

# Congo Protestant Missions and European Powers before 1885

(Concluded)

In the field, however, matters were not running so smoothly for the missionaries. At Stanley Pool, where the B.M.S. was very closely associated with the expedition, the people who would not dare to fight "Bula Matadi" were becoming restive after Stanley's departure. At Manyanga, too, there was fighting between the natives and the expedition, but although troubled over the matter, the missionaries supported the use of force as inevitable.<sup>78</sup> The natives distinguished the missionaries from the A.I.A. by the fact that they did not buy ivory, and healed the sick, and thus they preferred the "Ingleza," and regarded them in some measure as their protectors. Bentley was placed in a difficult position by the chief of Ndandanja, who begged him to open a closed envelope marked "A.I.C. Comité d'études du Haut-Congo : a n'ouvrir qu'en cas de contestation de territoire avec le peuple de Ndandanga ou de Mbanza," since his people were terrified lest it should contain instructions to burn their town. On opening it in these circumstances he was able to reassure the people, but also to realise the way in which the expedition was trying to monopolise all available ground.<sup>79</sup> Bentley was on his guard against the constant effort of Lieut. Valke to get legal possession of the B.M.S. land and river frontage at Manyanga, and because of its policy of commercial exclusiveness became suspicious of the Comité d'Etudes.<sup>80</sup>

In spite of these doubts, however, Leopold II was able to make good use of the gratitude which the B.M.S. publicly expressed for his work.<sup>81</sup> The propaganda which he sent to Lord Granville in October, 1882<sup>82</sup> contained two letters of Comber's dated August, 1882, one written to Stanley, and the other to Baynes, and these also appeared in the *Indépendance Belge* a year later,<sup>83</sup> when Leopold again needed testimony to the philanthropic fashion in which he was working in Congo.

The importance of the Portuguese claims for his Congo enterprise lay in the fact that Portugal claimed the mouth of the Congo—and without an outlet to the sea the state he was building up would be severely handicapped. Leopold was therefore most anxious that these claims should not be recognised by Great Britain. The B.M.S. missionaries, still experiencing difficulties from the Portu-

guese in Congo, had every reason to join in the agitation against the negotiations—indeed, it was scarcely necessary for Hutton to encourage the Society. When a Portuguese Catholic missionary expedition came to San Salvador in May, 1882, trying to win over the king and his people, and later claimed to have a letter from the Governor of Loanda ordering the immediate expulsion of the B.M.S. missionaries there, Herbert Dixon wrote anxiously to Cohen, the British consul at Loanda, to know whether the British Government recognised the suzerainty of Portugal over the territory,<sup>84</sup> since the priests were clearly there as representatives of their country. Cohen reassured him that unless the king wished to acknowledge himself a Portuguese subject, the authorities could not compel him to do so.<sup>85</sup> Later, Senhor Serpa, Portuguese Minister of Foreign Affairs, accused Cohen, in connection with Stanley and "certain English missionaries" at San Salvador, of stirring up the natives against Portugal.<sup>86</sup>

The agitation in England against the recognition of Portuguese claims, carefully watched from day to day by Leopold,<sup>87</sup> increased in intensity in the spring of 1883. Questions were asked in Parliament, showing the anxiety of the House over the negotiations,<sup>88</sup> and on 3rd April Jacob Bright introduced a resolution against the recognition of annexation by any power, which would interfere with the freedom of the civilising and commercial agencies in Congo. He was able to bring before the House evidence of the difficulties which the B.M.S. had experienced in San Salvador from the repressive policy of the Portuguese, and stated in contrast how grateful the missionaries were for the work of the A.I.A. In spite of the agitation in Parliament, however, Solvyns remained doubtful of the result.<sup>89</sup>

Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice, in replying to Bright on behalf of the Government, was able to say that it had insisted on religious liberty and adequate protection for Protestant missions in Congo. The treaties which had previously been made directly with certain native chiefs, without the recognition of any Portuguese sovereignty,<sup>90</sup> had stipulated that English missionaries should be free to settle, and the British Government knew that it could not secure less from the Portuguese. There was considerable difficulty over the terms in which this freedom was to be given,<sup>91</sup> but the government could not be satisfied with ambiguous wording, under pressure from the missionary societies, reflected in Parliament.<sup>92</sup> Portugal was certainly in considerable difficulties, for she had no more desire to see French Catholic missionaries than English Protestants in her Congo possessions, and was jealously guarding the diocese of Loanda against the encroachments of Lavignerie's White Fathers, over which question there was at the time considerable difficulty with Rome. It was not a propitious moment to grant guarantees to Protestant missionaries.<sup>93</sup>

