

University of Richmond

## UR Scholarship Repository

---

Honors Theses

Student Research

---

1924

### From Cape Town to Cairo

Leslie L. Jones

*University of Richmond*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.richmond.edu/honors-theses>



Part of the [History Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Jones, Leslie L., "From Cape Town to Cairo" (1924). *Honors Theses*. 601.

<https://scholarship.richmond.edu/honors-theses/601>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact [scholarshipprepository@richmond.edu](mailto:scholarshipprepository@richmond.edu).

UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND LIBRARIES



3 3082 01029 0012

FROM

CAPE TOWN

TO

CAIRO

## C O N T E N T S

Bibliography	2
Introduction	4
The Starting Point : Cape Colony	9
Natal and Basutoland	11
Egypt : The Keystone	13
Somaliland, Nigeria, Bechuanaland	15
Rhodesia : and The South Africa Co.	19
British Central Africa	22
The Anglo-Egyptian Soudan	24
Transvaal and The Orange Free State	26
German East Africa : The Last Link	27

## B I B L I O G R A P H Y

SOURCES:

- Anderson, C. J.      Explorations and Discoveries during Four Years  
Wanderings in the Wilds of Southwest Africa.
- \*Cromer, Lord      Modern Egypt.
- Johnston, Sir H.H.    The Opening Up of Africa.
- \*Jourdain, Philip    Cecil John Rhodes.
- Livingstone, David    Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa.
- \*      Last Journals.
- Narrative of an Expedition to the Zambesi.
- \*Stanley, H. M.      In Darkest Africa.      Autobiography.
- \*Williams, Basil      Cecil Rhodes.

LATER WRITINGS:

- \*Bowman, Isaiah      The New World.
- Cambridge Modern History, Vol. XII.
- \*Dilke, Sir C.W.      Problems of Greater Britain.
- \*Gibbons, Herbert A    The New Map of Africa.
- \*Hayes, J. H.      Political and Social History of Modern Europe.
- Hazen, Chas. D.      Fifty Years of Europe.
- Europe Since 1815.
- Low and Sanders      The Political History of England.
- Monypenny & Buckle    The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield.
- \*Morris, Henry C      The History of Colonization.
- Mowat, R. B.      A History of European Diplomacy.

- \*Robinson and Howard, The Developement of The British Empire.
- Schapiro, J. L. Modern and Contemporary European History.
- Schevill, Ferdinand, Political History of Modern Europe.
- Scott, Jas. B. Autonomy and Dederation Within Empire.
- \*Seeley, J. R. The Expansion of England.
- Trevelyan, G. M. British History in the Nineteenth Century.
- Woodward, Wm, H. A Short History of The Expansion of The British Empire.
- \*Woolf, Leonard Economic Imperialism.
- Grunzel, Josef Economic Protectionism.
- Viallate, A. Economic Imperialism and International Relations during the last Fifty Years.

The above bibliography covers only those books which may be obtained in the University Library and the Library of The State of Virginia, and which have been consulted by the writer in the preparation of this paper. Those marked with an asterisk have been of especial interest and value.

## I N T R O D U C T I O N

Cecil Rhodes has been dead twenty-two years. The flesh of the man has long since become dust; his dreams are about to become realities . . . two slender streaks of shining steel from Cape Town to Cairo. For the red now cleaves the heart of Africa, north and south, from the Inner Sea to The Cape of Good Hope. A great splash of red up and down this vast continent where fifty years ago but little red was to be seen.

And this is the simple task I have set myself in the present paper: accounting for the red, this astonishing growth of the red. It will be no profound discussion, will this little paper, of causes and effects; of the factors, innumerable and inexplicable, which gave rise to the British Empire; of those desires and beliefs of men which have resolved themselves into the phenomenon we imperfectly designate as "Economic Imperialism". These esoteric matters must be left, for the present, to gentlemen who possess more leisure and a greater faculty for analysis than I. An undergraduate, at best, can touch but lightly any of the intriguing subjects which constantly confront a student of History. And this business of surveying the British red has proved not only intriguing, but tremendously instructive.

