour aroused by contemplation of this spectacle, saves from subsiding into nausea, is the feeling which such hypocrisy inevitably excites in healthy souls. But let us return to the charges of our noble antagonist, the knight.

The statement that the natives were compelled by the Government by means of threats and blows to toil upon the land they had sold, is prevarication pure and simple. On the contrary, the natives themselves were most eager to find employment upon the plantations, especially on the Agu plantation. This demand for work upon the plantations was so great that it frequently occurred that the Mission pupils could not obtain employment during their holidays.

A lack of labourers ensued only during the season in which the natives were engaged in cultivating their own fields. In order to meet the demand, the company employed voluntary contract workers from Anecho and Agu. The Government also supplied the company with workers from the interior, where there was no lack of such — for a limited time. The Government itself undertook the recruiting of these labourers, because it was in a better position than a private company to safeguard the interests of the country and of the workers themselves.

These labourers from the hinterland received their wages partly at once, partly on their return to their homes. Since they were well-treated, numbers of them would frequently choose to remain upon the plantation

as voluntary contract workers. Even during the war a number of them remained true to their masters. This is known to the British Government, which took over the plantation and these workers in March 1916. And once more English action followed in German footsteps, for upon command of an official of high rank it was precisely the English who recruited labourers from distant tribes for employment upon the Agu plantations. This self-same English official even ventured to issue an order to the effect that every tribe in Togoland was to supply a certain number of carriers for the campaign which the English carried on against the small body of Germans in Cameroon. German subjects were thus compelled by the worshippers *par excellence* of international law and the sanctity of treaties (such as the Congo Acts) to take part in the war against their German rulers.

---

---

## CONCUBINAGE IN TOGOLAND.

Had the element of sex and sexual interest been omitted from the official English programme of atrocity-mongering against Germany, the English calumniators would have deprived themselves of a weapon which is always certain to prove effective with the English public when wielded with the requisite moral indignation. For in addition to catering to the feverish and furtive pruriency which Puritanism and Pharisaism have implanted in the English in contradistinction to the more open and liberal Continental attitude towards things sexual, a splendid opportunity is afforded the British war propagandist for indulging in orgies of unctuous self-glorification at the expense of the immorality of others. This cue was taken up by the libellous Blue Book upon the alleged maladministration of the Germans in South-west Africa, and obediently, in answer to patriotic duty and perchance to impulses of a grosser nature, Sir Hugh Clifford follows suit.

For must not the unfitness of the German to rule his colony be demonstrated by his carnality as well as by his cruelty? The necessity is clear — and there remains only the furnishing of "proofs," illumined by the proper comment — something which can prove no obstacle to so adroit a polemicist and moralist as Sir Hugh Clifford.

We are treated to as savoury a dish of hypocrisy and Pharisaism as has ever been concocted in the Witch's Kitchen of British war propaganda. The things that

Clifford writes concerning the intercourse of the German settlers with native women are not only, like most of his other charges, untrue or grossly exaggerated, but vitiated in advance by the fact that the accuser seeks *exclusively to stigmatize Germans for faults or conditions which are not specifically German, but generally African and even universally human.*

To deny that unmarried white men in German colonies indulged in sexual relations with native girls would be incompatible with that sense of intellectual honesty and reverence for facts and objective realities which has made the German such a poor hand in the matter of an offensive propaganda against his enemies. It is inevitable that so potent an impulse as the sexual should over-ride even the colour-line in African colonies. Every man who has had even a superficial insight into colonial life knows that this matter is one of those elementary human problems of the relations of races and sexes in which the moralist and the law-giver, to employ one of Sir Hugh's uses of Americanese, are "up against" the instincts of human nature itself. Sexual relations between natives and whites are to be condemned from various points of view, but it would never occur to a German to ascend to such heights of Tartuffism as to declare that immorality of this nature is more prevalent in English, French, Belgian colonies than in German.

It is, nevertheless, a clear fact, manifest to every honest observer, that such intercourse between white men and native women is *not* more common in German colonies than in British, and that it actually *is* far less common in German colonies than in French, Portuguese or Italian colonies.

We must reckon with conditions and the futility in such

cases, of most admonitions and regulations. If Sir Hugh Clifford, as an experienced colonial official, is unaware of these things, or attempts to hide them, he is left the choice merely of deciding which label he consider the more attractive — that of ignoramus or that of hypocrite. At all events he stands disqualified *a priori* as an antagonist with whom one cannot enter upon a serious discussion.

The German Government did all that lay in its power to suppress, or where suppression was impossible, to curtail these abuses of African custom and habit and to preserve both the whites and the blacks from their evil effects. The most energetic measures were taken against prostitution<sup>1</sup>.

Children which happened to be born from relationships between black and white were provided for by a special ordinance, which imposed upon the father the duty of depositing a certain sum for the child. In cases in which the father happened to be an official, a certain sum would be deducted from his monthly pay for the support of the child.

It is more than impudent on the part of our defamer to drag in precisely the Gold Coast colony as a model for the German colony. Must we cite the names of English officials and private individuals in order to prove that there were plenty of Britons, married and unmarried, officials high and low or non-officials of all

---

<sup>1</sup> Since Sir Hugh Clifford frequently refers to the Belgian atrocity yarns as a justification for his own, it may be permissible to refer here to one of the great and salutary tasks undertaken by the German authorities during the occupation of Belgium in diminishing and regulating the widespread prostitution in Brussels and elsewhere and in reducing disease by a scientific system of registration, hitherto unknown in that country.

classes, who indulged themselves in that form of intercourse which Sir Hugh condemns with such pure and lofty severity? It is possible that he may point to the strict rules and regulations which were intended to apply in this matter to British officials of higher rank and that this did in fact bring about a diminution of vice during recent years. Yet these laws, like many other English laws, were more honoured in the breach than in the observance — for which tangible *living proofs* exist. For the number of mulattos in Togoland whose fathers were Englishmen and among these English officials of higher rank, was by no means inconsiderable.

It is likewise notorious that prostitution among the black girls is in a particularly flourishing state along the Gold Coast, which is not to be wondered at in view of the numerous large trade centres with a city population and great numbers of Europeans. The British Government does not seem to have been very much concerned about these conditions. On one occasion when the Government of Togoland requested the Government of the Gold Coast to send back the Togo women who were practising prostitution on the Gold Coast, this request was not complied with.

Sir Hugh Clifford's pettifoggery for political purposes is well evidenced by his attempt to deduce from a general phenomenon as common in his own colony as anywhere else, that the native women in Togoland enjoyed no protection from white men, but were simply delivered over to the will or caprice of their European masters. It is certain that had he been able to produce a single instance to support his charge, he would have flourished it forthwith in the faces of his readers. He is therefore forced to content himself

and his dupes with generalities and vague conclusions. As a matter of fact, the institution of native marriage was strictly respected in Togoland and protected to as great an extent as in every English colony. The molestation of native wives by white men was naturally punishable and all cases which were brought to the attention of the authorities were proceeded against.

Clifford's statement to the effect that the unions between white men and native women were held in disfavour by the blacks and that the offspring of such unions were burdened with tribal disadvantages is an utter fallacy. It is possible that here, as in the land question, Clifford commits the error of judging conditions in Togo solely by these prevailing on the Gold Coast. That white men's bastards should be excluded from participation in certain tribal privileges is something which is unknown in Togoland. On the contrary, not only the native girls, but even their parents frequently evince a lively desire for these allegedly despised unions, simply because from the standpoint of the black, they bring to them advantages in money and reputation. The parents would duly and formally make over the girls to the white men, according to native customs, after the payment of the price agreed upon, and these girls were then regarded by the natives as legitimate wives. The natives saw nothing irregular or immoral in such relationships, as is clearly shown by the fact that native chieftains often esteemed it a point of honour and hospitality to offer a woman to their European guests.

A somewhat different but far less honest conception of hospitality is revealed by Sir Hugh Clifford in the Parthian shot he discharges at Duke Adolf

Friedrich of Mecklenburg, Governor of Togoland, in connection with a law which he issued in 1913, to the effect that natives were not to assume nor make use of German patronymics. According to German law, the illegitimate child bears the name of its mother. The law in question is therefore nothing less than the application of a legal principle of the Fatherland to its colony.

The insinuation that this regulation was introduced merely to preserve the good name of prominent Germans in Togoland is as malicious as it is contemptible. For we need only consider to what an extent the "good names" of Englishmen are assumed by negroes in British colonies.

