

**INDUSTRIALISATION, FABIANISM AND RACE:
SYDNEY OLIVIER AND THE LIBERAL CRITIQUE OF SOUTH AFRICAN SEGREGATION**

by

Paul Rich

The debate between liberal and revisionist scholars in South African history and social sciences has tended to be conducted, since its emergence in the late 1960s, in a relative historiographical vacuum. If there has been a "burden of the present" and a strong linkage of academic analysis to immediate political comment, this is due to the fact that the debate is itself an historical product of a more deep-rooted pattern of linkages between South African political ideology and the British and North American discourse on race. As a satellite of western imperial expansion, South African society became established behind both a strategic and geographical as well as an ideological shield which has continually been fostered by the West in the course of the twentieth century. (1) The debate over the political legitimacy of first imperial and then white settler hegemony has thus a considerable pedigree, which has continuously been couched in terms intelligible both for internal domestic political consumption in South Africa and for external political debate as white, western and "Anglo-Saxon" imperial expansion became increasingly defensive in the face of rising Afro-Asian and Caribbean nationalisms. (2)

The intellectual history of the impact and significance of South African racial ideology on the West generally remains to be written. What is probably of more immediate importance before such an undertaking commences is the periodisation of the ideological debate over "native policy" and the concretisation by the South African state of social relations in racial terms. In this context, internal South African ideological entrepreneurs interacted on the international plane with various "native experts" and interpreters of South African policy, who themselves became increasingly polarised politically as the internal logic of segregationism became manifest. (3) One of the most prominent of these experts in Britain before the Second World War was the Colonial Office civil servant and notable Fabian socialist Sydney Olivier (1859-1943). The theme of this paper is thus the significance of Olivier's writings on South African politics to the evolving debate on racial segregation and capitalist imperialism in the decades before the emergence of apartheid in the late 1940s.

The Application of Fabianism to Colonial Race Relations

Olivier's importance lay in his interest in relating British debates on socialism to the colonial context at a time when most Fabian socialists manifested a parochial disinterest in the empire and racial issues. He himself ascribed this interest to his Huguenot ancestry, though his upbringing was typical of the provincial Victorian middle class: born into a clergyman's family in 1859, he was educated at Tonbridge School and Corpus Christi College, Oxford, where he imbibed both the evolutionary ideas of Samuel Butler and the positivism of Auguste Comte and Herbert Spencer. In

1882, he joined the Colonial Office and in 1885 the Fabian Society, along with Sidney Webb. Over the following years the Fabians developed a Ricardian theory of rent which they applied to capital as well as land in order to meet the ideological challenge of the Marxism of William Morris and the Social Democratic Federation. The effect of these discussions in the Hampstead Historic Society in the late 1880s was, as Edward Pease later put it, that the rising Fabian group "could treat as questions of more and less problems which the Marxists treated as questions of absolute distinction". (4) Olivier himself propounded the arguments of Ricardian theory in the Fabian tract Capital and Land, in 1888, in which he argued that the land nationalisation campaign in England was short-sighted for failing to see that capital could exploit as much as land. Referring to the example of Ireland, he pointed out that, when tenants holding farms tried to improve their properties, the landlords appropriated the resulting capital created by raising rents on the expiry of the lease. It was thus absurd to try to discriminate between the capital and land value of estates, and it was important to recognise the socialist principle that "labour has contributed to capital, and that labour gives some claim to ownership". (5)

Olivier's neo-Ricardian doctrine, however, was underpinned by a commitment to the moral improvement of British society as a result of which he believed there would be an eventual attainment of socialism through evolutionary progress. This Eurocentric view of socialism was typical of the Fabian tradition in Britain and has been seen as colouring his outlook as far as the possibilities of socialist advance in non-European and colonial societies. (6) In an essay on the moral basis of Fabianism in the Fabian Essays on Socialism in 1889, he developed the theory of Herbert Spencer that industrial societies led to a condition of increasing peace and individualism in terms of the notion that socialism was "merely individualism rationalised, organised, clothed, and in its right mind". (7) The Fabian ideal in this context became little more than the supersession of Victorian liberalism, and Olivier confessed to George Bernard Shaw to having no faith in any clearly "socialist morality", only to the ideal that socialism was more "moral" since evolutionary doctrines had "knocked the bottom" out of the assumption that men had "equal rights to live", for "man has no more obvious right to live than have his poorer relations". (8)