What, then, have I gotten out of this survey? If nothing else, I have made the acquaintance of Cecil Rhodes; no small gain, this, and well worth all the time and labor put forth. Gain, that is, both in the way of pleasure and inspiration. The "Life" by Basil Williams held me like a tale from The Arabian Nights: I read it greedily. The recollections of Philip Jourdan, private secretary to Rhodes, was scarcely of less interest. . . . Then there were the enthralling tales of Henry M. Stanley, no ordinary man, this. His personality so gripped me that I shortly found myself delving about in his early life, reading that amazingly vivid account of Shiloh. . . . With David Livingstone I renewed acquaintance, reading once more, that Last Journal, and of his lonely death in the heart of the Dark Continent. . . . Then I discovered Lord Cromer, in his "Modern Egypt"; and Herbert Gibbons', "New Map of Africa" has given me a glimpse of present day happenings in the lands covered by red.

My greatest returns, however, from this pursuit of the creeping scarlet line, have been due, perhaps, to that thin, thought-provoking volume of Leonard S. Woolf, "Economic Imperialism". Although I do not agree with all the conclusions therein set forth, it must be admitted that another hundred pages so crammed with matter conducive of thinking is no easy thing to find. Mr. Woolf prepares a splendid brief against "Economic Imperialism". In fact, a terrific indictment. How-

ever, in a world of so many uncertainties, there is at least one thing scarcely admitting of discussion. This is, that all questions may be argued, successfully, from both sides. And so with Mr Woolf's little monograph. Pungent, virile, forceful as it is, it reveals to my admittedly unpractised eye various weak spots, and several times I have been tempted to take up the cudgels in behalf of this, I fear, rather over-lambasted Economic Imperialism. It seems to be the fashion, nowadays, to identify this recent developement with the Beast of the Apocalypse,, and all discussion of the matter which I have been able to obtain, both written and oral, appear to imply a great measure of odium to the term itself. And yet I am certain that much can be said upon the other side, that nobler motives, for instance, can be found behind Economic Imperialism than Mr Woolf is willing to grant. At any rate it could at least be shown that the world being still controlled by the species Man, it is scarcely fair to expect too much of any developement coming out of the desires and beliefs of men. Especially of men in their present stage of unfoldment. This, I realize, is a somewhat fatalistic view of history, against which Mr Woolf, by the way, warns us. A view, however, for which there is much to be said.

I should like to attempt a refutation of some of Mr Woolf's conclusions . . . audacious as this may seem in an undergraduate mind . . . but such a task would require a great deal more of




time and energy than I can at present summon up. Also, I had assembled the greater portion of my material for this paper before I began to perceive the loop-holes in the gentleman's argument. My first reading of "Economic Imperialism" left me rather impressed with the damning array of charges drawn up by Mr Woolf. As my acquaintance with the subject of British possessions in Africa widened, I plucked up sufficient courage to doubt the infallibility of the anti-imperialistic arguments, so adroitly presented by the author of this little red book.

Perhaps, during the past month, I have become too saturated, as it were, with the reading of Cecil Rhodes, and can so see something else than evil in this "desire to sell in the highest markets and buy in the cheapest"; this being the bedrock of European civilization, according to Mr Woolf, and the chief cause of "Economic Imperialism". Or possibly the desire, inherent in all literate persons, to inspect both sides of the question has stimulated in me the impulse to dig up a few pro-imperialistic arguments. This in default of finding any ready prepared at hand . . . at any rate none so ably presented as the opposite arguments of Mr Woolf. But this must wait. At present I can only produce the results of an attempt to trace the growth of Britain upon the continent of Africa. And these efforts, though contributing nothing of unusual value to the subject, have, at least, made clear to me some of the influences which caused a nation hostile to the "imperial" idea, to ac-

quire in the space of half a century the vast tracts of territory now covered by the red in the maps below. These maps, wherein I have endeavored to present graphically the slow, but constant advance of the Cape to Cairo route, are self-explanatory. The new annexations are shown as of the date upon which official recognition of the fact was made.

Leslie L. Jones.

