

In the early 1900s, when their activities in Africa and the Far East came under attack, a number of European powers defended their colonial policies. In his book *The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa*, Lord Fredrick Lugard, a veteran combat administrator and the first British governor-general of Nigeria, summed up major arguments of the imperial powers. In the excerpt below, Lugard explains the nature of the "Dual Mandate." As you read the excerpt, ask yourself whether you agree with Lugard's point of view

These products [food supplies and raw materials] lay wasted and un-garnered in Africa because the natives did not know their value.

Millions of tons of oil-nuts, for instance, grew wild without the labor of man, and lay rotting in the forests. Who can deny the right of the hungry people of Europe to utilize the wasted bounties of nature, or that the task of developing these resources was, as Mr. [Joseph] Chamberlain expressed it, a "trust for civilization" and for the benefit of mankind?

Europe benefited by the wonderful increase in the amenities of life for the mass of her people which followed the opening up of Africa at the end of the nineteenth century. Africa benefited by the influx of manufactured goods, and the substitution of law and order for the methods of barbarism.

Thus Europe was impelled to the development of Africa primarily by the necessities of her people, and not by the greed of the capitalist. Keen competition assured the Minimum prices to the producer. It is only when monopolies are granted that it can be argued that profits are restricted to the few, and British policy has long been averse to monopolies in every form. The brains, the research, the capital, and the enterprise of the merchant, the miner, and the planter have discovered and

utilized the surplus products of Africa. The profits have been divided among the shareholders representing all classes of the people, and no small share of them has gone to the native African merchant and the middleman as well as the producer. It is true to say that "a vast area of activity has been opened up to the British workman, in which he shares with the capitalist the profits of the development of tropical resources." In accepting responsibility for the control of these new lands, England obeyed the tradition of her race. British Africa was acquired not by groups of financiers, nor yet...by the efforts of her statesmen, but in spite of them. It was the instinct of the British democracy which compelled us to take our share...Even if it were true...that we could do as lucrative a trade in the tropical possessions of other nations, there can be no doubt that the verdict of the British people has been emphatic that we will not ask the foreigner to open markets for our use, or leave him the responsibility and its

reward...

Let it be admitted at the outset that European brains, capital, and energy have not been, and never will be, expended in developing the resources of Africa from motives of pure philanthropy; that Europe is in Africa for the mutual benefit of her own industrial classes, and of the native races in their progress to a higher plane; that the benefit can be made reciprocal, and that it is



BRITISH AFRICA IN 1905.

the aim and desire of civilized administration to fulfill this dual mandate.

By railways and roads, by reclamation of swamps and irrigation of deserts, and by a system of fair trade and competition, we have added to the prosperity and wealth of these lands, and checked famine and disease. We have put an end to the awful misery of the slave-trade and inter-tribal war, to human sacrifice and the ordeals of the witch-doctor. Where these things survive they are severely suppressed. We are endeavoring to teach the native races to conduct their own affairs with justice and humanity, and to educate them alike in letters and in industry...

As Roman imperialism laid the foundations of modern civilization, and led the wild barbarians of these islands [Great Britain] along the path of progress, so in Africa to-day we are repaying the debt, and bringing to the dark places of earth, the abode of barbarism and cruelty, the torch of culture and progress, while ministering to the material needs of our own civilization. In this task the nations of Europe have pledged themselves to co-operation by a solemn covenant. Towards the common goal each will advance by the methods most consonant with its national genius. British methods have not perhaps in all cases produced ideal results, but I am profoundly convinced that there can be no question but that British rule has promoted the happiness and welfare of the primitive races. Let those who question it examine the results impartially. If there is unrest, and a desire for independence, as in India and Egypt, it is because we have taught the value of liberty and freedom, which for centuries these peoples had not known. Their very discontent is a measure of their progress.

We hold these countries because it is the genius of our race to colonies, to trade, and to govern. The task in which England is engaged in the tropics...has become part of her tradition, and she has ever given of her best in the cause of liberty and civilization. There will always be those who cry aloud that the task is being badly done, that it does not need doing, that we can get more profit by leaving others to do it, that it brings evil to

subject races and breeds profiteers at home. These were not the principles which prompted our forefathers, and secured for us the place we held in the world to-day in trust for those who shall come after us.