Olivier's abstract view of socialist ethics began to be put to the test as his work in the Colonial Office developed. In 1890-91 he acted as Colonial Secretary, British Honduras, and between 1891 and 1895 he worked in the South African Department of the Colonial Office. Following this, he was attached to the Office's West India Department in 1895-96, and in 1896-97 was Secretary to the Royal Commission on the West Indies. Between 1899 and 1904 he was Colonial Secretary, Jamaica, and then Principal Clerk for West Indies and West Africa during 1904-1907. The election of the Liberal government in 1906 secured his posting to Jamaica as Governor between 1907 and 1913, after which he retired from the colonial service to act as an important writer and spokesman on colonial affairs in Fabian and Labour Party circles as well as being, briefly, Secretary of State for India in the short-lived Labour Government of 1924-25 and chairman of the West India Royal Commission of 1929-30. During this career Olivier developed a far closer acquaintance at first hand with the peasant and agrarian society of the West Indies, particularly Jamaica, than the white settler societies in East and Southern Africa which he criticised from a distance. This knowledge of the Caribbean, however, led Olivier into becoming an important early writer in Britain on comparative race relations and an opponent of the emerging system of racial segregation in South Africa, from the standpoint of the West Indian model of individual peasant proprietorship which he saw as being progressively undermined in the former context by settler capitalism - or what he termed "white capital".

Olivier's work in both the West Indian and the South African departments occurred at a critical time in the political economy of both regions, and his Fabianism only partially equipped him to be able to grope towards a conceptualisation of what was happening in these different areas of British imperial rule. His brief stay in the South African Department was marked by the advent of the Jameson Raid and the escalation of formal imperial involvement, culminating in the Anglo-Boer War of

1899-1902. Olivier became a strong critic of this policy, for he saw it as conniving with a repressive system of landlordism and labour exploitation in the Boer Republics owing to the weakness of the British imperial presence in formulating any alternative model of social and class relationships. Writing to Shaw in 1899, he saw the Boers as "a seventeenth century people" whose industrial organisation was condemned by evolution, and he parted company from the dominant strand of Fabian imperialism for this led them to become a party to the "imperialist microbe" and to the "illusion that sincerely possesses many worthy readers of Kipling but which to me appears a complete illusion. I do not believe in the White Man's Burden theory: of which this is only a variant - you cannot make a silk purse out a sow's ear". The "imperialist militarist movement" did not seek the welfare of "native races", still less "the regulation of capitalism in the interests of wage earners". The advent of popular imperialism was not due to conscious exertion, but the result of commercial self-interest and militarist pressures, neither of which Olivier saw as implying "the higher form of power" which his Victorian upbringing had led him to hope would be the result of British colonial expansion. It effectively lapsed back into the same morality as the Boer economy and Boer ideas, that of "might for might", and was thus, for him, a departure from the ethos of former British colonial rule. It would have been much better to have let "the Boer" shape his own model of South African "industrial democracy", free from English or American influences, for "on socialist and economic grounds I would not have embarked on a war of extermination to prevent him trying his hand". (9)

Olivier's attack on British imperialism lacked the coherence and thrust of Hobson's analysis of capitalist underconsumptionism in his book Imperialism, in 1902, but nevertheless manifested some similarities in that he avoided any fatalistic view of inevitable imperial advance and also saw the imperial phenomenon as largely driven by an alliance of capitalist and militarist pressures. (10) Unlike Hobson, however, Olivier was concerned not simply with developing a future-orientated theory of imperialist expansion derived from American concepts of investment-powered capitalist aggression, but with developing a historical critique of British imperialism, Olivier's, which he saw as having been diverted in southern Africa away from its authentic Victorian objectives as a "civilising mission" into a corrupt pact with militarists and financiers. The key to his argument was the West Indian colonial model which, after several decades of British "benevolent despotism" in the wake of the 1865 Morant Bay rebellion in Jamaica and the resulting repression of Governor Eyre, had led to the progressive advance of a free black peasantry out of the clutches of the plantations. (11) From the time he began work in the West India Department of the Colonial Office in the mid-1890s, he saw Jamaica as in some senses a testing ground for Anglo-Saxon concepts of racial harmony. The tropical areas of the globe at this time were thought, from powerful polemics such as Benjamin Kidd's The Control of the Tropics (1898), to be areas of growing inter-imperial rivalry, and an atmosphere of exuberant Anglo-Saxonist expansionism produced a new ethos of "scientific" imperialism employing Darwinian concepts of evolutionary advance which, it was hoped, would lead to the social reconstruction of tropical colonies. (12) In the Jamaican context this was seen by the black journalist W P Livingstone, in Black Jamaica, as unlocking the older, more rigid plantation system by the advance of a black peasantry in a colour-caste society established on "a system of mutual tolerance, which, however, has its well understood limitations". (13) Olivier took this conception further by the time of the first edition of White Capital and Coloured Labour in 1906, for the task of colonial administration he saw as actively aiming at continuous moral improvement through the balancing of the interests of the "two Jamaicas" of the money economy and the barter economy. The education of the peasantry into understanding the principles of trade was crucial to this and Jamaica became, in effect, a laboratory for the testing of Fabian concepts of "organic community" through the application of reason to the "art" of colonial dealings with black races. (14)