Richmond College,  
University of Richmond,  
May 1, 1924.



1 8 1 5


CAPE COLONY : Ceded by Holland in 1814.

## THE STARTING POINT : CAPE COLONY.

The year 1815 makes a good point of departure. Here we see the British possessions in Africa as of this momentous date: a few settlements on the West Coast, and Cape Town. The Gold Coast and Sierra Leone, together with the trading posts among the Ashanti and along the Nigeria need not engage our attention. They possess little significance with regard to the development of the British Empire in East Africa, other than to furnish additional evidence of the reluctance with which the London Government and the British people embarked upon colonial ventures in the early Nineteenth Century. Sierra Leone was founded by a philanthropic company as a home for freed negroes and outcasts. The crown, with its usual reluctance, took over the rights of the Company in 1807. The Gold Coast was settled as early as 1661 by British merchants, suffered at the hands of the Dutch, and by the abolition of the slave trade. The crown took over the forts in 1821, and then quit the country cold in 1828. The merchants, however, with help from a subsidy, held on for some years longer, until finally the Colonial Office took charge in 1843. These earlier settlements all give the same impression: the tremendous distaste of the Home Government for colonial expansion. And this, with good measure of reason, as these far-flung possessions were chiefly white elephants upon the tax-payer's purse.

Cape Colony, however, was different. It is true that it was a dead expense for many years, but, at the same time, it was on the route to India. A convenient port on the route to India, and an essential. So that, when the Ogre of Corsica started upon his European rampage, a British fleet sailed into Cape Town and made the place good for the Prince of Orange, its nominal lord. With the Peace of Amiens Cape Town went to the Batavian Republic, but when later happenings placed the Dutch in the ranks of England's enemies, another British fleet sailed into Cape Town and again made the town good. This time for England. And England has it today. Holland ceded it officially in 1814.

Here then begins the racial and nationalistic conflicts which caused the British red to gradually expand despite the the conservative howls of the folks back home. For the ideals of humanitarian England began to clash with the interest of the old Dutch settlers, especially in regard to the matter of slavery. So that the irreconcilables packed up their effects and trekked north into the veld. And over and over, throughout the Nineteenth Century, the same business repeats itself. The Boers spread out into new country, inevitably come into bitter conflict with the natives, and inevitably draw the cautious, at that time decidedly non-imperialistic government, into the affair. Now it is the Boers who conquer, and the oppressed natives raise such a shout for protection by the Queen, that the British red reluctantly extends. Reluctantly, although there is really no way out of it.



NATAL : Occupied. Proclaimed a colony in 1844.

BASUTOLAND : Annexed by proclamation 1868.

There is some sentiment and sympathy for the natives, it is true, but it will by no means do to let the Boers get an outlet to the sea. On the other hand, when the Zulus were upon the point of annihilating the Boers, it was Tommy Atkins who must needs step in and call a halt. Thus it went, and the next two additions to British South Africa present splendid examples of this constant trek of Boer, native war, Imperial intervention, and expansion of the red.

#### NATAL AND BASUTOLAND.


Adventurers it was who first claimed Natal for England. On August 27, 1824, Francis George Farewell declared it British territory. And that was all. The Home Government remained as silent as the proverbial clam. So the Boers, as usual, had to stir them to action. In the great trek of 1837, these freedom loving Dutchmen -- a great number of them -- found their way into Natal. They soon overran the country. The cries of the British were unheard in London, but Sir George Napier, Governor of the Cape, sensed the danger and sent troops, not to erect a colony and thrust it upon the home folks, but to prevent the erection of a Boer Republic upon the coast. The troops left in one year. Conflict broke out, the Boers gained the upper hand, and crushed the natives. In 1840 they demanded recognition of the "Republic of Natalia", and found out that, in spite of their strenuous trek-

king there were still subjects of the Queen. Napier consented to the forming of a British Colony, which was proclaimed in 1843. A year later it was joined to Cape Colony ( although later made into a Crown Colony ) and the Boers once again set forth upon their wanderings. Across the Vaal they trekked and into the country soon known as the Orange Free State and Transvaal Republics.

