

THE BOXER REBELLION FAILS TO REMOVE FOREIGN CONTROL IN CHINA

1900

The Boxer Rebellion marked the final attempt of the Chinese of the Ch'ing Dynasty to throw off the yoke of foreign imperialism

Category of event: Revolutions and rebellions

Time: June–September, 1900

Locale: North China, especially Shantung and Chihli Provinces

KEY FIGURES:

Chang Chih-tung (1837-1909), the governor-general of Hunan-Hupei, famous advocate of “self-strengthening” and ardent opponent of the Boxers

Jung-lu (1836-1903), the principal adviser to Empress Dowager Tz'u-hsi *Kuang-hsü* (1871-1908), the Chinese emperor imprisoned by his aunt Tz'u-hsi in the wake of the “One Hundred Days of Reform” of 1898

Li *Hung-chang* (1823-1901), an influential Chinese official and a leading advocate of conciliation with foreign powers

Tz'u-hsi (1835-1908), China's Empress Dowager who, following the *coup d'etat* of 1898, became sole ruler

Count Alfred von Waldersee (1832-1904), the commander of the international relief force sent to Beijing

SUMMARY OF EVENT

After the First Opium War (1839-1842) with Great Britain, China was continually subjected to foreign pressure. The Treaty of Nanking (1842), following the First Opium War, and the Tientsin Treaty (1858) and Peking Convention (1860), following the Second Opium War, allowed a system of foreign enclaves, the Treaty Ports, to be set up in dozens of Chinese cities. Foreign diplomats, not Chinese officials, controlled trade, administration, the collection of customs revenues, and the dispensing of justice in the Treaty Ports. By the late 1890's, this practice of extraterritoriality had been extended to cover all foreigners, and even Chinese subjects who had converted to Christianity were exempt from the power of Chinese courts.

Starting with the cession of Hong Kong to the British in 1842, the Ch'ing (Man-chu) Dynasty had been forced to surrender territory and sovereignty as a result of war or threat. Russia exerted pressure in Manchuria

and Central Asia; France seized control of Indochina in 1884; and a newly modernized Japan humiliated China in a war over influence in Korea in 1894-1895 and took Taiwan as a prize. In the wake of the Korean defeat, the older treaty powers redoubled their efforts, and new players, especially Germany, entered the race for concessions.

Despite persistent attempts at modernization, most notably the “self-strengthening movement” led by the officials Li Hung-chang and Chang Chih-tung, imperial armies and fleets routinely found themselves overmatched. Additionally, the great Taiping Rebellion (1850-1864) and the Nien and Muslim uprisings in the 1860's and 1870's—which by some estimates collectively took upward of thirty million lives—stretched resources to the limit and devastated much of the most productive land in the empire. By the late 1890's, secret societies and antiforeign militia had proliferated, particularly in the northern provinces of Chihli, Shantung, and Shensi, where Christian missionary activity and foreign encroachment had most recently become prominent.

In November, 1897, Germany, as part of a comprehensive program of naval expansion, had demanded and received a naval base and concession at Kiaochow Bay in Shantung. The methods by which the Germans consolidated their position, including punitive forays into the surrounding countryside and demands for the safety of their missionaries, increasingly inflamed the sensibilities of local groups and officials. Among the most prominent of these was an association of secret societies called the *I-ho ch'üan* (the Association of Righteousness and Harmony), most commonly known as the “Righteous and Harmonious Fists.” As part of its ritual exercises, this group practiced the ancient Chinese art of *t'ai-chi ch'uan*, which included a form of shadow-boxing, prompting the foreign nickname of “Boxers.”

The origin of the Boxers is obscure, but it is generally agreed that several of their constituent organizations had taken part in the White Lotus Rebellion of 1796-1804. Their beliefs may be characterized as nativist and fundamentalist: a blend of Taoist naturalism, Buddhist spirituality, Confucian ethics and politics, and a strong antiforeign bent. Previously, this had taken the form of anti-Ch'ing activities because the Manchus, who had

founded the dynasty and still occupied the principal court positions, were ethnically distinct from the Han Chinese majority and were thus depicted in the Boxers' iconography as "foreign." Increasingly, however, the emphasis shifted to antimissionary activity, especially after the Germans extended their control over Shantung, the birthplace of Confucius, in 1898.

The Ch'ing government found itself in an increasingly untenable position. On one hand, it faced pressure from the Boxers and other hostile secret societies to protect the empire from foreign encroachment, while on the other, it had to recognize increasingly strident foreign demands to suppress antforeign disorder. For a brief period in the summer of 1898, it seemed as if some of these issues would be resolved. Emperor Kuang-hsü, having recently attained his majority, now attempted, under the guidance of his adviser K'ang Yu-wei, an ambitious reform of Chinese governmental institutions along the lines of the Meiji Restoration in Japan. However, this "One Hundred Days of Reform" came to an abrupt end in September, 1898, when Kuang-hsü's aunt, the Empress Dowager Tz'u-hsi, prompted by her chief adviser, Jung-lu, and fearful of the consequences of extensive reform, staged a *coup d'état*. Kuang-hsü was placed under house arrest, K'ang Yu-wei barely fled with his life, and Tz'u-hsi ruled outright, swinging the dynasty toward a much more narrowly antforeign position.

Encouraged by the tacit support of many local officials in North China, including the governor of Shantung, the Boxers staged increasingly provocative attacks on foreigners. By the summer of 1899, the major Boxer groups in Shantung, led by the Big Sword Society (*Ta-tao hui*), had taken as their slogan "*fu-Ch'ing, mieh-yang*" (support the Ch'ing, exterminate the foreigners) and with official support had now become the *I-ho t'uan*, or "Righteous and Harmonious Militia." The foreign powers, during the winter of 1899-1900, presented the Imperial Court with increasingly heated demands for suppression of the Boxers and threatened to send troops.

The Empress Dowager, impressed with the success of the militia in destroying foreign railroads and settlements, and fascinated by their claims of invulnerability to foreign bullets, called upon the army and people to defend the country from an anticipated invasion by the foreign powers. Emboldened by this outright imperial support, Boxer groups in Beijing, the metropolitan province of Chihli, and adjacent Shensi staged massive antforeign demonstrations of their own. Hundreds of missionaries and thousands of Chinese converts were

wounded and killed, often in deliberately gruesome fashion. A foreign relief force sent from Tientsin was turned back by Boxers and Chinese army units in early June. The German minister to China, Count Clemens von Ketteler, was shot down in the capital's streets. On June 21, 1900, the Ch'ing government declared war on all the treaty powers in China and commanded Boxer militia to besiege Beijing's foreign legation quarter.

The edict of June 21 directed Chinese officials throughout the empire to use their forces in conjunction with the Boxers to attack foreign strong points. With the exception of those in North China with close Boxer affiliations, however, provincial officials in the rest of the empire ignored, defied, or did their best to stall the implementation of the orders. Many of the army commanders, such as future Chinese president Yüan Shih-k'ai, maintained a considerable skepticism about the Boxers' combat abilities and did their best to stay aloof from the fighting. Disillusionment with the seemingly futile declaration of war and the leadership which implemented it, sympathy for the captive emperor and the expelled reformers, and the muted influence of more cosmopolitan Chinese officials all served to keep conditions in the capital chaotic and to blunt the force of the Boxers' siege of the legations.

By late July, a powerful international relief force of twenty thousand men, including Germans, Japanese, Americans, British, Russians, French, Austrians, and Italians, had been assembled in Tientsin under the command of Count Alfred von Waldersee. After two weeks of daily skirmishes and several intense fights, the allied forces fought their way to Beijing, entered the city through an unguarded sewer gate, and ended the siege of the legations on August 14. The court fled to Sian, most government forces surrendered quickly, and the Boxers, who had proven largely unreliable in battle, melted quickly into the North China countryside.

Incensed by the brutality meted out to foreigners and Chinese Christians at the hands of the Boxers, the allies launched continuous punitive expeditions into the suburbs of Beijing and Tientsin, burning, looting, and summarily executing suspected Boxers. International forces remained in occupation of the capital until September, 1901, and the Empress Dowager and her court did not return until the beginning of 1902.