Late Victorian evolutionism thus taught Olivier initially to approach the matter of colonial race relations through the prism of race, which he saw as an inherited product of different local environments. "Pure" races he saw as still existing in the rural locations of colonies, while towns and industrial life broke them down, producing instead "popular types" such as the London cockney. (15) These "pure" races might, he thought, differ in capacity, but there was no necessary

reason for the generation of anti-black racism as in the segregationist American South or South Africa, for the establishment of a Coloured middle class could ensure a degree of social stability. Without this intermediary class, the main basis of social control would be in the colonial administration, which Olivier saw as unlikely to prevent social polarisation on racial lines:

A community of white and black alone is in far greater danger of remaining, so far as the unofficial classes are concerned, a community of employers and serfs, concessionaires and tributaries, with, at best, a bureaucracy to keep the peace between them. The graded mixed class in Jamaica helps to make an organic whole of the community and saves it from this distinct cleavage. (16)

Combined with this West Indian model of colour-class gradation, Olivier also saw colonial administration as needing to be cautious in its encouragement of black proletarianisation in an industrial economy. Typical of so many of his Victorian contemporaries, he doubted the fitness of black races for urban life and thought they were likely to resist the disciplines of capitalism so long as land was available to support a viable peasant economy:

The European wage proletariat and its standards of industrial virtue were only created by long evolution arising out of private landlordism and the pressure of climate and poverty. So long as the African has access to the land, and is saved from poverty by the simplicity of his needs and the ease of meeting them, so long the capitalist employer is sure to find his labour unmanageable under the 'free' wage system. (17)

Olivier saw the cohesion of African tribal society through the lenses of Dudley Kidd's The Essential Kaffir (1904) - a work often used to rationalise the evolving pattern of South African territorial segregationism - though his Fabianism had taught him to realise that such a system of segregationary insulation of African societies from industrial life depended upon there being no system of rampant landlordism. "Where land is not monopolised", he wrote, "no oppressive industrial system can be established." (18) Olivier's analysis overlooked the complex forces that impelled migratory labour from the countryside into towns and still tended to reflect the more general failure of Victorian analysts to understand proletarianisation in terms of environment rather than character. (19) It was the moral stolidity of the loyal, Creole middle class that attracted Olivier to the West Indian model of colonial rule - it provided, he considered, a sufficient degree of social cohesion to nullify prophets of impending race war, like Grant Allen in his novel In All Shades. (20)

In terms of the moral consensus of the West Indian model, however, Olivier became an early critic of South African segregationism, for he saw the land provisions of the 1903-05 South African Native Affairs Commission as failing to provide adequate outlets for the African peasant economy. "White Capital" in South Africa was already forcing Africans into the European wage economy, and this process, when allied to "race prejudice", intensified "the tendency to oppression in exploitation". (21) Inter-racial relationships he saw as fundamentally impelled by economic motives, and the resulting social conditions in tropical colonial dependencies were due far more to the "opposition in the categories of Capital and Labour than out of the opposition in the country of race and colour". (22) Nevertheless, racial antagonisms were highly prone to persist despite social evolutionary advance, and it was the function of "intellectual influences" to allay racial prejudices in the building up of a society and a civilisation whose essence was "to disguise the self seeking and violence by organising social injustice and corporate class interests". (23) Short of this, there was the continual fear that a society would lapse back into barbarism.