The annexation of Basutoland was a natural consequence of this trek. There had been constant disputes and conflict between the Boers and natives ever since 1837, the one stealing land, the other cattle. The Boers, however, were getting the better end of the bargain, and after forbidding further encroachments upon the Natives, Napier finally executed a treaty with the tribes establishing a British protectorate over Basutoland. This in 1843. In 1854 there was more strife between the tribes and the independant Orange Free State, just liberated by England. In 1865 the natives appealed for protection from the encroachments and oppression of their Boer neighbors, and after the usual delay at home, Basutoland was formally annexed in March 1868. In 1871 it became a part of Cape Colony, an unsatisfactory arrangement which led to it becoming a Crown Colony in 1884.

And so we reach 1870, another significant date. Here is drawn, by some, the first beginnings of this so-called "Economic Imperialism" which led to the great African scramble. Also the interior was being opened, Germany and Italy casting about for





1 8 8 2

EGYPT : Becomes a possession in all but name.

places in the sun -- the pleasant, smiling sun of rich colonial possessions -- and the notion that such possessions were necessary to maintain the prestige and economic welfare of a first class power was growing daily more powerful. The Home Government was losing, somewhat, its reluctance to extend the red across unexplored and unexploited countries. The old policy of "blundering" into colonies was giving away to a more consciously prepared program of colonial expansion. And so, as the new era opened, the southern terminal ~~route~~ of the Cape to Cairo route was thus firmly in the hands of Britain, and the kind gods who look after the fortunes of the Island Empire, shortly put into her ample hands the other end of the line . . . Egypt.

#### E G Y P T : THE KEYSTONE.

India and France. These were the factors that caused the land of the Pharaohs to turn red upon the map. France constructed the Suez Canal . . . French engineers and much French capital. A new route to India, this, and a safe, and a quick. And whether India was essential to the life of the Empire or not, England was in India and could not well get out ( not that she wanted to ) and the Suez must needs become British. As it very shortly did, thanks to the unthrifty extravagance of Egypt's rulers. The money which Britain paid for Ismail's shares in Suez


only postponed for a time the inevitable bankruptcy of the poverty-stricken country. This soon came to pass, followed by the Dual Control, the anti-Christian and anti-foreign agitation, and the decision of Britain to use force to protect its nationals, restore order, and secure the interest on the Egyptian bonds. At this point France ceased to coöperate and England went it alone. This was in 1882. In 1924 she still plays the lone hand along the Nile. Of course, now, theoretically Egypt has been given practical independence during the past few months, and on the very latest maps it shows, not red, but pale pink, or perhaps white, the color used to distinguish those three African states supposedly independant. The shadow of the Union Jack, however, still cools the burning sands of Lybia, and should ever their arise a menace to Suez, it will be a safe guess to say that Mr Thomas Atkins will once more pitch his tents at the foot of the Pyramids. And the Soudan, we must remember, is still Anglo-Egyptian.

England's position in Egypt was, from the very beginning, rather unusual and, to the rest of Europe, somewhat disconcerting. Her representative really governed the country, and her soldiers made his will effective. Constant declarations of an intention to evacuate the country were as constantly postponed, until in 1914, when the World War made this impossible, a Protectorate was proclaimed. In these three decades, however, ( as no honest person will deny ) the improvement in Egypt's political and eco-

nomic condition was little less than marvelous. This due to the British administration. The finances rehabilitated, the slave traffic suppressed, the lot of the fellahs made endurable, the Soudan reconquered, the general prosperity of the nation vastly increased . . . these were the labors of the men Britain sent out. The chief credit for the Egyptian venture must be given to Lord Cromer. Despite the lukewarmness at home, and the reluctance of government to spend the taxpayer's money, Cromer did the job. He put Egypt on a paying basis of its own, and when the time came to avenge Gordon it was Egyptian gold, for the most part, and Egyptian soldiers led by the "younger sons" of England that turned the trick. No, it can scarcely be said, with truth, that Britain has not been of benefit to Egypt, And this, in spite, of all our liquid talk of "national aspirations". Do not ten year old boys resent the control of their parents. And is not the burden of obligation to another the most difficult to bear?