The final peace treaty, the Boxer Protocols, accepted by the Chinese on January 16, 1901, was the most severe of the many "unequal treaties" imposed on China during

the sixty years following the First Opium War. Among its provisions were allied demands for the execution, exile, degrading, and dismissal of officials charged with collaborating with the Boxers, the suspension of official examinations (based on classical texts of Confucianism) for five years in cities where Boxer activity had taken place, foreign occupation of the Beijing-Tientsin corridor, the erection of expiatory statues of von Ketteler and other “martyrs,” and a crippling indemnity of \$333 million. The indemnity, payable over thirty-nine years at four percent interest, required installments nearly matching the annual revenue of the empire.

SIGNIFICANCE

The immediate consequence of the Boxer Rebellion and Protocols was that the Ch’ing Dynasty effectively squandered its diminished legitimacy in the eyes of both the Chinese and the rest of the world while the roots of nationalism spread steadily, especially among Chinese communities abroad. While China avoided the fate of partition, the Manchu government appeared to be largely under the control of foreign powers. The weakness and lack of moral prestige of the central government contributed greatly to the trend toward regionalism which had been growing since mid-century. The most reactionary officials were purged, but people of ability, particularly those with modern or foreign training, tended to avoid taking their place in a government that had proven itself lacking in its hour of crisis. For the city dwellers in the ports and the peasants in the countryside, it appeared that nothing had been accomplished except an increase in foreign arrogance, Manchu ineptitude, and their own misery.

The empire was now in severe financial straits. The customs revenue (already under foreign control), internal transit taxes, and salt tax collectively proved inadequate to service the indemnity. The result was both a large increase in the tax burden of Chinese subjects and also the wholesale borrowing of money from Western banks to make the scheduled installments.

The Empress Dowager, fearful of reform in 1898, now reluctantly allowed many of the edicts of the “Hundred Days” to be implemented. The official examinations were abandoned in favor of more modern curricula. Army training was revamped to give an emphasis on modern weapons and tactics. A number of sinecure positions in the bureaucracy were eliminated. The most ambitious of the reforms was an alteration of the form of government

itself. Chinese officials toured the West, studying various legislative systems. A plan for a constitutional monarchy was prepared, and in 1909 and 1910 elections were held for regional and national parliamentary bodies.

Already, however, the initiative had passed to a wide spectrum of reformers and revolutionaries for whom the Boxer Rebellion had proven conclusively that the Ch’ing had grown incapable of reform and too weak to rule. They ranged from the exiled K’ang Yu-wei, whose Constitutional Monarchist Party was soon superseded, to radical anarchist cells specializing in bombings and assassinations. Ultimately, the Revolutionary Alliance of Sun Yat-sen, encompassing a variety of republican, nationalist, reform, and secret society organizations, would mount the blow destined to topple this last Chinese dynasty on October 10, 1911. On February 12, 1912, the boy emperor P’u-i abdicated, ending millennia years of imperial rule.

Charles A. Desnoyers

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Duiker, William J. *Cultures in Collision: The Boxer Rebellion*. San Rafael, Calif.: Presidio Press, 1978. A pioneering attempt to examine the cultural aspects of tradition and modernity as the background for the rise of the Boxers. English language references only.
- Esherick, Joseph. *The Origins of the Boxer Uprising*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987. A major revisionist study based on extensive Chinese archival material and oral histories. Argues that the Boxers were never antidynastic, but instead that their opposition to Christianity grew out of the “social ecology” of the region. Scholarly yet readable. Numerous appendices and references.
- Fleming, Peter. *The Siege at Peking*. London: Hart-Davis, 1959. Competent, solid, in the best tradition of English popular history. Extensive coverage of battle plans, tactics, and fortifications. Dated English language bibliography; no Chinese or Japanese sources.
- O’Connor, Richard. *The Spirit Soldiers: A Historical Narrative of the Boxer Rebellion*. New York: Putnam, 1973. Gripping narrative history of the rebellion with an emphasis on explicating Chinese motives and activities. Strong ironic tone in treating the issues of imperialism and international cooperation. Efforts at deeper appreciation of Chinese conditions are undercut by a lack of Chinese sources.

Price, Eva Jane. *China Journal, 1889-1900: An American Missionary Family During the Boxer Rebellion*. New York: Scribner, 1989. A fine description of the strengths, shortcomings, and ultimate tragedy of the missionary enterprise in China as seen through the eyes of its practitioners. The letters and journal of the Prices, right up to the hour of their execution at the hands of a fraudulent military escort, reflect their deep love of the people, unflagging fortitude and good humor, and ultimate inability to comprehend fully the reasons for their fate.

Tan, Chester C. *The Boxer Catastrophe*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1971. Classic study, using extensive Chinese source material, of the diplomatic history of the rebellion. Tan's thesis that imperialism and Ch'ing ineptitude were the main causes of the movement has

long been the standard interpretation. The volume is scholarly without being overly pedantic, and its great wealth of sources makes it highly useful to the expert as well as to the layperson.

See Also: Sun Yat-sen Overthrows the Ch'ing Dynasty (1911); Students Demonstrate for Reform in China's May Fourth Movement (1919); Japanese Troops Brutalize Chinese After the Capture of Nanjing (1937); China Initiates a Genocide Policy Toward Tibetans (1950); China Occupies Tibet (1950); Mao Delivers His "Speech of One Hundred Flowers" (1956); The Chinese Cultural Revolution Starts a Wave of Repression (1966); Demonstrators Gather in Tiananmen Square (1989).

THE PHILIPPINES ENDS ITS UPRISING AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

1902

Expansionism by the United States in the Philippines awakened feelings of ambivalence, selfishness, and altruism among the American people regarding treatment of Filipinos

Categories of event: Revolutions and rebellions; atrocities and war crimes

Time: 1902

Locale: The Philippines

KEY FIGURES:

William McKinley (1843-1901), the president of the United States from 1897 until his assassination early in 1901

Theodore Roosevelt (1858-1919), the president of the United States (replacing McKinley) from 1901 to 1909, who continued McKinley's expansionist policy

Elihu Root (1845-1937), the secretary of war from 1899 to 1904, chief engineer of the Philippine policy

Emilio Aguinaldo (1869-1964), the leader of the struggle for Philippine independence, captured in 1901 and held in Manila as a prisoner of the U.S. Army

Henry Cabot Lodge (1850-1924), a Republican senator from Massachusetts

Gamaliel Bradford (1863-1932), the cofounder of the Anti-Imperialist League, who harshly criticized the imperialist policies of the United States

Cornelius Gardener (1849-1921), a major in the U.S. Army who served as United States governor of Tayabas Province in the Philippines

SUMMARY OF EVENT

The Spanish-American War of 1898 led to a number of direct territorial annexations by the United States of America. In December, 1898, a peace treaty was signed between the United States and Spain which officially turned over to the United States the islands of Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. In the case of the latter, \$20 million was paid by the United States to Spain. Even with this remuneration, the taking of the Philippines by America led to heated debates within the McKinley Administration: Should this group of islands be left to themselves, or should they receive "guidance" through suzerainty from the victorious American nation? In the end, the fate of the Philippines was left to President McKinley, who believed that the Filipinos were ignorant and childlike, and therefore unfit for self-government. McKinley chose to "educate, uplift, civilize, and Christianize" them by annexing the islands.

Secretary of War Elihu Root was appointed official overseer of this process. He organized and charged a newly created Philippine Commission to maintain the “happiness, peace, and prosperity of the people” and committed the United States government to the establishment of courts, municipal governments, a civil service, and schools.