The difficulty continued throughout the treaty negotiations. In March, 1883 Granville again insisted on complete freedom for

missions, noting that "religious bodies are easily alarmed," but in Lisbon the same situation obtained.<sup>94</sup> A saving clause was found, for after examining the eighth revision of the proposed Congo treaty, the Portuguese government was ready to accept the safeguards as to the protection of Protestant churches which the British government demanded, provided there was the addition of the words "without any appearance of temples."<sup>95</sup> This clause was not acceptable, but in July the observant Belgian Minister in Lisbon noted that there seemed more chance of bringing to a conclusion the long-drawn out treaty negotiations, since the remaining points to be settled—among which he listed that of religious liberty—were of minor importance.<sup>96</sup> In August it seemed to the F.O. that the Portuguese government, anxious to conclude the treaty as soon as possible, was ready to concede many points, including the withdrawal of restrictions on the appearance of Protestant churches.<sup>97</sup> Although the treaty finally gave full protection for English Protestant missionaries,<sup>98</sup> however, the missionary societies believed that they could put little trust in the actual carrying out of the provisions.

Throughout the unsettled year of 1883<sup>99</sup> both the B.M.S. and the L.I.M. consistently denounced the idea of the recognition of Portuguese claims in the Congo,<sup>100</sup> but continued to differ in their views on the solution of the political problem in the region. Relying on the expressed wish of King Leopold to assist them,<sup>101</sup> the B.M.S. gave him their full support, but the L.I.M., while regretting the fact that Great Britain had not herself entered into competition for the Congo, upheld French claims, disliking the commercial ends of the Comité d'Etudes,<sup>102</sup> and its policy of exclusiveness. At Pala Bala the L.I.M. missionaries joined with the agent of the Dutch house there to translate for the local chiefs a treaty imposed by Lieut. Van de Velde,<sup>103</sup> whereupon the chiefs declared in surprise that they had simply believed that the Comité wanted to establish a factory, and had not understood that they were to keep all other traders out, nor that they would themselves be called upon to find men to construct roads.<sup>104</sup> A complaint made by Mrs. Guinness was not well received at Brussels, and the indignant reply of Strauch had to be toned down by Leopold. The King would not allow a reference to the greater complaisance of the B.M.S. towards his Congo enterprise, fearing the Society might take advantage of this.<sup>105</sup> They were fully satisfied, however. In spite of minor disagreements in the field, and the secret regret of Stanley on revisiting Stanley Pool, to find that Lieut. Braconnier had given the B.M.S. such a very good site,<sup>106</sup> the Association had treated the Society well over the question of land. The return of Lieut. Braconnier to Europe in the summer of 1883 was made the occasion for an effort to secure a reduction in the rent paid for the plot at Stanley Pool, and Baynes paid a second visit to Brussels. As a result, not only was the annual ground-

rent reduced from £150 to £10, but even this sum was returned by Leopold.<sup>107</sup> The December *Missionary Herald* reported Baynes' audience with the King and commented with enthusiasm on the graciousness of Leopold. The existing conditions in the Congo seemed most favourable to plans for expansion of the work. Late in 1883 Grenfell took the *Peace's* boat on a prospecting expedition on the upper river, to look for suitable new sites. The district which he chose for immediate occupation was that near the A.I.C. station at Lukolela, Stanley's fourth above the Pool.<sup>108</sup> Stanley was ready to give permission for immediate residence, and offered A.I.C. ground for building, at a low rent.<sup>109</sup>

#### MUTUAL ASSISTANCE

Leopold was still of course anxious to see Belgian missionaries in the Congo,<sup>110</sup> but in the spring of 1884 was finding the English Protestants very useful as his allies. The Anglo-Portuguese treaty was finally signed on 26 February, 1884, but there was still time to stop its ratification, and Leopold was sparing no efforts to secure this. The B.M.S. joined in the agitation against ratification, presenting a petition to Parliament on 25 April, followed by the Baptist Union, while the F.O. received a spate of petitions from individual Protestant congregations, the first coming from Clapton Downs Chapel, Middlesex. *The Freeman* of 18 April printed a copy of this, and advised other churches to follow suit, in petitioning the Queen and Parliament. Although unimpressed by the arguments brought forward,<sup>111</sup> the F.O. had to take some account of the agitation, which insisted that the guarantees so hardly won from Portugal were useless, and that there was no practical possibility that she would change her policy in her African dominions. F.O. officials feared that the Government would be beaten on the Congo question in the Commons,<sup>112</sup> but it was to a large extent the opposition of France and Germany to the treaty which caused the decision against ratification.<sup>113</sup>