It is not in accordance with German taste or methods of controversy to serve up unsavoury colonial scandals even to annul by the contrast of counter-charges fortified by name, date and place, such loose and indefinite accusations as those of Sir Hugh Clifford. But such challenges demand something more than a mere contemptuous waving-aside; they demand the uncovering of the skeletons in the cupboards of the accuser himself.

An insight into the moral conditions that frequently prevailed along the Gold Coast may be obtained by consulting a book by the German author Schrenck "*Pilgerleben und Pilgerarbeit.*"

It was common talk in the colonies as late as the year 1900 that Acting-Governor Low was accustomed to boast in his club that his coloured concubine had cost him only £ 5!

In 1913 an English official related the following significant incident to Dr. Karl Huppenbauer, Resident Physician of the Basel Mission Factory at Aburi. During a distribution of prizes in the presence of the

Governor and his officials, the two chief prize-winners, a boy and a girl, both mulattoes, were asked their names by the Governor. To the amusement and astonishment of the entire assemblage, he received the simultaneous reply: "Riby Williams". The father of the twain, the Treasurer of the colony, Mr. "Riby" Williams, sat beside the Governor.

Sometime during 1906—10 Provincial Commissioner Curling was suddenly dismissed the service. It was notorious that he had ordered a negro customs official to be punished and that the latter in revenge had revealed to the authorities how often he had provided Curling with black girls at Akusi-Addah on the Volta River.

There is a certain humour as well as a certain significance in the reason given by Governor Hodgson for wishing to establish the government rest-house and commissioner's dwelling at remote Anum in close proximity to the Mission station there—he was anxious that his officials should live under the watchful eyes of the missionaries!

Dr. Karl Huppenbauer furnishes further interesting information and details as follows:

"Whence do all these mulattoes of the first degree who bear English names, come from? Surely the paternity of these hybrids can be attributed to non-English Europeans only in accordance with a percentage based upon their relative numbers? The same conditions prevail in nearly all English colonies. In South Africa mulattoes exist only since the seizure of their land by the English. The Boers had refrained from all intermixture with the native races. The Englishmen suffering from venereal disease whom I treated in the course of my activities at the Mission,

could have infected themselves only through contact with negresses, since there were no white women available. Often during moonlight nights between 12 and 3 o'clock did I chance to observe British officials in the company of coloured damsels gaily speeding in open motors along the main road in Aburi — it ran past my house at a distance of not more than 6 yards—on their way to the rest-houses in the Botanical Gardens where the officials from Accra were wont to spend their week-ends."

A glimpse into the Parliamentary Reports will bring to light the interpellation regarding the case of Attorney-General Willoughby Osborne who, in addition to his wife, took a black concubine with him to England, until a jealous clash between the two women led to a public scandal which was aired even in the Commons.

It must moreover be pointed out that the British Government has done much to make married life difficult for its officials in the colonies, since it prefers for its purposes the greater mobility of the unmarried. In all German colonies the percentage of married men was higher than in English colonies. This was due not so much to lack of a similar bureaucratic tradition, as to the fact that the German has a different conception of the duties and problems of colonial life than the Briton — even where the most dreaded and inhospitable parts of Africa are concerned.

The German goes out to the colonies to found if possible another home and to rear a family — since no other colonization land is at his disposal. The Briton, on the contrary, has no sooner set foot upon African soil, than he begins to reckon out the date upon which the steamer that is to bear him back to England will sail. The German sets his face towards Africa and

keeps it there, returning to the Fatherland only at long intervals — far longer than those that mark the visits of the Briton to his homeland. We have here two different motives which may be said to be characteristic of the difference between English and German colonization in African colonies — on the one hand settlement in the true sense of the term — on the other hand exploitation or politics.

When the chivalrous Briton expelled the inoffensive Germans from their homes on the Gold Coast, both Britons and blacks could not but be impressed by the fact that among 40 adult Germans, men and women, there were some 28 children, whereas a solitary Englishwoman with her one son, born in England at that, was regarded as something exceptional!

During the war, the natives of Togo enjoyed ample opportunities for observing the lofty standards of English morality as introduced by the invader. For example, the chief of a village in the district of Misahöhe was forced upon one occasion to lock up some 12 women who had been guilty of illicit intercourse with a white official of the British Government! Another instance was that of an Englishman who ordered the master of a black girl to whom he had taken a fancy to be put under military arrest, so that he might possess himself forcibly of the girl.

Many more such instances might be cited, but let these suffice. In the words of a German teacher, but recently returned from the British colonies: "Had my friends and I suspected the brutal and inhuman treatment to which we, our women and our children were to be subjected at the hands of the British, we might have at least provided for a future moral vengeance by a systematic accumulation of the overwhelming

mass of evidence against the true inwardness of the British colonial régime. But even under provocation it would not have been easy for us, despite all our opportunities, to be that which the Britons, in their blind and abysmal hate accused us of being — spies and informers!”

The old saw that they who live in glass houses should not throw stones is more than appropriate in this case. For the missile of the stone-thrower or the mud-slinger may all too frequently, as in this instance, turn out to be something uncomfortably in the nature of a boomerang.

---

---

## THE LABOUR QUESTION IN TOGO- LAND.

Pique and what must be regarded as professional jealousy simmer and seethe in Sir Hugh Clifford's language when he comes to speak of the noble German roads which, broad, well-kept, smooth and straight, traversed the hills and savannahs of Togoland. For these highways of Togoland were as famous for their excellent condition and scientific construction as those of the Gold Coast were notorious for their wretchedness.

Once again German achievement and German creativeness are seized upon to furnish calumny with a clue or a peg upon which to hang her unclean, tattered demagogical libels. No shred of honour, humanity, or good intent is to be left the German. Let the monster be discredited in all his ways and works! — for do not British fingers itch to filch his land?

All colonizing nations have built roads and railways in their colonies and protectorates and all have employed native labourers for these purposes precisely as the Germans have employed them. This is one of the first and most natural steps towards opening up and developing colonial territory.

Hence, when Sir Hugh Clifford declares that the construction of these roads in Togoland meant nothing less than a monstrous injustice towards the natives — exile from home, the interruption of their field tillage and other private affairs, in short, slavery, every person using his commonsense will at once recognize the crude exaggeration which stamps and vitiates the charge.

The most important roads in Togoland were built by so-called tax-labour (*Steuerarbeiten*) — a form of social service with which, judging by the fruits of the social revolution, the democracies of all the world will sooner or later have to reckon. Every man capable of manual labour was obliged to work 12 days in the year for the Government. As long as a primitive people does not possess a sufficiency of financial resources, such tax-labour represents the best and simplest form of taxation. One need only bear in mind, in conjunction and in comparison with this, the yearly excursions undertaken by the French in the West Soudan, in order to collect the taxes in natural produce, excursions which resemble robber-raids and which have almost ruined the land. During this period of tax- and tribute-collecting, the populations of entire villages would flee with all their goods and chattels from Upper Dahomey into Togo territory.

On the contrary, the building of roads and rest-houses by means of tax-labour signifies an improvement of the entire land — from which the inhabitants profit. And though the native may at first have been unable to appreciate the reasons for these improvements, he was soon able to appreciate, understand and profit by the improvements themselves.

Wherever possible, the rule was observed of employing the natives only within the boundaries of their own tribal district. The work was also arranged and carried out with all possible consideration for protecting the interests of the natives, the cultivation of their crops, etc. The work began after an agreement had been arrived at with the natives; the villages relieved each other by means of shifts, so that no man worked more than 2 days per week during the entire working period. During the season

for tilling the fields, all work was suspended. Hence the building of a road often took several years.

The fact that the natives were now and then obliged to work outside their tribal territory in making roads or keeping them in repair, was due to the nature of conditions and could not be avoided. It is not to be denied that this did not suit the natives from their shortsighted tribal point of view. The populous tribe of a densely-inhabited district would naturally wish to build roads only to the middle of the waste land which separated its district from the district of the neighbouring tribe, and perhaps leave the other half to a weak tribe with only a scant number of men available for work. The natives, of course, saw no injustice in this. And yet it would have been a crying injustice if, for example, the building of the railway to Atakpame had been thrown entirely upon the shoulders of the people of Atakpame, or a road that led far into the hinterland and served the convenience and profit of the tribes and communities living there, had been constructed solely by those tribes through whose lands the road incidentally led.