Under a policy of “benevolent assimilation,” Filipinos were to be integrated officially into Western culture as espoused and practiced by the United States. Implicit in this cultural ideal was the rhetoric of Social Darwinism: natural selection and survival of the fittest. For the most part, Americans viewed the Filipinos with a mixture of condescension and scorn, secure in the belief that Filipinos were incapable of managing their own affairs. Attitudes such as these began to manifest themselves in a blend of selfishness and altruism. Many believed that the acquisition of territory by the United States was always motivated by the highest ideals. On the other hand, the American articulation of expansionist policies in the Philippines, which promoted Social Darwinian principles, often resulted in racist notions such as the concept of the “white man’s burden.” This burden made the wearing of the mantle of expansionism a somewhat difficult task for many Americans. Consequently, the entire Philippine incursion was treated by the American people with a mixture of ambivalence, selfishness, and altruism. “Benevolent assimilation” began to be defined by those government officials who were implementing it, and American policy tended to confront public ambivalence with a good dose of patriotic selfishness. In the process, altruism was all but lost as “benevolent assimilation” was implemented more for American goals than for Philippine self-determination. American benevolence became a policy which thrived on the acquisition of territory for its own end. Any Philippine opposition to this policy was seen as the failure of the Filipino culture to grasp the ideas of progress, thereby justifying McKinley’s assessment of Filipinos’ unfitness for self-governance.

American policy in the Philippines was always justified as humanitarian by design, especially when compared to the decidedly inhumane policies of the previous Spanish rule. For their part, the Filipinos apparently did not see any difference between the two outside ruling powers. In 1899, under the leadership of Emilio Aguinaldo, the Philippine Insurrection began. Aguinaldo had originally proposed (for services rendered to the United States against the Spanish during the war) Philippine independence within a United States protectorate. His

proposal was rejected immediately by the American government following the removal of Spanish suzerainty over the islands. Instead of negotiating with the insurgents and assisting the Filipino people in their struggle for self-determination, the United States elected to go to war with the *insurrectos*, using seventy thousand American troops to crush the indigenous independence movement. Any pretext of rescuing the Filipinos from latent Spanish oppressive rule was all but abandoned by the end of 1899. American ideals of peacefully “civilizing the uncivilized” were soon replaced with racist attitudes which were implemented savagely. The Filipinos, even without significant weaponry, soon managed to return such savagery. This was a short-lived response. The American military and economic power were, in the long run, too much for the *insurrectos*, and in 1902 the conflict came to an end.

Beginning in July of 1901, the Roosevelt Administration “elevated the application of extreme measures . . . into a policy that was official and acknowledged.” Such measures were often brutal. Letters revealing to soldiers’ loved ones the harshness and wickedness of the insurrection began to find their way into print shortly after the Roosevelt policy was put into effect. Writing in the Springfield, Massachusetts *Daily Republican* on April 9, 1902, publicist and historian Gama-liel Bradford described the savagery of the infamous “water cure” to his American readers: “placing a man on his back, forcing open his mouth and pouring into him a pail of water, till he swells up like a toad, and then squeezing it out again.” An extract in the *New York Evening Post* of April 8, 1902, described the water cure in more vivid detail:

If the tortures I’ve mentioned are hellish, the water cure is plain hell. The native is thrown upon the ground, and, while his legs and arms are pinned, his head is raised partially so as to make pouring in the water an easier matter. An attempt to keep the mouth closed is of no avail, a bamboo stick or a pinching of the nose will produce the same effect. . . . A gallon of water is much but it is followed by a second and a third . . . a fourth and even a fifth gallon. . . . By this time the body becomes an object frightful to contemplate.

Associated Press dispatches from Manila in the last week of January, 1902, noted without comment that General J. Franklin Bell, United States Army commander of the troublesome southern Luzon province of Batangas, had recently instituted new measures for the pacification of the Philippines. Veterans of this new

campaign corroborated the resulting action by describing the herding of entire village populations into detention camps, where they would be under the surveillance and guard of American troops to “ensure the isolation of insurgent guerrillas.” According to Colonel Arthur Wagner, the American Army officer in charge of isolating insurgent guerrillas in Batangas province, all civilians were to enter these camps with no belongings. Detention centers on average allowed a twelve-foot by six-foot area for each inhabitant. A soldier under General Bell’s command insisted that Bell’s inhumanity exceeded that of the hated Spaniards: “They were content with ‘concentrating’ the miserable women and children left after the devastation of farms and villages, but General Bell marks the husbands and fathers and brothers as criminals to be hanged when caught.”

The indigenous population was not the only victim during the insurrection. The environment also suffered greatly. The American Army, charged with the “extensive burning of barrios” so that the *insurrectos* could not find sanctuary, destroyed hundreds of thousands of acres of fertile land in their attempts to pacify the natives. Testifying before the Lodge Committee, which investigated wartime atrocities, Major Cornelius Gardener stated that environmental destruction on this scale was necessary if the Army was going to induce a famine. Apparently, the insurgents—including any village suspected of housing or of even being related to an *insurrecto*—could not be allowed to find food anywhere. This campaign of starvation was relatively successful. Gardener went on to report that one-third of the population had been killed by military slaughter, famine, or pestilence.

SIGNIFICANCE

It was the view of many Americans that the Philippine Insurrection had to be crushed. The United States had fought for the islands and had officially purchased them from Spain: Why give them up to an undeserving indigenous population? Furthermore, if the United States did not control the islands, then the Germans or the British would most certainly colonize them. Finally, the duty to extend Christianity and civilization was part of the American mission to tutor backward peoples. These reasons, along with a foreign policy elite who believed that America must prove its power through an aggressive policy abroad, help to explain why there was so little attention paid to the inhumanity of this mission. To gloss over or cover up any wartime atrocities would

show America to be weak; any nation which was weak would not expand, and any nation that did not expand would perish. In the eyes of American policy engineers, this attitude provided sufficient justification for the use of extreme measures. “It is not civilized warfare, [because] we are not dealing with civilized people. The only thing that they know and fear is force, violence, and brutality, and we give it to them.” These attitudes, fueled by Social Darwinian principles, were pervasive in American society at the turn of the twentieth century and were actualized abroad by American forces in the Philippines.

Many American troops looked at the Filipinos as being of one race and condition. Because they were dark-skinned, these soldiers labeled them “niggers,” an extension of the contempt they had for African Americans back home. United States governmental proclamations complemented these feelings. By implying the inferiority of the Filipinos, many government edicts reflected the recently formalized Jim Crow codes of the South and the segregationist practices of the cities and unions of the North. The individual American soldier in the Philippines became an overseer, a master to an inferior race which needed discipline and training so as to be properly integrated into the Western ideal. The name given to this training was “benevolent assimilation.” The force to implement this assimilation was imperialism, bothersome to many Americans because it showed a powerful nation being driven by brute expansionism, camouflaged by a cultural atmosphere of altruism.

*Thomas Jay Edward Walker
Cynthia Gwynne Yaudes*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- May, Glenn Anthony. *Social Engineering in the Philippines: The Aims, Execution, and Impact of American Colonial Policy, 1900-1913*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1980. A comparative history, the goal of which is to study the impact of one set of values upon another. Analyzes the values and goals of Americans who made Philippine policy and of Filipinos upon whom it was imposed. Challenges the widely held view of the United States as an essentially successful colonial power. Includes appendices, index, and bibliographical essay.
- Miller, Stuart Creighton. *Benevolent Assimilation: The American Conquest of the Philippines, 1899-1903*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1982. Explores American imperialism as an aberration

or as part of a historical continuum, focusing specifically on the conquest of the Philippines. Creighton draws upon a wide range of views from generals, presidents, and soldiers to analyze the war itself and its challenge to America's sense of innocence. Contains a bibliography and an index.

Schirmer, Daniel B. *Republic or Empire: American Resistance to the Philippine War*. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman, 1972. A carefully researched study of the period in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries during which the United States conclusively turned to an imperial course. Deals especially with the American anti-imperialists who appeared in force during this era and gives attention to the Philippine War they so vigorously opposed. Extensive exemplification through primary sources makes this a valuable research source.