#### SOMALILAND, NIGERIA, BECHUANALAND.

The year 1885 is of tremendous importance in considering the Cape to Cairo route. In fact, it is the pivotal date. In this year the flanks of the line were secured ( Somaliland and Nigeria ) and out of the South came the first great wedge of red . . . Bechuanaland. But of greater import than these was



1 8 8 5

SOMALI : Treaty. Protectorate 1884.

NIGERIA : Protectorate proclaimed 1885.

BECHUANALAND : Protectorate proclaimed 1885.

the advent of Cecil John Rhodes, with his dream of Empire, his millions, and his unshakeable belief in the divine mission of the Anglo-Saxon. The acquisition of Bechuanaland was in no small part due to his efforts, for Government, even in 1884, was still a bit doubtful as to the advisability<sup>of</sup> bringing these wild, African lands under the protection of the Union Jack. But, of this, more later. Let us first glance at the striking situation which the map of 1885 (facing the page, above) presents to our view.

Here, at the most critical period in Africa's history, (the first partition by the Berlin Congress) we find Britain snugly ensconced upon each of the four corners of the Dark Continent. Cape Colony in the South; Egypt in the North; Somaliland in the East; Nigeria in the West. The two terminals of the not yet conceived (save in the dreaming mind of Cecil Rhodes) all British route have been secured. On the West Coast and on the East Coast two respectable splotches of red guard the line. From the South, the first advance is being made. All of which would seem to indicate the successful working out of a carefully constructed plan; than which nothing, however, could be farther from the real truth. It was the same old tale of British "blundering", or British "luck", or British "muddling". As usual it required a measure of tail-twisting to stir the Imperial Lion. In the case of Somaliland this was furnished by the Mahdi. In Nigeria, the French supplied the incentive for action; while the troublesome Boers in South Africa thrust Bechuanaland upon the

"reluctant" ministry and its indifferant supporters. A word concerning each.

Britain's first contact with the Somali was in 1827 when the East India Company purchased, by treaty, suitable places to serve as harbors for their ships. Further treaties were executed in 1840. In 1875 the Somali coast came under the control of Egypt. Nine years later, when the dervishes laid waste the Soudan, the Egyptian garrisons were withdrawn. This in the interest of safety, for the Soudan was shortly abandoned. Of course, under such circumstances, there was nothing left for England to do but take possession of the Somali coast. There was the India Route, you know, and it must be held. And it was. Treaties were made with the tribes, and a protectorate established. In 1888 French and British defined their spheres of influence along the Somali coast.

The Protectorate of Nigeria was proclaimed in June, 1885. This, as noted above, was due to the French. As early as 1865 it had been practically decided to abandon most of the Nigeria settlements. They had never been very profitable, the climate was unwholesome, and the scramble for colonies had not yet begun. When it did begin, the French erected several trading stations along the Niger, had great success, and put in thirty more. Then the English bestirred themselves, consolidated their interests and the French, in 1884, threw up the sponge and sold out to the new United African Company. The Crown soon took over the

Nigerian settlements and, notifying the Berlin Conference, proclaimed a protectorate in 1885. This placed the red upon the four cardinal points of the African compass, and the Caïor route was at liberty to carry on its astonishing advance. Four decades were to see the business consummated.


The first step upward, as we have seen, was Bechuanaland, "the key to South Africa". The Boers coveted this key . . . and so did Cecil Rhodes. London, as usual, was serenely indifferent; in fact, greatly opposed to annexation. So both the efforts of Rhodes and the obstinate Dutch were required to bring Bechuanaland under the red blanket. There had been British missionaries and explorers in these lands in the early Nineteenth Century, and the country as far north as the twenty-fifth parallel gradually came under English influence. The trouble began with the achievement of independence in 1852 by the Boer Republics. The Transvaal immediately commenced to encroach upon the natives, and to interfere with travelers in Bechuanaland. Livingston had unpleasant experiences of this sort. Cape Colony, however, soon put a stop to this, but the form of apprenticeship exercised by the Boers differed in no way from slavery, so that, in 1874, the natives begged British protection. From 1878 until 1881 the southern portion of the country was maintained in peace by the presence of soldiers. In 1881, however, the Government withdrew the military forces, refusing to annex the country. Immediately the Boers set up