In rousing himself to such a pitch of moral indignation over the cruelty of the Germans in using natives of one district to help in building roads in another, Sir Hugh Clifford evinces a bad or perhaps only a convenient memory. For he might have remembered the system under which most of the roads and railways of his own colony came into being. For example, the railway from Accra to Koforidua was built by hundreds of natives whom the English had brought in great transports from remote regions in the hinterland of the Gold Coast. The mortality among these black labourers was so great that it soon became necessary to transfer them once more to their homes.

"Volunteers!" the British apologist will cry — "volunteers" — a term which English imperialism and oppression have never failed to use cunningly and cynically in order to make the obedience induced by brute force appear as gentle acquiescence — nay, as eagerness to serve the interests of England. Such volunteers are as voluntary as the "gifts" which the wretched natives are called upon to give in aid of the Red Cross, or for the purchase of aeroplanes—as voluntary as the native conscripts shipped by thousands to Europe's shambles to be fed to that Moloch of War whose maw is no less insatiable than the maw of British imperialism. The real nature of this imperialism a long-suffering world has now clearly realized — whatever its advocates, such as Professor Ramsay Muir and his diligent disciple, Sir Hugh Clifford, may advance in defence of a pernicious institution founded upon and impelled by world-wide loot and exploitation.

British humanity in the matter of compulsory labour is conspicuously illuminated in a striking article entitled "The Wrongs of Egyptian Peasants, An Appeal to Labour Against the Crime," by Dr. L. Haden Guest, M. C., L. C. C., in the *Labour Leader* of April 3, 1919. Dr. Guest, after referring to the terroristic methods and the brutal militarism which had been introduced by General Allenby, the Dictator of Egypt and which had provoked to revolt the unfortunate people whom England, in violation of her most solemn promises, had calmly annexed, proceeds to describe the manner in which the "volunteer" Fellaheen are "enlisted:"

"A certain number of men enlisted readily enough. Then there came a pause, and men were still required. Orders were then sent round to stimulate the recruit-

ing, and eventually a press-gang method was established. A friend described to me how it was done.

"A party of "recruiters" would go up to one of the little mud villages (many look like big ant-hills) and wait for dusk when the fellaheen would return from the fields. When they returned they were "rounded up" like cattle, and the suitable ones picked out and enlisted. If they refused to "volunteer," *they were lashed with the Egyptian shorthide whip until they changed their minds.*

"There were boys of 14 taken and men of 70 or even over.

"The medical examination, if any, was a farce, and men gravely ill were sent to do military duties. *Once the men were enlisted discipline was maintained by the free use of the lash, and whippings were so common that a medical officer told off to oversee the administration of the punishment arranged to have his "sick parade" and his "whipping parade" at the same time, the whipping parade being quite near to his tent where he saw the sick, so that he could overlook both functions (with a little agility) at the same time."*

"The men received their pay regularly, I understand, but rations were often deficient, and clothing, blankets and tentage very often deficient. In the winter of 1917—18 Egyptians died like flies as the result of epidemics of typhus fever and other diseases, cold and insufficient food.

"The medical arrangements for the men were entirely inadequate, and the sickness rate and death rate would prove interesting, if grim reading, if they could be obtained. Egyptians were treated so brutally in their own units that they were afraid to report sick, and those discharged as permanently unfit on medical

grounds were not exempt from being recruited again by the next press-gang party which came to their village. Very frequently indeed also men were kept beyond the stipulated time of their contract service, and our word as Britons broken.

"In addition to these raids on the homes of the fellaheen for men we also requisitioned nearly the whole of their donkeys and their camels — at any rate, all the good ones.

"Of course, these animals were paid for, but the peasant cultivator could not make a few piastres do the work of a four-footed assistant. Also we bought up much food, and directly and indirectly, as a result of the presence of large bodies of troops in Egypt, the cost of living went up tremendously without a corresponding rise in wages.

"Before November last the Egyptian papers even — which are censored as to practically every word by a semi-military official — were reporting riots around food stores and shops where half-a-dozen people were killed. In Alexandria practically all the poorer classes were underfed — Egyptian and European alike. Is it very remarkable, therefore, that we were hated and detested in Egypt, and that it was currently said that all Egyptians were pro-German?"

Truly John Bull, the great civilizer at his best and favourite performance of instilling humanity and freedom with bludgeon and cow-hide whip! And yet how loudly he lifts his raucous voice to denounce to the world the inhumanity of a people whose record, compared to his own, may be said to be almost immaculate.

To revert to Togoland, it must not be forgotten that a system of protective laws for the worker was in vogue there, superior to anything existing not only

in English colonies, but even in England itself to this day.

The building of roads, which Clifford attempts to distort into a kind of perverse passion on the part of the Germans was, according to him, the cause of an extensive emigration to the Gold Coast. The first objection that must be made to this is that the wanderers, with the exception of a small fraction, always returned to Togo. For it was not in the real meaning of the term an *emigration*, but a kind of movement of season-workers who went to the Gold Coast. The same thing also took place, on an extensive scale, in the hinterland of the Gold Coast colony, east of the bend of the Volta River. These season-workers were tempted to go to the Gold Coast by the high wages obtainable there, especially in the cocoa-districts and, so far as the younger people were concerned, by all the temptations of a loose and dissipated life.

Sir Hugh Clifford exposes a strange unfamiliarity with native customs in asserting that the building of roads led to a scattering of family groups to distant spots and a great reduction in the volume of their annual crops. A person familiar with the land or people, or one devoid of ulterior motives, would not have risked such a statement. For it is known to all who are acquainted with conditions in Togoland that there are many Togo tribes which have since time immemorial preferred to live family-wise in the midst of their fields. As a result of the three and four field system of negro agriculture, it was natural that these families in the course of their customary alternate cultivation of fields, should occasionally transfer their habitations to spots remote from the main arteries of traffic, since there was not always a sufficiency of good land along these main roads.

The statement that the crops of the natives were diminished in volume from year to year is an arrant mutilation of the truth. The statistics of the exports from Togoland would prove the contrary. There were, to be sure, times when the crops failed. But this was due to the drought which prevailed in certain years. The year preceding the war was a bad year in this respect.

Another baseless statement contained in the booklet "German Colonies", is to the effect that the natives had ventured to establish their farms close to the railway and roads only after the British occupation. This form of settlement had in fact been begun by the German Government. It increased in extent from year to year and would certainly have developed itself as rapidly after 1914 under German government as under the usurping English. It could scarcely be expected that *all* the beneficial effects of Togo's system of roads should manifest themselves in full measure at the outbreak of the war, since this system had been completed only some two years before. It was because the war had brought loss of work to so many coloured employès, labourers and traders and had forced them to make their living by cultivation of the soil, that the more intelligent among them naturally chose to settle along the main routes of traffic.

The remarkable argument which the road-disdaining Sir Hugh had advanced in order to disparage these splendid works of civilization and communication, namely that "they had retarded, not advanced the development of the colony" is hereby nullified by himself in that he concedes the usefulness of these roads, and the appreciation of this usefulness by the natives.

The decisive factor which the excellent system of roads proved to be for the economic prosperity of Togo-

land must be conceded by every unprejudiced observer. Hundreds of thousands of human beings with their wagons, pack animals and herds of cattle thronged these roads from year's end to year's end; they were the highways trodden by the feet of multitudes of natives from all parts of the colonies, and by strangers from neighbouring territories, from the Soudan and even from Senegal. Especially the great caravans with far-off destinations were glad to make use of the good roads and rest-houses of Togoland, and the excellent food and fine opportunities for trade often induced them to make a prolonged stay. Not merely two government motor-cars, as Clifford slurringly and superficially declares, passed over these roads, but a great number of light and heavy lorries and passenger motor-cars as well as hundreds of motor-bicycles. Here, too, one must not forget that things were in their first stages of development and that motor traffic would naturally have increased considerably during the last four years—quite irrespective of whether the land were under German or under British administration.

The only premiss for this would naturally be that the network of the roads was kept in proper condition. But here the Britishers failed utterly. The beautiful roads were ruined by them in the most shameless manner; the bridges were left to decay, and as early as 1915, it became necessary to suspend lorry-traffic along certain sections.