Storey, Moorfield, and Julian Codman. *Secretary Root's Record: "Marked Severities" in Philippine Warfare*. Boston: George H. Ells, 1902. A valuable primary source which documents the "actions and utterances" of President Roosevelt and Secretary Root during the Philippine-American War, as noted in the "Law and Facts Hearing." Reprints telegraphic circulars concerning American military tactics which traveled between the Philippines and Washington, D.C. Storey and Codman also provide some revealing commentary on this correspondence and on testimony from the hearing.

Storey, Moorfield, and Marcial P. Lichauco. *The Conquest of the Philippines by the United States, 1898-1925*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1926.

Supplements and comments upon *Secretary Root's Record*. Suggests that the American people were led, through false statements and suppression of the truth, to support the taking of the Philippines and to believe in the "American mission." The lack of an index makes this book cumbersome for research use.

Welch, Richard E., Jr. *Response to Imperialism: The United States and the Philippine-American War, 1899-1902*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979. Analyzes the response of various sectors of American society to imperialism and to the Philippine-American War. Responses are analyzed in a manner that reveals the strength of such social forces as racism and patriotism. Bibliography and index.

See Also: The Boxer Rebellion Fails to Remove Foreign Control in China (1900); Legal Norms of Behavior in Warfare Formulated by the Hague Conference (1907); U.S. Marines Are Sent to Nicaragua to Quell Unrest (1912); Soldiers Massacre Indian Civilians in Amritsar (1919); The Atlantic Charter Declares a Postwar Right of Self-Determination (1941); Roosevelt Approves Internment of Japanese Americans (1942); Marcos Declares Martial Law in the Philippines (1972); The United Nations Issues a Declaration Against Torture (1975); Indigenous Indians Become the Target of Guatemalan Death Squads (1978); Opposition Leader Benigno Aquino Is Assassinated (1983).

REFORMERS EXPOSE ATROCITIES AGAINST CONGOLESE LABORERS

1903

King Leopold II of Belgium colonized the Congo Basin and maximized his personal profits by terrorizing and committing unspeakable atrocities against the people of the Congo

Categories of event: Workers' rights and civil rights

Time: 1903

Locale: Belgian Congo

KEY FIGURES:

Leopold II (1835-1909), the royal monarch of Belgium, whose reign over the Belgian Congo created one of the worst labor scandals in colonial history

Sir Charles Dilke (1843-1911), an author and radical member of the British Parliament committed to the welfare of Africans, who exposed Leopold's atrocities to the British Parliament

Edmond D. Morel (1873-1924), the chairman of the Congo Reform Association, which fought to end King Leopold's rule of the Belgian Congo

Tippu Tib (1837-1905), an Arab-Swahili trader, merchant, and administrator in Central Africa whose empire in the Eastern Congo was absorbed by Leopold II

Henry Morton Stanley (1841-1904), a journalist, soldier, explorer, and pioneer of Central Africa

SUMMARY OF EVENT

As Europe emerged from its Dark Ages, it struggled to break the Arab stranglehold on trade by developing sea routes to other continents. By the late 1400's, Portugal had pioneered sea routes along Africa's west and southern coasts. During explorations of Africa's coast, Europeans made contact with many African states that had achieved roughly equal levels of political development. Among these was the Congo kingdom.

Europe became wealthy as a result of a bloody and violent trade that developed in African slaves. Moral outrage and declining profits, however, curtailed the slave trade in the New World by the late 1800's. Europeans sought a new basis for their relationship with Africa and tried free trade. Africans proved so adept at pitting European rivals against each other that they nearly caused wars in Europe between rival commercial partners. To prevent competition from escalating out of control, fourteen world powers convened a conference in Berlin in 1884-1885. In essence, they carved up Africa among themselves. Belgium received the Congo and the right to monopolize internal and external trade and government.

King Leopold II of Belgium convinced the Berlin conference to grant him exclusive control over the Congo by declaring that the state he would establish in the Congo would be a neutral field for all commercial activity and that the natives would benefit from the blessings of justice and good government. He denounced material motives for acquiring the Congo. Great Britain, fearing French and Portuguese rivalry, preferred to support Leopold, who appeared to them as weak and no real threat. Germany also supported Leopold's claim as one means of taking the French government's mind off Rhine territory lost to Germany.

Immediately after his claims on the Congo were given international recognition, Leopold II began assembling a vast African army commanded by Belgian officers. Many "recruits" were forced into service against their will. Boys as young as eleven years of age

were conscripted, trained, and used as porters and as the core of future regiments. Officers were paid bonuses for every conscript recruited, whether voluntarily or involuntarily. Ruthless force was applied to those who refused to go voluntarily.

Arab slave traders were initially used by Leopold II as high and mid-level administrators. The most famous of these Swahili-Arabs was Tippu Tib, who had helped Henry Morton Stanley pacify the Congo Basin Africans and had become the chief administrator of the Eastern provinces. Tib demanded a share of the ivory profits earned in his districts. This annoyed the ambitious and greedy Leopold II. He declared to Berlin conference members his abhorrence of slavery and opposition to Arab slave traders. Leopold ordered his armies to annihilate all Arabs operating in the Congo. This earned for him the praise of Europe and left him as the undisputed ruler of the Congo. Tippu Tib and other Swahili-Arabs who survived this war lived out the balance of their lives in exile on the island of Zanzibar, off the coast of Tanzania.

Leopold II then issued clandestine orders to remove all non-Belgian European merchants from his territory. This was accomplished in part through heavy taxation, which ruined many merchants and forced others to relocate. It became apparent that Leopold II had never intended to honor his promise of making the Congo a neutral commercial zone.

Leopold's next move was to order that all officers securing very low prices for ivory be paid big personal bonuses; officers buying ivory from natives at high prices were given either small bonuses or no bonus at all. This guaranteed that Leopold would acquire large quantities of cheap ivory. His officers imposed ivory quotas upon villages. If a village's quota was not met, the village chief, along with village women and children, was kidnapped and held until the ivory quota was met. Selected victims were killed to force compliance when kidnapping proved to be insufficient motivation.

The pneumatic rubber tire was growing in popularity, and there was a growing demand for rubber on world markets. Rubber vines and trees grew in abundance in the Congo. Seeing this opportunity, Leopold established rubber quotas for villages in addition to ivory quotas. Chiefs were told to force villagers to supply the quota demanded or suffer punishment. Noncompliance was considered an act of rebellion, and Leopold's soldiers declared war on rebellious villages. Armed with rifles, his soldiers easily overwhelmed villagers armed with

spears, bows and arrows, swords, and clubs. For every bullet fired in a village raid, Belgian officers demanded that their African soldiers present them with one left hand as proof that a rebel had been eliminated. In the 1890's, white officers became suspicious of their African troops' loyalty. Subsequently, whites demanded that their African soldiers bring them both the right hand and genitals of males killed. This was deemed necessary to prevent soldiers from killing women and children and presenting their hands as evidence that they had crushed a rebellion. Women and children from rebellious villages, if captured, were enslaved and forced into both prostitution and involuntary collection of rubber.

Soldiers also forced villagers to supply all the fish, meat, vegetables, and fruit that they ate, regardless of season. Fish are abundant, for example, only during certain seasons of the year. A villager who could not catch the quota often had to travel far downriver and buy the balance at exorbitant prices. In extreme cases, to make such payments a son or daughter was sold into slavery.

Leopold II claimed that he eliminated slavery in the Congo when, in fact, he had merely introduced it in a new form and driven out potential Arab competitors. Africans were forced to go deeper and deeper into forests occupied by leopards, venomous snakes, and other threats. They often neglected to grow food for themselves to ensure that they met their excessive rubber quotas. The only escape from Leopold's tyrannical reign of terror was death or escape to another colonial territory.

On top of other demands, Leopold forced each village to repair specified sections of roads, railway tracks, and harbors. Most of his African subjects suffered from a chronic lack of sleep and poor nutrition. Sleeping sickness and malaria killed many in areas where these diseases had been rare before Belgian rule. Populations declined by more than 60 percent between 1890 and 1900. In many cases, whole villages migrated to neighboring colonies to escape Leopold's cruelties.