a republic, -- Stellaland --, and so gave rise to a new menace: the junction of Boer and German. Such a move would confine the British red to the very tip of the cape, and cut off further progress to the north. This, of course, would never do, as Mr Cecil Rhodes, deputy commissioner in Bechuanaland very clearly saw, and endeavored to impress upon the Government. And as the views of Government concerning colonial acquisitions were beginning to undergo a change ( this was 1884 ) we shortly find the dogged Mr Atkins, plodding through the veld, dispersing the Boer filibusters, and making possible the annexation of Bechuanaland. This was effected in September of '85, the southern portion being annexed, and over the northern half, a protectorate being proclaimed. This eliminated the danger of the Boer Republics, on the east, joining with German Southwest Africa, on the Atlantic. But farther north lurked another dragon. Portugese aspirations and claims threatened to sever the route just above Bechuanaland, until Cecil Rhodes, with indomitable energy and clear vision, drove his irresistible wedge between Mozambique and Angola. This wedge was Rhodesia.

#### RHODESIA: AND THE SOUTH AFRICAN COMPANY.

When the British Imperial Government informed Portugal that no claims to the interior could be recognized unless the occupation of the country was effective, there was an attempt upon the



1 8 9 0

RHODESIA : Occupation 1890. Charter of South African Company.

part of the smaller nation to extend their authority across the southern part of Africa. It was Rhodes' job to block this move. Obtaining concessions from the native king Lo Bengula, he hurried to London and secured a charter for his South Africa Company. This was in 1889 when notions concerning colonial development were undergoing a radical alteration. The resources and the personnel of the company's organizers were of the highest order, and the Government readily issued the requisite authority to the newly erected Company. The advantage of chartered companies in the development of new countries is quite obvious. If the venture turns out successfully the Government is spared the tremendous initial expenses and only take over the new acquisition after it has become more or less self-supporting. On the other hand, should the new developments prove without profit, the Government has lost nothing. Also private enterprise will more energetically develop the resources of the land than would a Government administration. Politicians do not like to sink the tax-payer's money in far-flung risks of doubtful value. Of course, now, when the flag is in danger ( regardless of how it got in danger ) and the country's prestige is menaced, the tax-payer himself is perfectly willing to foot the bill. This is called patriotism. But to toss public funds into distant commercial ventures is a different matter. So that, instead of the taxpayer developing new colonial possessions, the burden is shifted upon the stock-

holders, a difference somewhat analogous to that existing between tweedledee and tweedledum. For not always do the holders of stock in chartered companies suck vast returns from their investments. In fact, the reverse is often true. Rhodesia, for instance, during the first fifteen years cost more to administer than was produced by the revenues of the country. As a money maker the Chartered Company, as it is commonly known, has been a huge failure. As a builder of Empire it has succeeded admirably. And this, after all, was the aim of its founders. It was red upon the map that Rhodes wanted, not yellow gold in the bank. And red upon the map it is.

Rhodesia is still administered by The South Africa Company. Plans to alter its status into that of a self-governing colony have fallen down several times, owing to the unwillingness of Government to burden the young colony with the huge public debts which would have to be assumed if the Chartered Company is to be compensated for its efforts and property. Rhodesia, like its founder, is 100% British . . . loyal to the Crown. It has remained out of the Union, in order not to come under the domination of the Boer element who control South Africa, a fact which is of present interest in view of the strong agitation by the irreconcilables in the Union for a separation from the British Commonwealth of Nations. Who knows but that Rhodesia, this growing giant in the north, this chief love and darling of the Great Empire Builder, will yet be of vital significance in holding South



Africa for Britain? in keeping the Cape clothed in red?