With all the adroitness of a virtuoso in legerdemain Clifford strives to impress his audience of laymen by flourishing in their faces the figure of *33 per cent* (the italics are his) increase in cultivated land during the British occupation. The statement is reckless and haphazard in the extreme. I should like to ask Sir Hugh Clifford

upon what he bases his estimates? For the amount of land which was cultivated under German rule is totally unknown to the British official. Owing to the manner in which the separate fields lie scattered far and wide, even an approximate estimate of the total area of cultivated land is impossible for one who has dwelt for long years in the country—how much more so then for the newly-arrived English intruder!

If Clifford's statement is not based wholly upon what he permitted himself to imbibe from the blacks, I can only assume that he must have trusted to the statistics of the export of maize. But in this there enters an element which must prove very disintegrating for all calculations—as follows:

In 1916 the chiefs in Togoland received orders from the English to plant as much maize as possible. The maize was then to be placed at the disposal of the Government at the price of 120 Marks (£ 6) per ton. The interpreter, however, had translated the word ton by "atigo," (that is to say, "tun" or barrel) which caused great joy among the black growers who naturally had a flour-barrel in mind. Hereupon maize was planted indiscriminately in certain districts at the expense of other crops, and was sold for export. This artificial intensification of the maize crop and its export to France brought about a terrible shortage of food in the central parts of Togoland.

Why indeed should England or her Sir Hugh Cliffords be so solicitous for the bodily welfare of the black African, when her heartlessness towards a race upon a far higher scale than the negro, that is, the Indian, has been manifested by mountains of famine-withered corpses throughout history, and is being so manifested every day? For example the *Labour News Service*

for the week ending April 5, 1919, as quoted by a Manchester newspaper, draws attention to "a terrible instance of the way famine can be created in a food-producing country. From the trade returns for 1914—1917 it shows that wheat to the value of millions of pounds was actually *exported* from India, *at the very time that the Indian poor were dying in hundreds of thousands* as a result of high prices and want! Even as late as 1916—17, the last year given, £ 5,969,971 (or 14½ million cwts. of wheat) was exported from India, of which eight million pounds worth came to Great (the adjective reads strangely here) Britain and the rest went to our allies, Italy and France. Verily, it was "War at any Price" — and largely a price we did not pay."

English methods of cultivation often entail, like those of the negro himself, a wanton sacrifice of forests, and if there has been an increase in the area of cultivated land, this must have been largely at the expense of the forests which the Germans have always been at such pains to preserve by means of their scientific forestry laws. Vast tracts of land on the Gold Coast have been rendered waste and sterile — after the Government there had lacked the energy to carry out the very sensible measures embodied in the so-called Forest Bill.

The people of the Ewe tribe, with but few exceptions, long for the return of the Germans. Even though the tax-labour and the money taxes of German rule may not have been relished by them, there is no doubt that English rule soon became more irksome to them than anything they had experienced before. The British Government would again and again order the chieftains to supply labourers and carriers. On one occasion, in the northern part of the Misahöhe district, men were engaged to serve as carriers in the interior of Togoland.

Only after soldiers had been ordered to mount guard over them did they discover that they were to be sent as carriers to the Cameroons. A few escaped by flight. The others were brought to Lome under military guard. No one was permitted to leave the train during the halts at the stations. After reaching Lome they were given the choice of going on or returning to their homes, after very high wages had been promised to those who were willing to go to the Cameroons. Many preferred to return — but no pay was offered them for the days they had lost, nor for the return journey. Some of them were locked up, receiving no food for over 24 hours.

The instance here cited is but an example of many. It soon came to pass that the able-bodied men fled far afield when the emissaries of the British Government appeared in search of new victims. The hand of the Briton lay heavily upon the helpless people. The roads which were intended for the benefit of all, white or black, were neglected, as has already been described. Only certain highways which were necessary for the motor-traffic of the Europeans were taken care of and extended by the English — as for instance, in Agu. The frequently excessive fines inflicted upon the natives by the English for the non-observance of some government order or other — were the cause of much bad blood.

I will add a few opinions of the natives themselves as they expressed these in personal talks with a German physician in whom they placed great confidence: From these it will be clearly seen what the natives thought of the blessings which English rule had brought them:

“The German Government made us pay a yearly tax of 6 Marks. Many of us did not like this. So we complained and said: What have we bought from the Government that we should pay it money? Yet we

could pay these 6 Marks without great hardship. And there was order and safety in the land.

“But the English breed insecurity in the land with their laws, and yet they draw more money from us than ever the Germans did through the tax. First of all, they pay us only about one-fourth the former price for our produce. For one kilogram of cocoa we receive only 25 Pfennigs, formerly we got 80 Pfennigs or 1 Mark. He who has 10 loads of 30 kilograms, loses thereby some 200 Marks. This is alone a tax of 200 Marks a year. Then the English charge us higher prices for their poorer wares than the Germans for their good wares. Again, any man who is able to furnish witnesses can bring charges against another! Though innocent, we are condemned as guilty and must pay heavy fines.”

A number of Germans who were leaving the land, were spoken to as follows by the Elder of a village:

“Tell your countrymen and our former masters to come back soon. We now know who wished us well, and we shall do everything that we are bidden without murmuring. We shall be glad to pay our taxes, if only things would once more be as they were when the Germans were here. For now we receive almost nothing for our crops and we must pay four times as much for everything we need. But we dare not say anything, for the Englishmen have ears everywhere.”

I need make no apology for relating here a touching and significant little incident which occurred on the day when our group of civilian prisoners was transferred from Dahomey to Morocco during the early part of July, 1915. One of the coloured French soldiers, set to guard us, watching his opportunity, addressed me in Ewe — a tongue unknown to his Senegalese comrades:

“I have something for thee.”

"Go into the house," said I, "and hide it under the bed."

It proved to be a small packet, containing 24 francs, and a small scrap of paper upon which these words were written:

"I am a Togo man and live here in Ouidah. I feel sad to see the Germans leave Africa. I have no money to help you — only these 24 francs. I give them to you as a parting gift — and as a sign of my love and gratitude."

The note was signed with the name of the kindly black man. He well knew what we were forced to endure in French captivity, and there can be little doubt that the behaviour of a Venère and of a Castelli had aroused nothing but disgust even in negro circles.

Before the war, ere the admirable little colony which the Germans had conjured forth from the sandy waste, the barren bushland and the sterile coast had aroused the greed and rapacity of British imperialism, there were not wanting, as I have already indicated, many British and American witnesses to the efficient administration and advanced development of Togoland. For example, one might cite the fair and sober testimony of very recent date given in "The New Map of Africa," (1900—1916) by Herbert Adams Gibbons:

"Germany has outstripped other colonizing powers in Africa in four things, all of which are strikingly illustrated in the little colony of Togoland: road-building for co-operation with railways and transport; accommodation for travellers in the interior; scientific forestry and supervision of public health."

The Government organ of Togo of Sept. 27, 1913, contains an official account of that visit of several days of which I have already spoken, paid by Sir Hugh

Clifford to Togoland. As the guest of the Governor the present defamer and besmircher of our model colony displayed no parsimony in his utterances of warm recognition and fervent appreciation.

An English lady, Mrs. Mary Gaunt, who was born and raised in the Australian Bush, and who may therefore be said to have some experience with the various features of colonial life, utters many a glowing tribute to Togoland in her book, "Alone in West Africa." Clifford turns pettishly upon this wholly unprejudiced witness, and seeks to invalidate her words by calling her "a superficial and casual observer." The anger of the good knight may easily be understood, for Mrs. Gaunt had the temerity to draw the deadly parallel and not only indulge in enthusiastic descriptions of the beautiful roads and general prosperity of poor, vilified Togoland, but also to draw several painful comparisons between this German Colony and that of the Gold Coast — for which Sir Hugh Clifford was himself responsible! Responsible perhaps even in his irresponsibility — for among the inhabitants of the Gold Coast it was well-known that the so-called "surprise visits" of the unsuspecting Governor were always preceded a fortnight before they took place by an uncommon activity among the District Commissioners, who would frantically order all the neglected roads to be put in order and force all hands, under penalty of severe fines, to join in the work!

It will prove interesting and illuminating to quote a few passages from the book which so aroused the ire of the Governor and Commander-in-chief of the Gold Coast:

"German territory is the beloved child, planned and cared for and thought much of; English terri-

tory is the foster-child, received into the household because of the profit it will bring, and most of the towns of the Gold Coast shore bear these marks plain for everyone to read. They suffer, and suffer severely from the iniquitous system that is for ever changing those in authority over them in almost every department."