Growing Confrontation with Settler Colonialism

By the time of South African Union in 1910, Olivier had expounded his fears regarding the possible lurch into segregationism by the white settler society there, especially if British imperial capital became allied to a system of landlordism which threatened to destroy the independence of African peasant economy. His was a comparatively lone voice, though some liberal critics, such as J A Hobson, also warned that the South African system resembled less other white dominions, such as Canada, but rather the American South of Jim Crow, so challenging the basic tenets of Victorian liberalism. "Deliberately to set out upon a new career as a civilised nation with a definition of civilisation which takes as the criterion race and colour, not individual character and attainments", he wrote in The Crisis of Liberalism, "is nothing else than to sow a crop of dark and dangerous problems for the future." (24) Olivier's critique, however, was complicated by his involvement in Jamaican affairs until his resignation as governor in 1913, and also his isolation in Fabian circles as the main body of the Society was drawn behind the British imperial cause in South Africa after the publication of George Bernard Shaw's manifesto, Fabianism and the Empire, in 1900. (25) For Sidney and Beatrice Webb, this accommodation to social imperialism led to a temporary alliance with the Liberal imperialists led by Lord Rosebery (26) and later an alliance with Lord Milner via the Coefficients Club. (27) Even after the election of the Liberal Government in 1906 this imperial enthusiasm of the Webbs never entirely collapsed, for in their Far Eastern tour of 1911-12 they manifested considerable racial chauvinism towards black races. (28)

Olivier thus had no strong political base in the Fabian Society from which to launch an attack on segregationism in southern Africa, certainly not before the end of the First World War and the rise of the Labour Party. The climate of political opinion in Britain in the years before 1914 was strongly racist and a number of opinion formers reflected the negrophobia rampant at this time in America and southern Africa. The theatre critic and friend of George Bernard Shaw, William Archer, for example, attacked Olivier in a strong defence of Southern segregationism in his book Through Afro America, in 1910, arguing that it was the South rather than the West Indies which represented the "great crucible in which this experiment in inter-racial chemistry is working itself out". (29) Olivier's critique of South African and Southern segregationism became part of a wider ideological struggle for the mode in which British imperial power was to structure its control over colonial societies and non-white races.

One significant forum for this debate was the 1911 Universal Races Congress held at the Imperial Institute in London between 26 and 29 July. In his paper to the Congress, Olivier saw South Africa as now serving as the terrain for the greatest ideological conflict between "the efficient class of colonists in those lands" and "the mother country" over policy towards black races. There was a likelihood, too, he foresaw, that similar policies would be adopted by white settlers in East and Central Africa in order to secure an adequate labour supply, so that, for Britain, a "non interventionist policy which is convenient for the wide territories of the later annexations and protectorates tends to become obsolete". (30) Olivier's argument was an important warning to liberals such as J A Hobson not to rely too much on a revived neo-Cobdenism and free trade analysis as a means of "harmonising" inter-racial relations. In the Congress' debates, Olivier's position was reinforced by W E B Du Bois, who urged that the development of trade and business in the black economy in America needed to be supplemented by laws to outlaw racial discrimination and ensure fairer income distribution. (31) This economic debate also revealed for Olivier the limitations of a purely anthropological analysis of race relations, for disputes over the nature of racial types and their supposed hereditary qualities failed to throw much light, he thought, on the characteristic constitution of Man as a single species, and what separated mankind from animals. (32) In the absence of any coherent anthropological theory, Olivier thus turned for the next few years to psychology, especially as it had been popularised by William McDougall at the University of Oxford into a "science" of human behaviour. This led Olivier in some respects out of the Social Darwinist evolutionary paradigm of races which had so dominated British imperial thought in the 1890s and 1900s, into the cul de sac of a

static Race theory built around a concept of "natural man" derived from McDougall and August Weissman's theory of the germ plasm:

I would not say that Natural Selection makes Race any more than I would say that it makes Man. I would rather say - Race is made by that living soul of Adam, the natural man; natural selection largely decides in what form that soul shall succeed in effecting survival. (33)

This concept buttressed Olivier's argument at the Fabian Summer School in 1913 at Derwent Water that Africans were "instinctively" ill-fitted to both an industrial society and the European education system. (34) It led him also into championing economic co-operatives as a means to rejuvenate African peasantries after their apparent success in the West Indies. (35)

By the end of the First World War, Olivier's warnings about the trajectory of South African segregation and its possible extension to other white settler colonies began at last to receive some scholarly and academic support. In 1919, W M Macmillan urged the application of policies by the South African state to sustain the bywoner system in the face of mounting class polarisation on the land and the drift of poor whites into the cities. There was mounting evidence of "the growth of social caste, the landlord and the landless" (36), and it was the poverty and low economic position of blacks which undercut unskilled white labour. There was an urgent necessity, he argued, for the improvement of agricultural methods in black territories in South Africa, so contributing to the growing "development" ideology which came to grip political discourse in that society in the decades ahead.