#### BRITISH CENTRAL AFRICA.

This term embraces the protectorates of East Africa, Zanzibar, and Uganda. Zanzibar is an island, East Africa a coast country, and Uganda a rich hinterland. In this study it is Uganda which shall engage our attention; and that very briefly. Here we find another instance of the chartered company. A commercial enterprise which, in spite of Mr Woolf's howling, earned nary a penny for its stockholders. It did however, suppress the slave trade, eliminate rum drinking, and improved the native's life in other ways. This at the expense of the Company. . . . The Imperial British East Africa Company. Sir William Mackinnon is the guiding spirit here, and he was without doubt, a man actuated by other motives than the mere "selling in the highest markets and buying in the cheapest". The Company was chartered in 1888, after having secured various concessions from the Sultan of Zanzibar. The British influence gradually extended into the hinterland despite the usual apathy of the Home Government and the opposition of German interests, who, however, were very substantially surpated by their government. An Anglo-German agreement in 1890 defined the spheres of influence, but the Company, under countless difficulties, had about had enough, and decided to withdraw. A particularly severe


blow was the making of Zanzibar a zone of "free trade". This was the last straw . . . and administered by Britain. The Company was broke, had no funds to maintain its authority and decided to withdraw after no help could be obtained from the Home Government. Immediately a great agitation for the retention of Uganda arose. The hand of Cecil Rhodes can be seen here, and as he was no minor figure in the affairs of Colonial Britain ( he was then Prime Minister of the Cape ) his influence could be felt in London. Government granted a subsidy which enabled the East Africa Company to maintain its forces until 1893. In the meantime an inquiry was made into the country, and in the year following the Government bought out the interests of the stock-holders, at great gain to the nation, and tremendous loss to the Company, and shortly thereafter proclaimed the Protectorate of Uganda. The Protectorate of East Africa was officially announced in 1895, while Nyasaland, which gave Britain one bank of the Lake Nyasa, was annexed in 1891, due to the efforts of Rhodes and his Chartered Company.

And thus, at the close of the decade 1885-95 we find an appreciable bit of red upon the route from Cape Town to Cairo. Another ten years will witness the closing of all the gaps save one . . . and here the German Eagle was to sit for still another ten years.

## THE ANGLO-EGYPTIAN SOUDAN.

Chinese Gordon . . . Lord Cromer . . . Kitchener of Khartoum -- these are the high names to which the Soudan owes its mantle of British red. To these fell the lion's share of the work, with each in a different field: the sentimental, the economic, the militaristic. Gordon, massacred in '85 when the Upper Nile was lost to Egypt, shamed a ministry and gave to a repentant nation that battle cry which was not without force in '98. The first act of Kitchener's victorious troops entering Khartoum was to hold a memorial service for the lamented old warrior. But sentiment alone, however, would not have furnished Kitchener the means for conquering desert and dervish. The Soudan was a long way from Downing Street, and a punitive expedition would not only have cost millions in money and thousands of lives, but would result in no material advantage to anyone concerned. No dividends, that is, as Mr Woolf might put it. So, for the time being, Government ordered the Soudan left to its fate . . . a fate, which, under the dervishes, was dismal enough. Britain had only been in Egypt three years and honestly expected ( this cannot be doubted ) to withdraw as soon as possible. So soon, say, as order could be restored, the Khedive reseated upon his wobbly throne, and the interest on the public debt guaranteed. Extensive reforms had not then been projected, or even contemplated, and when the Mahdi ravaged the Soudan the British Government disclaimed all responsibility for the administration of Egypt south of Wada Halfa. Beyond that point the Egyptian Government could do as it saw fit. The






1 8 9 8

ANGLO-EGYPTIAN SOUDAN : Conquest 1898.

military faction in Egypt wished to attempt an immediate reconquest, but Cromer (then Sir Evelyn Baring) the British Consul General and Agent quickly scotched this plan. Such a venture would most certainly have proved disastrous, as had the ruinous Abyssinian campaigns. The country was bankrupt, and the army thoroughly demoralized. So Cromer said no. He had a better plan. He began that vast system of economic and political reform which shortly rehabilitated the country's finances, liberated the oppressed fellah, and with the aid of British officers, made of him a self-respecting soldier who, later at Omdurman and Khartoum, stood as stoutly against the wild rushes of the Mahdi's hordes, as did the British Regulars. In this manner was the Soudan retrieved, the bill, for the most part, being footed by Egypt. The troops with which Kitchener conducted those brilliant campaigns against the elements and religious fanatics, and so came to Khartoum, were chiefly black men of the Nile; led, it is true, by British officers. And the gold which carried them up the Nile was, for the most part, gold from the Egyptian strong-box. But this gold, we must remember, came into the Egyptian strong-box through the efforts of Englishmen, and the steadiness of the fellah warrior was the work of British subalterns.