"There was nothing to mark the border between the Gold Coast Colony and Togo. The country on the one side was as the country on the other, orchard-bush country with high grass and clumps of trees and shrubs; the lowering sky was the same, the fierce sun the same, only there was a road at last.

"The Germans make roads as the Romans made them . . . and here, in this remote corner of the earth, where neither Englishman nor German comes, is a road, the like of which I did not find in the Gold Coast Colony. It is hard and smooth as a garden-path, it is broad enough for two carts or two hammocks to pass abreast, it runs straight as a die, on either side the bushes and grass are kept neatly trimmed away, and deep waterways are cut so that the heavy rainfall may not spoil the road.

"After a short time we came to a preventive station, neat and pretty as a station on the Volta, higher praise I cannot give it, and beyond that was a village; a village that was a precursor of all the villages that were to come. As a Briton I write it with the deepest regret, but the difference between an English village and a German village is as the difference between the model village of Edensor and the grimy town of Hanley in the Black Country.

Here, in this first little village on the Togo side, all the ground between the houses was smoothed and swept, the houses themselves looked trim and neat, great, beautiful, spreading shade-trees of the order *ficus elasticus* were planted at regular intervals in the main street, and underneath them were ranged logs, so that the people who lounge away the heat of the day in the shade may have seats. Even the goats and the sheep had a neater look, which perhaps is no wonder, for here is no filthy litter or offal among which they may lie.

“As I passed on my wonder increased. Here was exactly the same country, exactly the same natives, and all the difference between order and neatness and slatternly untidiness.

“And so I went on through country, lovely as the country round Anum mountain, only in the British colony there is this great difference — there the land is exactly as Nature made it, bar the little spoiling that man has done, innocent of roads, and exceedingly difficult to traverse, while here in German territory everything is being carried out on some well-thought-out plan. Ho was a station straggling over hill and valley, with high hills clothed with greenery near at hand, high hills fading into the blue distance, and valleys that cried out to the Creator in glad thankfulness that such beauty should be theirs. The road up to the Commissioner's bungalow was steep, steep as the E veto Range, but it had been graded so that it was easy of ascent as a path in Hyde Park. Every tree had been planted or left standing with thought, not only for its own beauty but for the view that lies beyond ; flamboy-

ant, mango, palm, frangipanni, that the natives call forget-me-not, all have a reason for their existence, all add to the beauty and charm of the scene.

“Palime is the neatest of little towns, set at the foot of some softly rounded hills. Not hills clothed with dense bush such as I had come across farther west, but hills covered with grass, emerald in the brilliant sunshine, with just here and there a tree to give it a park-like appearance. And the town, it is hardly necessary to say, was spotlessly neat and tidy. All the streets were swept and garnished, and all the fences were whole, for if a German puts up a picket fence, he intends it for a permanency, and not for a fuel supply for the nearest huts. That the streets were neat was perhaps a little surprising, for every morning, beginning at dawn, in those streets there was held a market in which all manner of goods, native and European, were exposed for sale, spread out on the ground or on stalls. I looked with interest to see if I could notice any difference between the native under English and under German rule in the markets, and I came to the conclusion that there was none whatever.”

Mrs. Gaunt also requested permission of the German Commissioner to visit the German Sleeping Sickness Hospital, and her opinion of German consideration for the native is somewhat better than Sir Hugh's consideration for the truth.

“I was bent on going on to Mount Klutow, the German Sleeping Sickness Camp, and he said he had never seen it, though it was only a short distance away, so he would get carriers and come with me.

Accordingly we got carriers, paying them three-pence extra because it was Sunday, and went up to Mount Klutow. They were very good carriers, but since I have heard so much about the German's inconsiderateness to the native, I must put it on record that when we came to a steep part of the road, and it was very steep, though a most excellent road, that German not only got out and walked himself, but expected me to do the same. I did, of course, but many and many a time have I made my men carry me over far worse places and many an Englishman have I seen doing likewise.

"Again I must put it on record that these German roads are most excellent. They are smooth and wide, well-rolled and hard, and they are shady, a great boon in such a climate. Every native tree that is suitable has been allowed to stand, and others have been planted, shapely, dark-green mangoes and broad-leaved teak, and since all undergrowth has been cleared away, the road seems winding through a beautiful park, while there is absolutely no mosquito. During all my stay in German territory I never slept under a mosquito curtain, and I never saw that abomination, a mosquito-proof room. The Germans evidently think it is easier to do away with the mosquito.

"Lome is the most charming town I have seen in West Africa. It is neat and tidy and clean, it is beautifully laid out, and the buildings are such as would do credit to any nation. Very evident it is that the German does not consider himself an exile, but counts himself lucky to possess so fine a country, and is bent on making

the best of it. For Lome has certainly been made the very best of. Only fifteen years ago did the Germans move their capital from Little Pope in the east to Lome in the west of their colony, not a great distance, for the whole sea-board is only thirty-five miles in length, and all that length is, I believe, swamp. Lome is almost surrounded by swamp; its very streets are rescued from it, but with German thoroughness those streets are well-laid-out, the roads well-made and well-kept, and are planted with trees, palms, flamboyant and the handsome *ficus elasticus*. Here is a picture of a street in Lome, and the trees are only four years old, but already they stretch across the road and make a pleasant shade. The gardens and the trees of Lome made a great impression on me. Any fences one sees are neat, but as a rule they do not have many fences, only round every bungalow is a well-laid out, well-kept tropical garden; if it is only just made you know it will be good in the future because of the promise fulfilled in the garden beside it.

“All the Government bungalows look like young palaces, and are built to hold two families, the higher-class man having the choice of the flats, and generally taking the upper. Indeed I could find no words to express my admiration for this German capital which compared so very favourably with the English capital I had left but a short time before.

“When I had talked to the Commissioner at Ho about the magnificent roads, I had hinted openly at the forced labour which is talked of so openly in the English colony as being a sin of the Germans. But he denied it.

"How do you make your roads then?" I asked.

"There is a tax of six shillings a head or else a fortnight's labour a year. It is right. If we have no roads how can we have trade?" and I, thinking of the 25 per cent of the cocoa harvest left up the Afram river because "we no be fit to tote," quite agreed...

"Every English village has some sort of tax by which the roads are kept in order, why object if that tax is paid in the most useful sort of kind, namely labour?"

"I can but see that there is something much to be admired in the thorough German methods. Particularly would I commend the manner in which they conserve the trees and preserve the natural beauties of the country. A beauty-spot to them is a beauty-spot, whether it be in the Fatherland or in remote West Africa, while England seems indifferent if the beautiful place be not within the narrow seas. Possible she has no eyes, possibly she is only calm in her self-conceit, certain of her position, while Germany is building — building herself a reputation."

Thus runs the testimony of a keen-eyed, unprejudiced observer, a much-travelled woman of the world, who had every reason to be actuated by the usual patriotic or tribal obsessions which afflict the English mind and which now appear, under the added spur of war-hatred and land-voracity, in so unlovely a guise in the animadversions of Sir Hugh Clifford.

As to the relative value of the evidence contained in the frank, human tribute paid a rival nation in times

of peace by an experienced Englishwoman who had no sordid ends to serve, and the calculated, systematic defamation of an English governor bent in time of war upon aspersing an enemy whose possessions he seeks a motive for annexing — nothing further need be said.

---

---

## THE CASE OF DAGADU.

Having realized the efficacy of the sexual interest in matters propagandistic, Sir Hugh Clifford, taking a leaf out of the manuals of the experts in this art, is not above utilizing the equally effective sentimental appeal for depicting the wickedness of the German. Therefore the old stop "Moral Indignation" is pulled out to the full and the reader edified by an account of the harsh treatment meted out by German law to a noble black, Dagadu, paramount chieftain of Kpandu. The case of Dagadu is to Sir Hugh's booklet what the case of Hendrik Wittbooi was to the notorious Blue Book — and the motive is the same in each.

It is characteristic in this case, as in others that Sir Hugh Clifford does not trouble to base his charges upon an investigation of the facts established in the case (which were all accessible to him) but merely upon the tale told him, as he himself confesses, by Dagadu himself — scarcely an impartial witness! It is therefore small wonder that we are once more treated to a caricature of the truth, sketched in with much vindictiveness.