Macmillan's more detailed empirical research in the African reserves of the Eastern Cape, especially Herschel, in the early 1920s had some impact on the small coterie of Labour activists interested in imperial and colonial matters via the party's Imperial Advisory Committee. Furthermore, his work on the Reverend John Philip and the Cape liberal tradition appeared to confirm Olivier's earlier view that the economic liberalism of the Cape colony had been overridden by a repressive landlord class which threatened the status of the free African peasantry in a manner similar to earlier periods in Ireland or the Caribbean. From 1920 onwards, Macmillan, as a "10 years old back bench Fabian", began a long acquaintanceship with Olivier that involved regular visits when he was on leave in England to Olivier's house at Ramsden in Oxfordshire. (37) The ideas of the young South African academic undoubtedly contributed to a progressive radicalisation of Olivier's thought in a period when, in the wake of the First World War, his earlier confidence in British imperial mission had declined and his hatred of racial prejudice as "a product of war, of the bronze and the iron ages", increased. (38) His resulting studies in South African affairs were thus impelled by a growing dislike of white racism, which he now saw as a product of South Africa's particular historical trajectory which made it somewhat different from other industrial societies. It so happened, he wrote to H G Wells in 1926:

that South Africa had not extended itself from the slave system when the mining industry was thrust into it and the Land Syndicate method was set running. The combination is the direct and demonstrable motive of the poor white problem in South Africa, the White Labour Party's apprehension and the idiotic colour bar policy which is being adopted to meet them. (39)

The South African system increasingly appeared as the single most important political and ideological threat to liberal hopes in Britain for the emergence of a just and humanitarian colonial policy. As some Labour activists like Norman Leys warned of the dangers of the South African system extending to Kenya, despite the British government's professed policy of the "paramountcy" of African interests, Olivier felt impelled to expose the nature of South African segregation to an ill-informed British public. (40) The Anatomy of African Misery was published in 1927 to cause "some fury" (41), while in 1929 there was a second and substantially revised

edition of White Capital and Coloured Labour. Both works depicted South African industrialisation as part of a process of capitalist imperialism which led to the appropriation of African land in a manner "unprecedented in the history of mankind". (42) In the light of developments since his earlier analysis of 1906, British imperial policy in the region was now seen as a great betrayal and a sell-out, dated to the time Sir H B Loch was High Commissioner in South Africa in the 1890s, to "financiers and expansionist Afrikanders" (43) - a view endorsed by some recent analysis of the essential weakness of British imperial power in the region and the necessity for its collaboration with local settler power in the hope of extending the Pax Capensis northwards. (44) Given this earlier sell-out, Olivier warned that a similar process was possible in East Africa, where the "Kenya Die Hards" had attitudes which were "a direct lineal derivative of the attitudes of Afrikander theory in South Africa". (45) It was important, furthermore, Olivier argued, for British opinion to recognise the unstable nature of the South African system, for his acquaintance with white "native experts" such as Howard Pim and C T Loram had led him to recognise "the potential value of the African mind so direct and unsophisticated that it immediately ... drops on to the important note in a scale of values really common to all human intelligence". (46) Working himself slowly out of the tradition of Victorian paternalism, Olivier questioned those observers like Sir Harry Johnstone who argued that South African "native policy" was becoming more just in the 1920s. (47) Indeed, he saw the possibility of "Jacqueries" by "oppressed and dissatisfied natives", particularly if South Africa continued to be ruled by a "white aristocratic community" dependent on a "servile labouring population". There was a possibility even that the society would "overtake organised capitalism in Europe" through the "evolution of the power of the wage-earning classes". (48)

The Significance of Olivier's Thought

Olivier's analysis of South African industrialisation remained flawed, however, by its continual reliance on the peasant model as the ultimate telos for African social and economic advance. While recognising that "the development of an entirely self-supporting native peasantry would take many years to accomplish" (49), he never really moved beyond an agrarian analysis which appeared increasingly outmoded as the 1930s progressed. By 1932 Leonard Barnes, who had earlier worked with William and Margaret Ballinger in a study of the Protectorates in southern Africa, initiated a discussion of the effects of migrant labour, which he saw as undermining the power of tribal authorities, producing cheap labour power in the South African urban economy through "unfair competition with the landless, urbanised native worker of the Union" and so effectively ensuring that land in the Protectorates was "being used to give an indirect subsidy to the European employer in the Union". (50) Unlike Olivier, Barnes was far more acquainted with the permanence of African urbanisation in South Africa, and argued in The New Boer War that, in contrast to the relatively detached rural peasantry in the reserves, it was the "permanent town-dwelling native" who was "the pivotal factor" in South African politics. The central challenge was political mobilisation of urban blacks, whom he estimated as over half a million, into a force that could "function as a kind of ductless gland in the body politic, profoundly influencing the brain and modifying the temperament of the State with its invisible hormones". (51)