Missionaries reported these atrocities as early as 1892. Their reports were ignored until Leopold's soldiers began raiding villages in British colonies and capturing Africans. Those who survived often returned home missing their left ears, left hands, or left feet. British officials were outraged that such atrocities were committed against British subjects for Leopold II's personal gain. Sir Charles Dilke, a radical member of the British Parliament, introduced evidence of these atrocities into parliamentary debates in 1897, 1903, 1904, 1905, and 1906. This created public awareness

of these atrocities in Europe. Leopold consistently denied that he ordered, condoned, or had knowledge of these horrors. He gagged the Roman Catholic church by assassinating irritating missionaries and declared that rival rubber merchants, jealous of his success, were using agitation against him to mask their own personal ambitions.

The fact remained that the Congo's forests and natural resources were being used not to benefit the Congo's inhabitants but to profit King Leopold II and his associates. Henry Richard Fox Bourne of the Aborigines Protection Society began writing extensively about the atrocities in the Congo. Edmond Morel, another reformer and convincing writer, also began publishing accounts of these atrocities as well as accusing Leopold of knowingly recruiting members of cannibal tribes from the Sudan into his army. Morel shocked Europe by reporting cases of reluctant rubber laborers being mutilated and eaten by Leopold's men. He claimed that white officers knew of these crimes and ignored them as long as ivory, rubber, and food quotas were met. He further claimed that Leopold invited European officials who were disenchanted with his policies to dine with him in Brussels, at his expense. They were offered a percentage of profits from their areas in return for covering up atrocities used to gain compliance with his labor demands. Many accepted his bribes and kept quiet, fearing that assassination was the alternative. Some who refused to cooperate later disappeared. Wild animals were alleged to be the cause of death.

In 1903, an outraged European public organized the Congo Reform Association in an effort to end Leopold's wanton abuse of power and public trust. European opinion noted that people should have the right to trade freely in the produce of their soil and to enjoy the fruits of their labor. Trade, free labor, and the right to possess private property were believed to be basic human rights and the essential basis of economics. Denial to the Congolese of their right to trade goods and labor was thought to strangle their development and reduce them to permanent slavery.

Leopold had thus violated Congolese rights by declaring that the state could appropriate all salable products of the land on which his citizens dwelt. In practice, he also appropriated their labor and gave them no judicial means to challenge these acts. Leopold thus destroyed a potentially mutually profitable relationship between whites and Africans throughout the Congo. Africans were reduced to tenants on Leopold's property rather than proud landowners.

Sir Charles Dilke, Sir Harry Johnston, Sir Edward Grey, Henry Fox Bourne, Edmond Morel, and the Congo Reform Association decided that Leopold's crimes against humanity were so heinous that his rule must be ended. From 1903 to 1908, they campaigned vigorously against Leopold. Public opinion in Belgium forced Leopold to resign, despite the fact that he surrendered the Congo to the Belgian public in a final failed ploy to maintain monopolistic control over commerce in the Congo. Defeated, humiliated, and broken, Leopold died in 1909, soon after handing over control of the Congo to a reform-minded Belgian government.

SIGNIFICANCE

An Italian official in Leopold's Congo government once noted that the black slave trade should have been labeled the white slave trade. Officials with a sense of decency came to the Congo filled with Belgian patriotism and human compassion, thinking that their mission was to uplift the natives. Such men were told, after reaching the Congo, to get rubber using the most barbaric and inhumane means conceivable. In this living hell, many perished from self-inflicted gunshots. Like the Africans, they too were victims of Leopold's system with its heartless, cruel policies. That system turned decent men into pitiful brutes, while Leopold and his associates in Belgium quietly pocketed the profits produced. Ultimately, Leopold was responsible for the anguish, suffering, and denial of rights of millions of Africans whom he had reduced to misery, poverty, and slavery. Leopold preferred to call this his "taxation scheme." No public accounts were produced to account for these taxes, and in fact, Leopold was their principal beneficiary.

Duplicity and deceit could not disguise Leopold's atrocities forever. Clean, healthy, prosperous, densely populated villages were reduced to ghost towns under his rule. The few malnourished, dirty, impoverished inhabitants who remained were those too sick, weak, or frightened to flee.

Denied their rights, whole regions fought back by rebelling. The wars of rebellion that occurred bear testimony to the resilience of the human spirit, even under appalling inhuman conditions. The rebellions also show that war and widespread bloodshed should be expected responses to attempts to deny people their fundamental human rights. The courage of the decent Africans and Europeans who stood up to and fought against Leopold's tyranny helped safeguard human rights for millions of people.

Acts establishing a new colonial charter for the Congo and transferring it to Belgian control, rather than Leopold's personal control, were passed in 1908. Forced labor was not outlawed under the new charter, and many of Leopold's administrators kept their positions. The efforts of Morel and other reformers, however, gradually dismantled Leopold's system. In June, 1913, the Congo Reform Association dissolved itself, having determined that the process of reform had gone far enough.

Dallas L. Browne

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anstey, Roger. *Britain and the Congo in the Nineteenth Century*. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press, 1962. Recounts Britain's rivalry for control of the Lower Congo and coast, followed by a period of collaboration with Leopold and consequent evolution of a policy to reform his government. Anstey explains why British plans to use Leopold as an instrument for their own exploitation of the Congo failed.
- King Leopold's Legacy: The Congo Under Belgian Rule 1908-1960*. London: Oxford University Press, 1966. The Belgian government, Anstey argues, inherited a country whose tribal traditions and customary institutions had been badly damaged by King Leopold. It also inherited his forced labor system, with all of its abuses and atrocities. Anstey blames Leopold for the inadequate preparation of Africans to accept independence in 1960.
- Doyle, A. Conan. *The Crime of the Congo*. New York: Doubleday, Page, 1909. Doyle's book accuses Leopold of committing the greatest crimes in human history up to 1904. A passionate and scathing indictment of the Congo Free State.
- Keith, Arthur Berriedale. *The Belgian Congo and the Berlin Act*. New York: Clarendon Press, 1919. This book describes defects in the Berlin Act that were revealed by Leopold's abuse of power and privilege in the Congo. It suggests amendments to the act which would ensure that it delivered the benefits of civilization and freedom of trade to Africans under European tutelage.
- Morel, Edmond D. *Edmond D. Morel's History of the Congo Reform Movement*. Edited by William Roger Louis and Jean Stengers. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press, 1968. A fascinating autobiographical account of Edmond Morel's life and his successful crusade against labor abuse and atrocities in Leopold's

Belgian Congo. Provides the best contemporary record available of the Congo Reform Association and extensive supplementary material.

———. *Red Rubber: The Story of the Rubber Slave Trade Flourishing on the Congo in the Year of France 1906*. New York: Negro Universities Press, 1906. A vivid record of Leopold's atrocities and a passionate plea to free humanity from them.

Slade, Ruth. *King Leopold's Congo: Aspects of the Development of Race Relations in the Congo Independent State*. London: Oxford University Press, 1962. Recounts the history of racial contact and the evolution of race relations in the Congo. Captures the debate in Belgium concerning whether Africans were capable of improvement and high culture.

Starr, Frederick. *The Truth About the Congo*. Chicago: Forbes, 1907. A collection of a series of *Chicago Tribune* newspaper articles written between January 20 and February 3, 1907, which exposed the American public to atrocities in the Congo.

See Also: The Belgian Government Annexes the Congo (1908); The League of Nations Adopts the International Slavery Convention (1926); Ethiopia Abolishes Slavery (1942); The United Nations Amends Its International Slavery Convention (1953); The United Nations Adopts the Abolition of Forced Labor Convention (1957).