Clifford seeks to establish a sort of premiss by declaring that the German Colonial Government rigidly excluded the public from its law courts and caused all cases to be heard *in camera*, when formal trial was not altogether dispensed with. This is a blow full in the face of Truth. It is impossible to assume that the Governor of a neighbouring colony did not actually know what was known to every white and

every black man in Togoland — namely, that the palavers of the Germans always took place in public and were open to all who cared to attend them.

Dagadu was a vain and very ambitious fellow, and incidentally the one chieftain in all Togo with whom the Germans, after the final occupation of the land, had considerable difficulty. He was unable to reconcile himself to the fact that the days of his unfettered and despotic rule were over. He was therefore hostile to the German Government. For a considerable time he managed to conceal this under a mask of loyalty and faithfulness, but he was unable to keep up this pretext and in good time his real attitude revealed itself.

It may prove illuminating, so far as his personal disposition is concerned, to refer to an incident which occurred when Dagadu assumed the dignity of the chieftainship. A spokesman of the paramount chieftain of Gbedshigbe who was sent to the ceremony to bear a message of condolence over the death of Dagadu's predecessor, was ordered to be murdered by Dagadu — according to an ancient savage rite, in order that the victim might accompany the dead chief to his grave. The atrocious deed was concealed from the Government in the most cunning fashion. It was only after the expiration of one or two years that this murder came to light. Since Dagadu confessed to the deed and as due account was paid to the influence of the old custom of the tribe, he escaped with a prison sentence.

During recent years Dagadu began in an ever-growing measure to infuse fear not only in the whites but also the blacks. The missionaries resident at Kpandu recognized in him an enemy of the whites

and warned people against him. The Government therefore felt itself compelled to warn him against continuing his refractory behaviour and his machinations against the German administration. Despite these warnings he took advantage of the sulkiness which had been created among the natives through the measures made necessary for combating the sleeping sickness, to assume the leadership of the dissatisfied elements and to arrange meetings in which rebellion against the Government was fomented.

In order to further his very transparent purpose, Clifford ventures the wholly unproved statement that sleeping sickness attained to no very alarming proportions in Togo, as the bulk of the native population is immune. The measures taken by the German Government the reader may therefore (by connotation) assume to have been more or less unnecessary — mere bureaucratic fussiness as it were, to plague and pester the unhappy black.

One may assume, after all, that the judgment of the German Government and its experts would be more authoritative than that of Sir Hugh, and both Government and medical men realized that the sleeping sickness constituted a great danger for the population of Togoland and therefore regarded it as their duty to combat the spread of the disease by every means in their power. It was, of course, to be expected that the ignorant natives would not at first realize the significance nor the value of the measures undertaken for their protection. For this reason, if for no other (such as German thoroughness, or the desire of making the venture a success through native co-operation), *the Germans would naturally have done their utmost to enlighten the natives as to the necessity of*

*submitting to these hygienic measures.* But here too the diligent disparager of German colonial methods cannot avoid discharging a poisoned dart from his blowpipe.

"No effort," he writes, "appears to have been made to explain to the natives, or even to their chief, the scientific and philanthropical objects which the Germans had in view. It is not in accordance with German ideas of dignity to condescend to such a course."

It may be useless, or at least unedifying to seek to characterize in fit terms that peculiar malignity of mind which would seek to slander a political enemy *precisely there where his actions and his motives are eminently benevolent and humane.*

Sir Hugh Clifford might easily have ascertained the truth, had it been his wish to ascertain it, by making inquiries of Dr. von der Hellen, the leading physician entrusted with the combating of the sleeping sickness in Togoland, for this gentleman remained there until 1917. He might then have learned how great and persistent were the efforts made by the German doctors and district commissioners to enlighten the natives in everything that concerned the fatal disease. But after all, even such an inquiry would have been unnecessary, for during the course of his visit to Togoland in September, 1913 *Clifford himself*, in company with his government physician Dr. Le Fanu, made a personal inspection of the German sleeping sickness camp on Kluto Mountain and was thus informed of all the features and details of the campaign against the scourge.

Dagadu complained to the Governor at Lome, preserving, however, the attitude of a perfectly loyal subject. During this visit to Lome, he sought to achieve his purpose by falsely declaring that perfectly

healthy persons had been taken to the camp on Kluto Hill. After this point had been fully cleared up during a second meeting with the Governor at Misahöhe, and an assembly of native chieftains had once more been thoroughly enlightened as to the necessity of combatting the sleeping sickness and the measures taken to this end, the chiefs assumed a very threatening air.

It was only afterwards that the District Commissioner Dr. Hans Gruner learned of the secret meetings and the treasonable machinations inspired by Dagadu. It had been agreed between him and his followers that if their request for a suspension of the sanitary measures by the Government should prove unsuccessful, they should oppose them by force as soon as opportunity offered. After due consideration, the colonial administration came to the conclusion that the peace of the land could be maintained in the future only if the moving spirit of disaffection, that is to say, Dagadu himself, were put under control.

About the same time the District Commissioner Dr. Gruner received from the Governor two letters with the request that they be investigated. These letters had been directed to the Reichstag and the Foreign Office in Berlin, and bristled with slanderous charges against the Government of Togoland. They were signed by Dagadu's native "counsel" for Togo at Koforodua in the Gold Coast colony, on behalf of Dagadu. It was urgently necessary that careful investigation be made concerning these calumnies. Dagadu was taken into custody and his house as well as that of his letter-writer were searched. During the first house-searching at Kpandu, Dagadu was told of the charges against him and his statements were taken down in a protocol. His assertion — and Clifford's — to the

effect that he had been arrested without a hearing and without knowing the nature of the charge against him, is therefore false. The examination and the large number of confiscated papers (which were chiefly written in Ewe and partly in Tshi) consumed considerable time, during which Dagadu remained in custody.

The investigation of the documents resulted not only in revealing the fact that the "consul" in Koforodua was a son of Dagadu's who had fled to the Gold Coast because of defalcation (previous to this he had been in gaol at Misahöhe for burglary) and who had made use of a friend to write the letters so that his own culpability might be concealed, but the papers also established the highly-treasonable attitude of Dagadu himself as well as explaining many a lawless action on his part.

The sentence which was proposed by the District Commissioner who conducted the examination and which was submitted to the Governor for his approval, was: Banishment for threatening a breach of the public peace. The natural excitement of the inhabitants with respect to the measures necessary for combatting the sleeping sickness, measures which must have appeared unreasonable and rigorous to them, were taken into consideration as extenuating circumstances.

When the confirmation of the judgment came from Lome, it chanced that the District Commissioner Gruner was upon a tour of inspection and therefore not able to announce to Dagadu the judgment and the reasons upon which it was based.

In order that Dagadu might be put aboard the steamer bound for Duala, his place of banishment, it was necessary to take him away from Misahöhe before District Commissioner Gruner returned.

Whatever accidental omissions of formalities there may have been in the case of Dagadu, they cannot be imputed to any tyrannical desire on the part of the Togo Government to suppress him by any illegality of procedure. On the contrary, what ensued may be said to constitute incontrovertible proof of the considerate attitude towards this troublesome and seditious chieftain.

Towards the close of 1913 Chief Dagadu stabbed to death at Duala a fellow-prisoner with whom he had quarrelled. It would have been proper and certainly expedient to sentence him to death for this crime. Nevertheless, the Governor of the Cameroons made inquiries at Lome as to whether Dagadu was entirely sound of mind, and whether he was therefore to be held to strict accountability for his deed. The authorities of Togo, however, were disposed to give the chieftain the benefit of the doubt, and so Dagadu escaped his well-merited punishment. It is not likely that Dagadu gave any account of this part of his career to the Governor of the Gold Coast — or did Sir Hugh Clifford simply suppress uncomfortable facts which did not fit into the picture of Dagadu's innocence and German oppression which it suited his purpose to draw?

When we consider English procedure in similar cases, not as in this, concerned with the measures against a rebellious negro chief in the wilds, but with the action taken against highly-cultivated Irish and Indian patriots in civilized communities, we can only marvel once more at those astounding traits in the English mind which are so imperfectly and inadequately stigmatized as "arrogance" and "hypocrisy." The wholesale arrests, incarcerations, deportations and

executions of Irish and Indian leaders during the war — such brutal murders as that of the gifted Sheehy Skeffington and the shooting of wounded Irish poets and patriots after the uprising in Dublin, once more prove how black with crime and red with bloodshed is that hand which is now raised piously to Heaven in horror at the infamy of the "Hun."