Despite the political limitations of Olivier's analysis of South African politics, his work was important for recognising the longer term significance of segregationism, which one historian has recently termed "the highest stage of white supremacy" and one of the most successful political ideologies in the twentieth century. Given the essential "toughness and resilience" of segregationism (52), Olivier's writings were significant in developing political debate on South Africa in British left-wing circles in the inter-war years, which eventually spilled over into more international discussion of South African racial policies by the end of the Second World War. The ultimate end of segregationism as the resettling of the entire society into self-contained and self-governing communities appeared to him, as well as to most of his fellow liberal critics, an absurd notion, given the economic interdependence of the economy. (53) At the time he wrote, though, the power of the

South African state appeared comparatively miniscule and the vast forced removals of the 1960s and 1970s unimaginable. With the emergence of the English-speaking universities in South Africa and an observable liberal intelligentsia, it seemed that the notion of "intellectual influences" could be brought to bear and state policy restructured to coincide with liberal ideals of reason and justice. The watershed period of the inter-war years, however, has proved, as De Kiewiet has pointed out, to have been one of political and ideological failure for this emergent liberal tradition. (54) From the distant vantage point of London and Oxford, Olivier hoped he might in some manner influence its development as, for example, at the Saamwerk Club - a small group of South African liberals led by D Hobart Houghton and Arthur Keppel Jones - at the University of Oxford. (55) The constituency was too small and elitist, however, to have any significant political impact, and Olivier continued to resist pressures for the nationalisation of the settler estates in East Africa. (56) By the end of the 1930s, indeed, it was Macmillan who went on to exert a greater impression on British colonial policy by urging, after a research trip to the Caribbean, the need for policy to move beyond fostering simple peasant economies towards establishing a more collectivist system of state management and Keynesian pump-priming of colonial economies to boost development programmes. By the start of the Second World War an era had effectively come to an end as more detailed academic work, such as W K Hancock's Survey of Commonwealth Affairs, began to stress the role of pre-industrial frontier conflicts in shaping modern racial attitudes and to plead for a regeneration of the liberal ethos in a manner similar to Gunnar Myrdal's argument in An American Dilemma in the United States. (57) Olivier's warnings on the possible ideological trajectory of settler segregation and its cumulative nature tended therefore to go unheeded during the 1940s, until the advent of the 1948 Nationalist government and the emergence of apartheid ideology began slowly to shock international liberal opinion out of its political complacency.

-----oOo-----

Notes

- (1) This conception of South Africa in world politics was originally mooted by C W de Kiewiet in the 1950s as a project for South African historiography. See the unpublished paper by Chris Saunders on de Kiewiet (without a title), Southern African Studies Program, Yale University, 1984, pp 25-26.
- (2) For the operation of Anglo-Saxonism in international relations, see Stuart Anderson, Race and Rapprochement: Anglo-Saxonism and Anglo-American Relations, 1895-1904 (London and Toronto: Associated University Press, 1981).
- (3) Paul Rich, "Fellow Travellers of Jim Crow: British 'race experts' and the ideology of segregation", New Community (forthcoming).
- (4) Graham Wallas Papers, BLEPS, I/93, E Pease to G Wallas, 4 February 1916.
- (5) Sydney Olivier, Capital and Land, Fabian Tract No 7 (London: 1888), p 6.
- (6) Mohammed Nuri El-Amin, "Sydney Olivier on Socialism and the Colonies", The Review of Politics, 39 (1977), pp 521-539, argues that Olivier never moved substantially beyond the argument of the 1900 Fabian Tract Fabianism and the Empire, written by George Bernard Shaw: that "advanced" countries had a right to occupy "primitive" ones and the main objectives were simply to make imperial rule more just without actually expropriating white capital. An alternative interpretation recently offered by Richard A Lobdell, "Socialism, Imperialism and Sydney Olivier", unpublished paper, University of Manitoba, 1984, is that Olivier sought to adapt Fabian socialist doctrine to different economic and social conditions according to a hierarchy of civilisation that required different degrees of socialist intervention (p 14). This paper substantially agrees with Lobdell, though Olivier's faith in this hierarchy of civilisation itself changed in the wake of the First World War and he progressively lost confidence in the notion of a western civilising mission.