THE PANKHURSTS FOUND THE WOMEN'S SOCIAL AND POLITICAL UNION

1903

Through the use of civil disobedience and militant obstructionism, the WSPU introduced the issue of women's political rights into the mainstream of pre-World War I British politics

Categories of event: Voting rights and women's rights

Time: October 10, 1903

Locale: Manchester, England

KEY FIGURES:

Emmeline Pankhurst (1858-1928), a leader of the women's suffrage movement in Great Britain; formed the Women's Social and Political Union (WSPU) in 1903

Christabel Pankhurst (1880-1958), Emmeline Pankhurst's daughter and cofounder of the WSPU

Sylvia Pankhurst (1882-1960), Emmeline Pankhurst's daughter and a leader of the women's suffrage movement in Great Britain

Millicent Garrett Fawcett (1847-1929), a leader of the women's suffrage movement in Great Britain; president of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies (1897-1919)

H. H. Asquith (1852-1928), the leader of the Liberal Party and prime minister of Great Britain (1908-1916)

David Lloyd George (1863-1945), the leader of the Liberal Party and prime minister of Great Britain (1916-1922)

Reginald McKenna (1863-1943), the home secretary in the Liberal government in Great Britain (1911-1915)

SUMMARY OF EVENT

There are few examples of women being treated as equal to men in the history of humankind prior to the mid-nineteenth century. Inequality was the result of religious teachings, prejudice, and law. Women systematically were denied, solely on the basis of their gender, educational opportunity, meaningful employment, the right to vote, basic human rights, and a legal identity. This slowly began to change in Western societies as the result of the liberal ideas of the Enlightenment (during the eighteenth century) and as the result of the changes wrought by the Industrial Revolution (in the nineteenth century).

Great Britain was the first nation to experience an industrial revolution. Economic development led to demands by the emerging middle class for political change. The Reform Bill of 1832 extended suffrage to most middle-class males. Within one generation, the Liberal Party emerged, representing the middle class and heir to the Enlightenment ideas of the rights of man. Reform bills in 1867 and 1884 extended the right



Emmeline Pankhurst is arrested outside Buckingham Palace, 1914
(Courtesy Imperial War Museum via Wikimedia Commons)

to vote to most adult males in Britain. Social legislation provided for a basic public education, improved factory conditions, and solutions to some of the social ills caused by industrialism.

Very little of the social legislation dealt with inequality based upon gender. In the nineteenth century, British women were treated as inferior. Stereotypes and prejudices portrayed women as weak and incapable in most areas. Only after 1887 did married women have the right to own property and to enter into contracts on an equal basis with unmarried women. Most professions and occupations were closed by statute to women. The only professions that were socially acceptable were those of teacher, secretary, or homemaker. Industry, particularly the textile industry, employed women in large numbers but usually in nonskilled, low-paying jobs.

There were some who believed that the Enlightenment ideas of the “rights of man” should apply to all people. *A Vindication of the Rights of Women* (1792) by

Mary Wollstonecraft and *On the Subjection of Women* (1869) by John Stuart Mill were early statements on the need for, and the right of, woman suffrage. In the 1860's, small groups of educated, middle-class women began forming to discuss the need for woman suffrage. The National Society for Women's Suffrage (1867), under the leadership of Lydia Becker, and the Women's Franchise League (1889), under the leadership of Richard and Emmeline Pankhurst, were the most important organizations advocating woman suffrage.

The National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies (NUWSS) was formed in 1897 under the leadership of Millicent Fawcett. This organization continued the policy of working within the political system to achieve the vote for women. The Liberal Party offered only nominal support for woman suffrage and made no serious attempt to introduce legislation granting women the right to vote. The Conservative Party was overtly hostile to the idea, and the House of Lords, with its right of veto, was dominated by Conservatives.

With little to show from decades of working within the constitutional guidelines, a more militant approach to the issue was proposed. The death of Richard Pankhurst in 1898 temporarily forced Emmeline Pankhurst to abandon political activity and to devote her efforts to providing a living for her family. Her daughter, Christabel, who studied law but could not practice because of her gender, began working with the North of England Society for Women's Suffrage, an organization primarily for working women.

To the great irritation of the Pankhursts, the Manchester branch of the Independent Labour Party (ILP) refused to admit women to a meeting hall which was named for Richard Pankhurst. The ILP was the logical political home for the proposed group, but Labour politicians were largely disinterested in woman suffrage as an issue. The Pankhursts thus decided to form their own group, the Women's Social and Political Union (WSPU). On October 10, 1903, the first meeting was held at the Manchester home of Mrs. Pankhurst.

Little is known of the early meetings, as records of minutes, strategy, finances, and membership no longer exist. Two facts are clear: Men were excluded from membership, and the WSPU had a clear platform. In December, 1903, a WSPU pamphlet stated

... for all purposes connected with, and having reference to, the right to vote at Parliamentary elections, words in the Representation of the People Act importing the masculine gender shall include women.

Simply translated, universal manhood suffrage should be understood to mean universal personhood suffrage. The statement of purpose by the WSPU was not new, but the group's method of attracting attention to the issue was. Politics in Great Britain relied upon the constitutional method, that is, formal procedures which were to be followed in a prescribed manner. Earlier reform campaigns occasionally had resorted to nontraditional political tactics, such as propaganda campaigns, mass rallies and marches, demonstrations, and civil disobedience. The problem was always one of attracting the attention of the establishment and achieving a goal before the nontraditional tactics alienated that same establishment.

Prior to the WSPU, women's suffrage groups had not only followed the unwritten rules of political activism but had remained true to the stereotype of women. The Pankhursts observed that following the rules had achieved nothing. Over the next decade, the WSPU utilized every traditional and nontraditional tactic available. In addition to traditional speeches, rallies, and printed materials, WSPU suffragists made press headlines by heckling and taunting politicians wherever possible. In October, 1905, two women were ejected forcibly from a Manchester meeting hall and then arrested. The incident taught the WSPU that militancy attracted far more publicity than traditional tactics.

At first, militancy was subordinate to constitutional methods. Occasionally women suffragists were arrested, and hunger strikes were held to call attention to the movement. When force-feeding was used and several women were injured, the WSPU became more militant. In 1909, the first stone-throwing incidents occurred. This escalated by 1912 into even more violent acts such as the smashing of shop windows, arson, and vandalism of art works.

Government response to the militancy was predictable. Police raided WSPU headquarters and arrested suffragist leaders. Hunger strikes soon followed, and, in 1913, the government passed the Prisoners' Temporary Discharge for Ill-Health Act. The "Cat and Mouse Act," as it was quickly dubbed, allowed the government to release prisoners on hunger strike and rearrest them later. Also during this period, Emily Davison achieved martyrdom when she was killed after running in front of the king's horse at the 1913 Derby. The WSPU held a huge funeral procession through London to publicize her dedication.

Despite these efforts, the net result of the WSPU was to alienate potential supporters far more than to gain support for woman suffrage. Women's suffragists

were considered by the government primarily to be an irritant and not a major problem. The outbreak of war in August, 1914, changed everything. Mrs. Pankhurst called an immediate halt to militancy, and the government released women suffragists from prison. Throughout World War I the WSPU, the NUWSS, and other women's suffrage organizations worked for the war effort. Traditional men's occupations were filled by women, thereby freeing men for the trenches. Largely because of the contributions by women to the war effort, a limited suffrage was granted to women in Great Britain in February, 1918. Voting equality was finally achieved with the Representation of the People Act of 1928.

SIGNIFICANCE

An exact impact of the WSPU is difficult to assess or quantify, but there are areas in which its significance can be seen. First, limited suffrage was granted to women in 1918, and suffrage equality was achieved in 1928. Second, WSPU civil disobedience and militant tactics became a permanent feature of British politics. Third, the stereotype of the submissive female was challenged. Finally, the culmination of the women's suffrage movement can be seen in the 1979 election of Margaret Thatcher as prime minister of Great Britain.

It cannot be proven that the Pankhursts and the WSPU were either crucial or essential to winning the vote for women. Indeed, it can be argued that their efforts actually were counterproductive. The WSPU overstepped the boundary of what was considered in that era to be acceptable political activist behavior. Their militant campaign alienated many potential supporters of woman suffrage in Great Britain. Moreover, it is probably accurate to state that women received the vote because of their war record between 1914 and 1918. The social changes brought about by the war resulted in political changes. It also can be argued that the efforts of the WSPU placed the issue squarely in the center of British politics, a place where it never had been before. Without such awareness, it is possible that woman suffrage would not have been granted in 1918.