"In the foregoing examination of the German colonial administrative system," Clifford writes, "the concrete examples quoted have, as far as possible, been taken exclusively from the records in Togoland. This course has been followed of set purpose, because Togoland was at once the most peaceful and the most prosperous of the German colonies in Africa....." (here follows a slander lightly hurled *en passant*, with which I shall deal anon). "In Togoland it is possible to watch the German system of colonial administration working at its best and amid the most favourable circumstances."

If there can be such a thing as magnanimous malignity, then to Sir Hugh Clifford, by his own confession, must the prize for this remarkable quality be given. He deliberately chose, he avers ("of set purpose") the model colony of Togoland as the object of his charges and recriminations, *because here in this colony there was less occasion for these than in any other*. His charges, as we have seen, have been neither few nor light for want of occasion for making them — the occasion, of course, always being duly supplied by the diligent propagandist himself. But what is to be said of the censor who, intent on blackening or exposing the character of an enemy, chooses to assail and asperse him where he is least open to reproach, leaving his presumptive greater crimes or vices unmentioned and uncens-

ured? These surely were tactics unworthy of even a tyro propagandist. Or does this furtive thought enter the calculation of the defamer: by attacking the best, I pronounce at the same time a judgment upon the worst? It is possible that some such thought entered Sir Hugh Clifford's mind — I do not know. But it is obvious that he chose Togoland for his onslaughts — not because it was the most model of German colonies — but simply because it was to him, as a neighbouring colony, somewhat less unfamiliar than other German colonies. Therefore we must deny him on the score of his convenience, the laurels of magnanimity with which he would complacently crown himself.

The virulent knight hurls, as I have already indicated in the foregoing, another poisonous javelin in the shape of an atrocious accusation — so atrocious in fact, that were it really true it could be exceeded in iniquity only by such an incident as the Massacre of Glencoe in which Englishmen's hands were embrued with the blood of an entire Scottish clan — their kindly and unsuspecting hosts. Clifford accuses the Germans of having instituted a massacre of Konkombi tribesmen at Yendi in northern Togoland — "the men and women, on that occasion being lured to the administrative headquarters of their district by friendly representations and then treacherously surrounded and shot down."

In all the course of my long period of service in Togoland, I have never heard anything of such a "massacre." No colonial German with whom I have spoken had ever heard even the slightest whisper of such an affair. District Commissioner Hermann Kersting, who saw much service in Togoland, declares that fights with the Dagonola-Konkomba took place near Adibo-Yendi

in 1896, and Messrs. Gruner, Thierry, Mellin and von Seefried had various skirmishes with these warlike seminomads. These tribesmen frequently killed or wounded the native outposts who were established in those districts for the preservation of law and order.

“Not even any occasion which could give rise to such a legend is known to me,” writes Dr. Hans Gruner. “I would nevertheless state that, had it even the slightest foundation in truth, I would certainly have heard of such an occurrence, for I had men from Basari and Mangu in my service for a long time. And I might remark that the Yendi people were accustomed to tell me the most fabulous yarns — equalled only by the Hausas and the Mangu men.”

Had there been any foundation for this story, or even rumours of it, they would assuredly have reached the ear of the Governor.

Can it be possible that another Governor of an African colony should be so little acquainted with the soul of the African as to permit himself to become a vessel for the reception and propagation of these wild and fantastic imaginings? It is deplorable for the honour of a great nation that such unclean weapons should be wielded on no better authority than negro prattle, in a matter that concerns the honour of another great nation, — and that extravagant atrocity lies under the impulse of a noxious “patriotism,” should be injected like some virus into the world to poison the minds of men.

---

---

## CONCLUSION.

One glance at the "Table of Contents" of Sir Hugh Clifford's booklet suffices to reveal the grossly partisan nature of the author, his extravagant prostration before the joss of national megalomania and conceit — his rancorous and reckless abuse of all things German. "Grasping Germany," "German Brutality," "German Tyranny," "Despotic Rule," "German Savagery," "German Crimes," "Germans not white men," are a few of the grotesque and witless phrases, monotonously reiterated throughout the mere headings of this thin flat book of large fat calumnies. It was begotten of hatred, and covetousness, and the child does not belie its parents. Its worthlessness as evidence is established not only by what its author says and his manner of saying it, but by what he purposely ignores. For if his conception of patriotism will not permit him to see or acknowledge the crimes and shortcomings of colonizing England, he must surely be aware of the crimes and shortcomings of colonizing France<sup>1</sup> and Belgium — compared to which all German sins of commission or omission pale into insignificance. But are the voice and the hands of Sir Hugh Clifford raised or the whites of his eyes turned to Heaven to adjure the world to deprive these incapable and tyrannical countries of their colonies — and entrust

---

<sup>1</sup> See "How Natives are Treated in German Colonies — and in French," A Reply to the "*Journal officiel de la République Française*." Published by Dietrich Reimer, Berlin, SW. 48.

them to England? No! — once more “expediency” forbids.

The only reference to the unspeakable horrors of the Belgian Congo is a sneer at that noble humanitarian, Sir Roger Casement, who was instrumental in exposing not only these but also the British abominations along the Putumayo — Casement who was *not* an *English* but solely and wholly an *Irish* patriot and whose brutal judicial murder will evoke the execration of generations to come. Another sneer is levelled at the well-known English publicist, E. D. Morel, whose fearless, self-sacrificial defence of truth and justice brought him to a prison-cell at the order of a government which could not bear to hear, nor permit its subjects to hear, either.

“German Colonies,” according to its author’s belief, should be written “British Colonies.” *That and that alone is the end and purport of his book.* “A Plea for the Native Races” means nothing else than a plea for England’s annexation of the possessions of the German people. It is a plea for the perpetration of an act of cold-blooded, shameless robbery — for the infliction of a gigantic, unpardonable wrong *against* that people which stands in greatest need of colonial land, *by* that people which is already overburdened with it.

We know that there is no desire among the common people of England to rob the German Republic of its sorely-needed colonies. But let them see to it that their blind imperialists, incapable of reading a single sign of the times, make no mistake. Germany, though bleeding at present from untold wounds, though torn by inward dissension and the tremendous battle between opposed systems and philosophies, and exhausted

by her superhuman struggles, the inhuman starvation blockade and the monstrous terms of the armistice — *Germany and Germany's children would never forget nor forgive this crime.*

Despite his "set purpose" of confining his attentions to Togoland, Sir Hugh Clifford became convinced of the necessity of attacking the other German colonies as well — since upon each and all of these, British politicians, profiteers and militarists had cast avid eyes. Therefore, with much innuendo and *suggestio falsi* he warms up and serves up the old atrocity stories concerning the Hereros and the Damara Hottentots in South-west Africa. All these charges and calumnies have been answered in detail in the German reply to the English Blue Book — to which reply the reader is referred.<sup>1</sup> Clifford's onslaught upon East Africa and the Cameroons is made under cover of another man's name, and the argument, — such as it is with its false and absolutely unsubstantiated premises, — may be summarized in this: that the Germans are unfit to administer these colonies, because there were "frequent" native revolts.

It would be fruitless and tedious to disprove or disentangle point for point the invidious and indefinite calumnies of so hopelessly prejudiced and unfair an antagonist as this British governor, who asperses his opponents for so transparent and sordid an end. But once more we have at our disposal one of those facts relating to British rule in British colonies which suffices in itself to annihilate the vague and dishonest

---

<sup>1</sup> The Treatment of Native and Other Populations in the Colonial Possessions of Germany and England. 1919. Haen Robert Engelmann, Bookseller, Berlin, W. 15.

generalities of our accuser and to shatter the moral basis upon which he would build up his indictments. I shall omit any reference to the terrible and unintermittent revolts in French colonies<sup>1</sup> during the war, the uprisings of tortured native populations against the ferocious French policy of wholesale conscription of natives for cannon-fodder, and confine myself to a single recent and most significant *British* instance.