- (7) Sydney Olivier, "Morals" in G Bernard Shaw (ed), Fabian Essays in Socialism (London: The Fabian Society, 1889), p 105.
- (8) George Bernard Shaw Papers, British Museum, Add 50543, Sydney Olivier to G B Shaw, 22 October 1888.
- (9) Ibid., S Olivier to G B Shaw, 1899.
- (10) For the future-orientated nature of Hobson's conception of imperialism, see the stimulating study by Norman Etherington, Theories of Imperialism, War, Conquest and Capital (London and Canberra: Croom Helm, 1984), esp pp 76-83.
- (11) Sydney Olivier, Jamaica: the Blessed Island (New York: Russell and Russell, 1936; reprinted 1971), p 103. For the rise of this peasantry, see A J G Knox, "Opportunities and Opposition: the rise of Jamaica's black peasantry and the nature of planter resistance", Canad Rev Soc & Anth 14 (4), 1977, pp 381-95; Sidney W Mintz, "Historical Sociology of the Jamaican Church-Founded Free Village System", West Indische Gids, 38 (1958), pp 46-70.
- (12) Anderson, op. cit., p 30.
- (13) W P Livingstone, Black Jamaica: a study in evolution (London: 1899), pp 165-66. The work was considerably influenced by Benjamin Kidd's works, Social Evolution and The Control of the Tropics.
- (14) J J Carroll, "The Government of Jamaica, 1910-1913, with special reference to the role of Sir Sydney Olivier", PhD thesis, University of London, 1972, pp 177-81.
- (15) Sydney Olivier, White Capital and Coloured Labour (London: ILP, 1906), p 14.
- (16) Ibid., pp 38-39.
- (17) Ibid., p 84.
- (18) Ibid., p 118.
- (19) Gareth Stedman Jones, Outcast London (Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1984), p 262.
- (20) White Capital and Coloured Labour, p 35.
- (21) Ibid., pp 95-96.
- (22) Ibid., p 122.
- (23) Ibid., p 142.
- (24) J A Hobson, The Crisis of Liberalism (Sussex: Harvester Press, 1972; 1st ed 1910), p 244.
- (25) Norman and Jeanne MacKenzie, The First Fabians (London: Quartet Books, 1979), pp 276-78.
- (26) Sidney Webb wrote an article, "Lord Rosebery's Escape from Houndsditch" in The Nineteenth Century, September 1901, pp 366-86, in which he argued for a policy of "national efficiency". Rosebery considered it "the most brilliant ... that I have read for many a day" and employed the term in a Rectorial Address at the University of Glasgow in December the same year. See G R Searle, The Quest for National Efficiency (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), p 126. See also Peter D Jacobson, "Rosebery and Liberal Imperialism, 1899-1903", The Journal of British Studies, XIII, I, November 1973, pp 92-98.
- (27) Bernard Semmel, Imperialism and Social Reform (London: Allen and Unwin, 1960), pp 169-70.
- (28) J M Winter, "The Webbs and the Non-White World: a case of socialist racialism", Journal of Contemporary History, 9, 1974, pp 181-92.
- (29) William Archer, Through Afro-America: an English reading of the race problem (London: Chapman and Hall, 1910), p XIII.
- (30) Sir Sydney Olivier, "The Government of Colonies and Dependencies", in Papers on Inter-Racial Problems communicated to the First Universal Races Congress held at the University of London, July 26-29, 1911, edited for the Congress by G Spiller, Hon Organiser of the Congress (London: P S King and Boston, The World Peace Foundation, 1911), p 295.