Politics itself was changing, and the relatively placid constitutional system would never be the same. At the same time that women's suffragists were resorting to arson and window smashing, Ulster Protestants, with the assent of Conservative Party leadership, were arming and preparing for civil war. Radical labor unions in Great Britain, throughout Europe, and elsewhere advocated violence in strikes. In comparison to other,

later movements, the militancy of the WSPU was quite tame. Indeed, a comparison could be drawn between the WSPU and the civil disobedience of either Mohandas Gandhi in India or Martin Luther King, Jr., in the American South. Marches, demonstrations, debates, sit-ins, and protests were characteristic of each of the movements, and each movement was concerned with basic human rights and human dignity.

Perhaps the greatest impact of the WSPU can be seen in the change in the image of women in Great Britain. WSPU suffragists, unlike their predecessors, were certainly not meek, submissive women. The hunger strikes, the demonstrations and scuffles, the rational speeches, and the intelligence of the leadership demonstrated that the suffragists could not be dismissed as a group of hysterical females. The WSPU was well organized, determined, and efficient. That the members were willing to suffer imprisonment and even, in the case of Emily Davison, death, served to demonstrate that women were human beings who deserved equality.

It cannot be said that the WSPU, or the Representation of the People Act, or any other individual event or act brought about equality for women in Great Britain. Margaret Thatcher, however, served as prime minister of Great Britain from 1979 to 1990, a period of service longer than that of any other prime minister since the eighteenth century. That she could even vote can be traced to the determination of the woman suffragists of the WSPU.

William S. Brockington, Jr.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barker, Dudley. "Mrs. Emmeline Pankhurst." In *Prominent Edwardians*. New York: Atheneum, 1969. One of four biographical sketches presented to illustrate the age, which was one of glitter and of unrest. A brief introduction to the topic.
- Dangerfield, George. *The Strange Death of Liberal England*. New York: Capricorn Books, 1961. A significant, albeit dated, book. Studies various political crises in Great Britain in the five years preceding World War I. Unsympathetic to women's issues and harsh in judgment of the Pankhursts. No footnotes.
- Holton, Sandra Stanley. *Feminism and Democracy: Women's Suffrage and Reform Politics in Britain, 1900-1918*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986. Provides an overview of the women's suffrage movement in Great Britain. Primary focus is on the differences among the political groups within the suffragist movement.
- Hume, Leslie Parker. *The National Union of Womens Suffrage Societies, 1897-1914*. New York: Garland, 1982. Studies the impact of the NUWSS, which coordinated the activities of a coalition of nonmilitant women's suffrage organizations. Concludes that the conciliatory attitude of the NUWSS countered the negative effects of the WSPU's militancy. Has an excellent bibliography and is well documented.
- Mitchell, David. *The Fighting Pankhursts: A Study in Tenacity*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1967. Briefly surveys the WSPU years, then offers a portrait of the Pankhurst children following the achievement of woman suffrage in Great Britain. Useful for understanding the motivations of the Pankhursts.
- Pankhurst, Emmeline. *My Own Story*. 1914. Reprint. New York: Kraus Reprint, 1971. Written at the beginning of World War I. Praises the militant wing of the women's suffrage movement. Must be read carefully because of its omissions and rationalizations.
- Pankhurst, Sylvia. *The Life of Emmeline Pankhurst: The Suffragette Struggle for Women's Citizenship*. 1935. Reprint. New York: Kraus Reprint, 1969. This work and her *The Suffragette Movement* (1931) reflect not only the devotion of a daughter to her mother but also the dedication of a suffragist to the cause of women's rights. Must be read carefully because of its subjectivity.
- Rosen, Andrew. *Rise Up, Women! The Militant Campaign of the Women's Social and Political Union, 1903-1914*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974. Utilizes numerous primary sources and is a scholarly overview of the WSPU. Well documented.
- Rover, Constance. *Women's Suffrage and Party Politics in Britain, 1866-1914*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1967. Considered to be the best overview of the lengthy struggle for suffrage by women in Great Britain. Primarily a political analysis, and certainly not a paean to the personalities involved. Has an excellent bibliography, is well documented, and includes numerous useful appendices.
- Wright, Almroth E. *The Unexpurgated Case Against Woman Suffrage*. London: Constable, 1913. This virulent attack on the women's suffrage movement conveys the resentment and antipathy faced by women suffragists. Useful for understanding the fear and prejudice of the era.

See Also: The British Labour Party Is Formed (1906); Women's Institutes Are Founded in Great Britain (1915); Parliament Grants Suffrage to British Women (1918); Gandhi Leads a Noncooperation Movement (1920); The Nineteenth Amendment Gives American

Women the Right to Vote (1920); The Minimum Age for Female British Voters Is Lowered (1928); The SCLC Forms to Link Civil Rights Groups (1957); Thatcher Becomes Great Britain's First Female Prime Minister (1979).

PANAMA DECLARES INDEPENDENCE FROM COLOMBIA

1903

Maneuverings surrounding the construction of the Panama Canal sparked a revolution in Panama

Category of event: Revolutions and rebellions

Time: November 3, 1903

Locale: Panama City, Republic of Panama

KEY FIGURES:

Manuel Amador Guerrero (1833-1909), the first president of Panama and a leader of the independence movement

Philippe Jean Bunau-Varilla (1859-1940), a French engineer who worked to persuade the United States government to select the Panama route for a canal

Theodore Roosevelt (1858-1919), the twenty-sixth president of the United States (1901-1909); supported the canal and the Panama route

John Hay (1830-1905), the U.S. secretary of state under Theodore Roosevelt; supported the independence of Panama and negotiated the canal treaty

SUMMARY OF EVENT

When other parts of the Spanish Empire declared independence, Panama, a part of the Spanish viceroyalty of Nueva Granada, remained loyal to the crown. Economic reasons, however, caused many Panamanians to reconsider their loyalty before Ferdinand VII allowed free trade in 1813. Panama prospered until free trade was repealed. The repeal resulted in a resurgence of patriotic fervor that caused Spain to appoint governors who were determined to retain the isthmus at any cost. Violations of civil and political rights occurred with regularity. The patriots' cause benefited from the dissatisfaction created by the governors' use of censorship, arbitrary arrests, and persecution of suspects.

In October, 1821, Colonel José de Fábrega became the first native-born isthmian to serve as governor. The patriots guessed correctly that Fábrega would be

reluctant to shed the blood of his fellow countrymen. On November 27, 1821, shortly after an uprising began in the interior towns, the citizens of Panama City invaded the main plaza and demanded a meeting of the *cabildo* (council) to decide the future of the isthmus. The next day the *cabildo* met, declared independence from Spain, and accepted union with Colombia.

The union with Colombia led to much civil unrest. Political instability in Colombia, opposition to the dictatorship of Colombian ruler Simon Bolívar, and the breakup of the extensive republic of Gran Colombia in 1830 gave the isthmus opportunities to express its desire for autonomy or independence. Unsuccessful rebellions occurred in 1827, 1830, 1831, and 1832. Both political and economic factors played a part in the uprisings. Panamanians could not accept the arbitrary exercise of power by officials from other areas and wanted free trade, free ports, and free transit.

Panamanians responded to civil war in Colombia by proclaiming the Free State of Panama in November, 1840. External threats from England and Colombia, however, forced the Free State to sign a treaty of reincorporation after only thirteen months.

Various projects for canals, roads, and railroads across Panama's narrow isthmus had been proposed since early in the colonial period. Panamanians would have welcomed such projects and partially blamed Colombia's government for lack of progress. Colombia, however, thought the interest that France and England expressed in such projects was a threat to its control of the isthmus and signed the Bidlack Treaty of 1846 with the United States to guarantee the neutrality of the isthmus and Colombian sovereignty. Panama regarded the treaty as an attempt by the United States to increase its influence and power in the area. Nevertheless, a half-century and many North American military interventions later, Panama turned to the United States for assistance in achieving independence and constructing a canal.