It was a joint undertaking, this conquest of the Soudan ( for there were also British troops and British gold ) and today the flags of both nations stand side by side in the Anglo-Egyptian Soudan. The usual British luck accompanied this venture. Khartoum



1 9 0 1

TRANSVAAL : Conquest 1900.


ORANGE FREE STATE : Conquest 1900.

ASHANTI : Annexed by Order in Council 1901.

was reached and the dervishes broken just in time to prevent another attempt at severing the Cairo route. As Bechuanaland had kept Boer and German apart, and as Rhodesia had driven a wedge between the holdings of Portugal, so did the Soudan, at the opportune moment, thrust itself through the heart of French aspirations along the Upper Nile. This at Fashoda. But the tale of this incident which terminated the Soudan campaigns and came near to starting mther and more deadly campaigns, needs no recounting here. Its history is known to all. Therefore, leaving the reaches of Upper Nile, let us hurry back to the other end of the line, South Africa, where an additional bit of the map is about to turn red . . . with blood.

#### TRANSVAAL AND THE ORANGE FREE STATE.

These two republics, annexed in 1900, were the costliest of all the various additions to the Cape to Cairo Route. Twenty-five thousand lives and untold wealth, this was the price to Britain. And Britain paid it. Not for a railway right of way ( the red already reached Tanganyika ) but to determine whether South Africa should be Boer or Briton. And strangely enough, after all the Niagara of blood, it is neither . . . and both. The Boer rules, but under the British flag. An amazing fact, this, and one which arouses respect for British statesmanship . . . in this instance, at least. Five years after this bitter, bloody conflict, the former Boer states were given self-government, and in 1910 at the



1 9 1 9

GERMAN SOUTHWEST AFRICA )  
GERMAN EAST AFRICA ) Mandates. Treaty of Versailles, 1919.

formation of the Union of South Africa, the Boer element came into power throughout the new dominion. The men who had fought against Roberts and Kitchener were now governing the country for Britain, and a few years later when the world went mad, these same old leaders of Boer resistance held the Union for King George, — held it against a revolt of former followers, bitter-enders and irreconcilables. And more, the men who had fought Tommy Atkins to a finish now went forth and conquered German Southwest Africa . . . For the British Commonwealth of Nations. Thus, we come to the final episode.

#### GERMAN EAST AFRICA : THE LAST LINK.

When the World War broke in 1914, and the various nations began to count their unhatched chickens, it was a foregone conclusion that Britain, in case the Allied Powers were victorious, would receive German East Africa, the best of the German colonies, and the single, remaining obstruction on the red road from Cairo to Cape Town. The Allied Powers were victorious, and the present status of East Africa is that of a mandate under the British Government. ( German Southwest Africa is a mandate of the Union of South Africa. ) The distinction between "mandate", "protectorate", and "possession", is purely verbal. Any actual difference, should it exist, is invisible to the naked eye, so that we make no mistake in extending the British red across this gap which, in 1913, separated Uganda and Rhodesia. Although East

Africa was not so easily taken, or at so early a date, as was German Southwest Africa, to all practical purposes this last unit in the dream of Cecil Rhodes turned red in 1914, for, although the war was four weary years from its end, it must not be forgotten that "Brittania" still ruled the waves . . . a fact which settled the fate of Kenya; or, for that matter, the War itself.

So then, we come to the end of the survey, a job which consumed just one hundred years in the doing. Cape Colony ceded in 1814, and in 1914, troopships putting off for the east coast of Africa. . . .

T H E      E N D