- (31) For a revival of neo-Cobdenism in Hobson's thought, see J A Hobson, "Do Foreign Investments Benefit the Working Classes?", Financial Review of Reviews, VII, March 1909. See also Avner Offer, "Empire and Social Reform: British overseas investment and domestic politics, 1908-1914", The Historical Journal, 26, I, 1983, pp 121-22. For the role of Hobson's ideas in the economic debates at the Universal Races Congress, see Paul B Rich, "The Baptism of a New Era: the 1911 Universal Races Congress and the liberal ideology of race", Ethnic and Racial Studies (forthcoming).
- (32) Record of the Proceedings of the First Universal Races Congress (London: P S King, 1911), p 32; Sydney Olivier, "The Transplanted African" in Margaret Olivier (ed), Selected Writings and Addresses of Sydney Olivier (London: Allen and Unwin, 1948), pp 191-92.
- (33) "The Transplanted African", p 193. For the domination of race in British imperial discourse in this period, see Graham Hamilton Munn, "Thought on Race as Part of the Ideology of British Imperialism, 1894-1904", BLitt thesis, Oxford, 1976.
- (34) Sydney Olivier, "Are We Going To Act Justly In Africa?" The Contemporary Review, CXVIII, August, 1920, p 203; "Master and Man in the Tropics" in F S Marvin (ed), Western Races and the World (London: OUP, 1922), p 242.
- (35) Sydney Olivier, "Agricultural Co-operatives and Credit", The Contemporary Review, CV, March 1914, pp 321-30.
- (36) W M Macmillan, The South African Agrarian Problem and its Historic Development (Witwatersrand, Central New Agency, 1919), p 83.
- (37) G Wallas Papers, I/64, W M Macmillan to G Wallas, 11 November 1920.
- (38) Sydney Olivier, "Colour Prejudice", The Contemporary Review, 12, 1923, p 456.
- (39) Sydney Olivier to H G Wells, 2 September 1926 in Selected Writings and Addresses.
- (40) For the role of Leys and the liberal lobby on East Africa, see Diana Wylie, "Norman Leys and McGregor Ross: a case study in the conscience of African empire, 1900-1939", Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History, 5, May 1977, pp 294-309.
- (41) G Wallas Papers, I/69, S Olivier to G Wallas, 19 December 1926. A reviewer of the book in The Nation, however, considered it a "powerful piece of argumentation ... addressed primarily to the awakening conscience in South Africa" (April 23 1927).
- (42) Lord Olivier, The Anatomy of African Misery (London: Leonard and Virginia Woolf at the Hogarth Press, 1927), p 61.
- (43) Ibid., p 62.
- (44) D M Schreuder, The Scramble for Southern Africa, 1877-1895: the politics of partition reappraised (Cambridge: CUP, 1980).
- (45) The Anatomy of African Misery, p 64. For the ideological influences of South African segregationism on Kenyan "native policy", see Richard D Wolff, The Economics of Colonialism: Britain and Kenya, 1870-1930 (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1970), pp 51-55. After World War One the drift of labour policy was towards a colonial plantation economy in the wake of the 1919 Land Settlement Commission.
- (46) G Wallas Papers, I/69, S Olivier to G Wallas, 19 December 1926.
- (47) H H Johnstone, "Race Problems in the New Africa", The Nation, 15 December 1923.
- (48) The Anatomy of African Misery, pp 66-67.
- (49) Ibid., p 75.
- (50) Leonard Barnes, "Memorandum on the South African Protectorates", Memo No 102, May 1932, Labour Party Advisory Committee on Imperial Questions (Labour Party Headquarters, Walworth Road, London), p 2.
- (51) Leonard Barnes, The New Boer War (London: Hogarth Press, 1932), p 42.
- (52) John W Cell, The Highest Stage of White Supremacy: the origin of segregation in South Africa and the American South (Cambridge: CUP, 1982), p 18.

- (53) The Anatomy of African Misery, pp 71-72; White Capital and Coloured Labour (London: The Hogarth Press, 1929), p 144.
- (54) C W de Kiewiet, The Anatomy of South African Misery (London: OUP, 1956), p 26.
- (55) Olivier spoke at the sixth meeting of the Club on November 6 1930, when 14 members and 5 guests were present. MSS Afr S 1667 (i), Minute Book of the Saamwerk Club, Oxford, founded in March 1930.
- (56) Winifred Holtby Papers, Hull Public Library, file 15, S Olivier to W Holtby, 28 June 1932.
- (57) W M Macmillan, Warning From the West Indies (Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1938; 1st ed 1936); Macmillan warned of the possible effects of introducing a plantation system in South Africa from the past history of the system in the Caribbean, "Africa and the West Indies", The African Observer, 5, 4 August 1936, pp 18-23.
- (58) W K Hancock, Survey of British Commonwealth Affairs, Vol II: problems of economic policy, 1918-1939 (London and New York: OUP, 1942). When coming to write the work, Hancock found little of the work written on South African industrialisation illuminating, "either at home or abroad": W K Hancock, Country and Calling (London: Faber and Faber, 1954), p 171. In distinguishing between "beliefs and valuations", Hancock later thought his approach similar to Myrdal's notion of "the American creed" (*ibid.*, p 174). See also, D K Fieldhouse, "Keith Hancock and Imperial Economic History" in Frederick Madden and D K Fieldhouse (eds), Oxford and the Idea of Commonwealth (London and Canberra: Croom Helm, 1982).