The French, undeterred by the Bidlack Treaty, pursued their plans for a railroad across the isthmus but were unable to find financing. The settlement of Oregon in 1848 made people in the United States aware of the problem of transit. William H. Aspinwall, a U.S. citizen, organized the Pacific Mail Steamship Company and planned a transisthmian railroad. His efforts led to the organization of the Panama Railroad Company, which completed the railway on January 27, 1855.

From the time of the completion of the railroad until the country's independence, Panama experienced international, national, and local problems. Liberal-conservative disputes involving civil disturbances in Colombia, the withdrawal of local self-government by Bogotá, and economic and racial problems on the isthmus resulted in forty different administrations, fifty riots, five attempts at secession, and thirteen major interventions by the United States. By the end of the nineteenth century, Colombia had pushed Panama into independence by refusing to consider the desires of the area, failing to provide security for property and persons, denying Panamanians the vote, conducting illegal arrests and detention, and imposing censorship and arbitrary and excessive taxation.

A small group of Panamanians became convinced that Panama could never expect any permanent, satisfactory political arrangement or economic progress as long as Panama remained under the control of Colombia. The failure of two French canal companies between 1879 and 1898 convinced them that independence under the protection of the United States was the only answer. The United States had a definite interest in a canal and, after the failure of the New French Canal Company, had assumed the right to build it in Panama.

In the first months of 1903, a group of influential Panamanians began meeting secretly to plan an insurrection. Captain James R. Beers, the port captain working for the railroad company, was leaving for a vacation in the United States, and he was asked to ascertain the feelings of the railroad officials in New York. It was hoped that Beers could obtain promises of support and aid, perhaps even from the U.S. government. The answers Beers brought back were so encouraging that the insurrectionists sent Manuel Amador Guerrero, the railroad medical officer, to New York to make further inquiries.

Just as a discouraged Amador Guerrero was preparing to leave New York, Philippe Bunau-Varilla, the head of the New French Canal Company, arrived. Bunau-Varilla, believing that the United States was the only nation that could complete the canal, was determined

to vindicate France and salvage his own reputation. He took control. After a series of "accidental" meetings with high U.S. government officials, including Secretary of State John Hay and President Theodore Roosevelt, he was able to assure Amador Guerrero that the United States would permit a revolution to succeed and would recognize the new republic.

Bunau-Varilla supplied Amador Guerrero with money, a declaration of independence, military plans, and a national flag. When Amador Guerrero returned to Panama, he found his fellow revolutionaries unhappy with Bunau-Varilla, timid, and unwilling to continue. Resolute action by Amador Guerrero and his wife saved the revolution. Amador Guerrero arranged for the commander of the Colombian forces in Panama to aid the movement in return for a generous financial arrangement for himself and his men.

The revolution started on November 3, 1903, after the U.S. warship *Nashville* docked in Colón. The U.S. military presence prevented the Colombian troops in Colón from suppressing the revolt. The officials of the Panama Railroad, who were citizens of the United States, also contributed to the success of the revolt by arranging to keep all rail cars in Panama City, making it impossible to transport Colombian troops across the isthmus.

The municipal council of Panama City declared Panama's independence the same day and called a public meeting for the next afternoon. The meeting selected a *junta* of three men as a provisional government. The *junta* provided for a constitutional convention and for presidential elections, in which Amador Guerrero was chosen as the first president.

Panama was forced to pay a price for the assistance of Bunau-Varilla and the United States. As a condition of his support, Bunau-Varilla demanded appointment as Panamanian minister to the United States. He was replaced one month later by a Panamanian, but in that month he negotiated a canal treaty with the United States that was similar to one Colombia had rejected. The few new provisions in the treaty made it more favorable to the United States. Bunau-Varilla pointed out to the two Panamanian diplomats sent to help negotiate the treaty that any delay in accepting the treaty could lead to withdrawal of U. S. protection and to new negotiations for a canal treaty with Colombia. U.S. protection was essential for the preservation of Panamanian independence. The arguments were not lost on the diplomats nor upon the Panamanian *junta*. The treaty was accepted by the *junta* and by virtually every town council in the new republic.

SIGNIFICANCE

When Panama became independent in 1903, the new government accepted the canal treaty with the United States, giving the United States a physical presence in the new nation and an interest that led to limitations on political action by the government of Panama. The average Panamanian citizen did not gain political power either. A small group of elite families controlled the republic until the end of the 1960's, when the commander of the national guard seized control of the country. The United States accepted two new canal treaties in 1978 under which the Panamanian government, but not the individual citizen, gained politically.

Observation of civil rights was not characteristic of the colonial period or of Colombian rule. Censorship, arbitrary arrests and imprisonment, exile, illegal taxation, and physical abuse were commonly used against political opponents and the poor. Independence improved the abusive conditions but did not eliminate them. The political patterns of electoral fraud, political violence, arbitrary decisions, suppression and abuse of opponents, and use of political control for economic benefit characteristic of the previous periods continued to be the norm. The masses that had only rarely participated in the political process remained passive. The poor were given no economic consideration by the elite factions who dominated Panama.

The construction of the railroad in the 1850's and the later construction of the canal depended heavily upon the recruitment of black laborers from the English-speaking Caribbean. Many blacks remained in Panama and congregated in their own sections of Panama City and Colón. They continued to speak English and to attend Protestant churches, and their racial and cultural differences from other Panamanians made them a conspicuous minority.

Economic development did come with the construction and operation of the canal, but the more technical and higher-paying jobs were given to U.S. citizens during the first forty years of the canal's operation. Panamanians reacted negatively to the political and economic influence of the United States, and nationalism increased. When U.S. interventions aroused Panamanian anger, the blacks became an easy target for protests; the United States was not so easily attacked. Blacks also competed with the "native" Panamanians for jobs. The administration of the canal used the division between the blacks and other Panamanians to maintain an adequate and docile labor supply.

The growth of Panamanian nationalism was given an added impetus by U.S. cultural influence. The cultural influences on everyday life were pervasive and

readily apparent to the average citizen. The canal remained closely tied to the independence of Panama and to the lives of the Panamanians.

Robert D. Talbott

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bishop, Joseph Bucklin. *Theodore Roosevelt and His Time Shown in His Own Letters*. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920. The author was secretary of the canal commission. This is a favorable picture of Roosevelt. It includes interesting and useful insights about the canal and Roosevelt's participation.
- Bunau-Varilla, Philippe. *Panama: The Creation, Destruction, and Resurrection*. London: Constable, 1913. A self-serving account of events. It vindicates the author and France. There is no bibliography, but some of the author's letters are included.
- McCulloch, David. *The Path Between the Seas: The Creation of the Panama Canal, 1870-1914*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1977. A detailed account of events surrounding the creation of the canal and a brief summary of the pre-1903 period. Has an extensive bibliography.
- Millander, G. A. *The United States in Panamanian Politics: The Intriguing Formative Years*. Danville, 111.: Interstate Printers, 1971. This is a good, brief explanation of the 1903 revolution. It has an extensive annotated bibliography.
- Niemeier, Jean Gilbreath. *The Panama Story*. Portland, Ore.: Metropolitan Press, 1968. This work was written from articles in the *Panama Star and Herald*. The newspaper articles are quoted extensively.
- Perez-Venero, Alex. *Before the Five Frontiers: Panama from 1821-1903*. New York: AMS Press, 1978. Contains a good history of nineteenth century Panama but does not include the 1903 revolution. Has an extensive bibliography.

See Also: The Philippines Ends Its Uprising Against the United States (1902); U.S. Marines Are Sent to Nicaragua to Quell Unrest (1912); El Salvador's Military Massacres Civilians in *La Matanza* (1932); The Atlantic Charter Declares a Postwar Right of Self-Determination (1941); Indigenous Indians Become the Target of Guatemalan Death Squads (1978); Somoza Is Forced Out of Power in Nicaragua (1979); Presidential Candidates Are Killed in Colombian Violence (1989); Sandinistas Are Defeated in Nicaraguan Elections (1990).