"German rule in the colonies," our dispassionate critic declares, "never stood, broad-based upon a people's will" — like (to be sure) the British. Yet so recently as the second half of 1918, there occurred a widespread revolt of over 30000 Egba tribesmen in Nigeria — a revolt which was suppressed by the English with all their customary ruthlessness — and at the cost of over 700 native lives. The contrast is illuminating. In the German protectorates we find the majority of the natives openly or secretly loyal to German rule — we need only think of the loud lamentations of the native population when General von Lettow-Vorbeck and the East African Germans left the colony — in British Africa we have such bloody revolts as that of the Egba tribe — "broad-based upon a people's will." And yet in the face of such glaring facts as these, this unscrupulous attorney for annexation ventures to assert that the German system had not maintained itself!

I have been in Togoland ever since 1893. We had brought order to the land, placed it under our control and administered it with scarcely a struggle worthy the name. But during this same interval, despite

---

<sup>1</sup> See "France's Black Militarism," Published by Dietrich Reimer, Berlin SW. 48.

her infinitely longer colonial experience, England in addition to constant uprisings, skirmishes, "little wars," riots and disturbances in almost every part of her colonies, was forced to carry on two sanguinary campaigns against the Ashantis along the Gold Coast — in 1896 and in 1900. Were these revolts and the remorseless measures taken for their suppression signs of an administration "broad-based upon a people's will?" Are they convincing testimony to the success of that British system which this British apologist and eulogist does not weary of extolling?

The world has seen to what this system leads, not merely in the negro colonies of Africa, but far more conspicuously in the unfathomable misery, poverty, illiteracy and degradation of the dispossessed and exploited millions of India and Egypt — not to speak of the 700 years of torture, extermination, robbery and starvation inflicted, not upon the "lesser breeds without the law," but upon the loveable and unfortunate Irish people who are now engaged in an heroic struggle to free themselves from the vampire clutches of that land whose chief concern, according to Sir Hugh Clifford, is for government based upon the will of the people!

At the very moment in which I am writing, Reuter is tentatively permitting brief, fragmentary and strictly censored rumours of sanguinary riots and armed insurrections in Egypt and India to leak out into a world which, after all, cannot be hoodwinked forever. British officials have been murdered, banks sacked and burned; death and havoc are stalking through Bombay, Lahore and Amritsar, through Ahmedabad, Cayeranvalla and other Indian districts. British troops are being killed in the streets of Cairo, Alexandria and Cesubrah

by the infuriated Egyptian populace, long down-trodden and driven at last beyond the limits of endurance. Malta is seething with revolt, and seven Irish districts have proclaimed the general strike. Truly a magnificent testimonial to the affection in which British rule is held by the British-ruled!

It does not lie in the nature of Germans to follow Cliffordian tactics and indiscriminately condemn all that another nation has accomplished in the field of colonization. There where England's methods deserved praise and often where they did not deserve it, German tributes have not been few nor lacking in warmth. But by things such as the foregoing we, or rather the world (since, unlike our English censors, we do not arrogate to ourselves the rôle of judges) shall judge the efficacy of British rule — and the competence of our judges — as well as the motives that inspire them.

These motives are penetrated by all honourable, clear-thinking Englishmen themselves who cannot but repudiate the rapacious policies of their annexationist cliques. These short-sighted policies are surely also repudiated by those Englishmen who may honestly believe in the hideous caricature of former German colonial administration presented to them by their propagandists, but who nevertheless realize the iniquity and folly of attempting to exclude the seventy million citizens of the new German Republic from participation in the common task of developing and civilizing Africa.

The motives of the British annexationists are also clearly understood by all the neutral nations of Europe who have scornfully torn aside the rags of moral pretext under which the imperialist profiteers of the war would filch from the German People the few scanty and indispensable colonies which their industry, their

enterprise and their resources have built up. Sir Hugh Clifford and those who think as he does might profit their souls by a survey of the opinion of honestly neutral journals in this matter. *For the judgment which they deliver is a forecast of that of history.*

I have before me, for example, a cutting from a liberal Spanish newspaper, *El Dia*, which has always been friendly to the Entente. Under date of December 12, 1918, this journal writes:

“Mr. Long, the British Colonial Secretary, told the truth in so far as he declared that England had actually put the question to the natives (as to whether they wished to remain under English protection or to return to German protection). But the answer turned out quite different from what Mr. Long asserts it to have been (namely, that the male inhabitants who had been asked, decided to remain under English rule). For the answer these inhabitants made clearly indicated that they would all prefer to continue to live under German protection!...

“But all who are familiar with the egoistic character of the African, and his inclination to treachery — as we have sufficiently learned to our cost in Morocco and other parts of Africa — know how easy it is to egg on the unscrupulous natives against Germany — and how quickly disposed they are to forget all the benefits they have received at German hands. Fair-minded men know all too well that the natives in the Cameroons and in the neighbourhood of our own possessions on the Gulf of Guinea would simply have gone to ruin had not the Germans brought order and civilization to them.”

The ghastly and impudent farce of a negro plebiscite which England has attempted to stage-manage in the German colonies is an insult to the intelligence of the world. It is a corrupt travesty of the most elementary justice and reason so long as *she*, the arch-oppressor of native races of every colour and in every clime, does not apply her own medicine to her own negro populations — not to speak (as humanity shall henceforward be continually forced to speak until freedom be theirs) of Ireland, India and Egypt.

All human institutions are imperfect, even, — maugre Sir Hugh Clifford, — those of the British empire. It has not, I repeat, been the habit of Germans as individuals or as a nation to sit in judgment upon the methods and actions of other peoples. But where our own institutions are unjustly assailed by those who have sinned infinitely more than ourselves in the very things of which they accuse us — there we shall not fail to return a fitting, and when necessary, as in this instance, a scornful, answer.

We know, and history affirms the fact, that the British system of colonial acquisition and colonial exploitation (even if it were not once more so incontrovertibly proved by the proposed robbery of German soil), is based upon a imperialistic policy of greed, conquest and expropriation — a system which this war has discredited and annulled forever and to which only the most incurable adherents of "Might before Right" still adhere — the men to whom the whole tragic war has been, not a terrible and luminous warning, but merely an opportunity for preying upon the possessions of other peoples.

Nor can I find words more suitable to define and condemn that policy and that system than those

which are supplied me by Sir Hugh Clifford himself — a policy and a system “untempered by any of the principles of a higher morality, untouched by human sympathy, and inspired throughout by a brutal selfishness which can bring nothing save misery to those to whose affairs it is applied and disappointment to the men who invent and apply it.”







## NEW BOOKS ON THE COLONIAL QUESTION

Published by Dietrich Reimer (Ernst Vohsen)

29 Wilhelm Strasse, Berlin SW 48

# HOW NATIVES ARE TREATED IN GERMAN AND IN FRENCH COLONIES

A Reply to the Statements Published in the "Journal Officiel de la République Française" of November 8, 1918 and January 5, 1919

Compiled by the German Colonial Office

This work is a clear and detailed repudiation of the reckless and unsubstantiated charges which have been levelled against German colonial methods by the French in their efforts to establish a pretext for the annexation of the property of the German People.

It refutes point for point the baseless slanders which the French have uttered against the administration of the German colonies, and quotes French testimonials to German colonial efficiency. It exposes the inwardness of the French colonial system, the curse of forcible conscription which it has imposed on helpless subject peoples, the depopulation of the colonies through war, the bloody riots resulting from oppression, the evils of the alcoholization, exploitation and prostitution of the natives, the treatment of coloured troops in the colonies and in Europe, the atrocities perpetrated in the French Congo, etc.

The book is compiled by well-known colonial authorities and is based chiefly upon *French sources of information*. Its disclosures deprive France of every vestige of right to appoint herself a judge of German colonial methods and arraign her before the bar of public opinion upon the very charges she had preferred against Germany.

## FRANCE'S BLACK MILITARISM

SIDELIGHTS ON THE FRENCH COLONIAL SYSTEM

BY

A J A X

The author, a well-known publicist, concentrates his attention upon the great menace to peace and the supremacy of the white race which is embodied in France's system of ruthless militarization of her coloured subjects. This brilliant and interesting little work throws a clear and merciless light upon conditions in all French colonies during the war. It reveals the cruel system of enforced drafts, the constant revolts of tortured and betrayed native peoples, doomed by the hundred thousand to serve as cannon-fodder, and the brutal military measures taken to suppress these uprisings.

The whole is a calm, terrible and irrefutable indictment of France's inhumanity and her violation of her duties to the natives. Its facts and figures are based almost entirely upon French sources and are absolutely authentic.