The right of pre-emption accorded to France in April meant a sudden decrease in popularity for the Congo enterprise of the King of the Belgians, but Leopold had many firm friends in England. Bentley, home on furlough, was an indefatigable supporter. His letters to the press<sup>114</sup> denounced the Portuguese treaty in no uncertain terms, while an interview with him was published on 20 May by the *Pall Mall Gazette*, which under the editorship of W. T. Stead was beginning to have great influence in both political and social fields. Not only did he criticise the Portuguese treaty, but actively supported the Association.<sup>115</sup> Well aware of the fear of France, he declared that while the Anglo-Portuguese treaty, if ratified, would not be recognised by France, and therefore would not keep her out of Congo, this object would be far better attained by strengthening

the position of the A.I.C. Strauch, sent to London in May to calm British fears raised by the agreement with France, found that Bentley had been effectual in rallying W. E. Forster, a Liberal M.P. of some influence, to the support of Leopold.<sup>116</sup> Strauch found of considerable use the suggestions of the latter, which accorded in certain particulars with the views of the B.M.S., with whom he was also in touch.<sup>117</sup> If Lord Granville was sceptical as to whether Leopold intended to maintain the philanthropic character of the enterprise he had undertaken in Congo, the religious world was not,<sup>118</sup> but gave the King its full support.

The treaty was not ratified, and agitation over the Portuguese claims died down, but Leopold still had need of English opinion favourable to his Congo enterprise, working as he was for the recognition of the full political rights of the A.I.C. This he hoped to secure at the Conference of Berlin, called together at the end of 1884 to regulate, as far as possible, the "scramble for Africa."

The B.M.S., in the autumn of 1884, was looking forward to a considerable expansion of the work on the Congo river. A third visit of Baynes to Brussels in the summer had gained for the Society the site at Lukolela, the first station to be planted above the Pool, at a nominal rent, and also, instead of a short-term lease, it was to be held in perpetuity. This same condition was secured for the Stanley Pool site.<sup>119</sup> In recording the Society's gratitude to the King of the Belgians, the July *Missionary Herald* set forth a description of his work in Congo, expressing the hope that as a result of it an independent state would be created and recognised there—a state based on free trade principles and securing religious freedom to all. Meanwhile, Grenfell had constructed the *Peace*, and in June was able to write home that a trial trip had been made, that now was the time to plant stations on the upper river, and that the need for reinforcements was urgent.<sup>120</sup> In July the Committee, urged by Bentley, set forth a plan for ten stations to be planted between Stanley Pool and the Falls, beginning immediately with Lukolela.<sup>121</sup> It seemed that at last the preliminary stage was over, and that work on the upper river, always the aim, was now a possibility.

At the opening of the Conference of Berlin, the British attitude towards the Congo was of great importance to Leopold.<sup>122</sup> The flag of the A.I.C. had been recognised by the United States, and by Germany, but not as yet by Great Britain. Again the views of the commercial and the religious elements in England coincided, in their support of the King of the Belgians. Stanley was doing his best, in addressing meetings of various kinds, to stress the civilising work of the A.I.C., and was quoted with approval by *The Freeman*,<sup>123</sup> after this journal had reported on further negotiations at Brussels highly satisfactory to the B.M.S. When Leopold had again returned the annual ground-rent due, as a mark of his interest in the work of the

Society, Baynes had secured a definite agreement that rent due according to B.M.S. leases should only become payable after being demanded by an accredited A.I.C. official.<sup>124</sup> It seemed unlikely that the demand would be made. *The Freeman* approved of recognition by the United States of the A.I.C. flag, and hoped that the British Government would follow suit, instead of continuing to favour an alliance with Portugal.

The B.M.S. were interested in the Berlin West Africa Conference not only from the point of view of the Society's work in the Congo, but also that in the Cameroons, and it was chiefly their concern for this latter which led the F.O. to suggest that they should be represented at Berlin. The representatives of Leopold were to be found among the delegations of Belgium and the United States,<sup>125</sup> for the A.I.C., not being an independent state, had no official delegation, and this meant further support for him at the conference. In November Baynes arrived, but early in December he telegraphed for Bentley to join him, as the latter's testimony would be useful. The conference did not officially deal with questions of sovereignty at all, but the meeting ground at Berlin was used as a field where these could be fought out, and they were in reality treated as of greater importance.

France was claiming a great deal of territory on the south bank of the river, based on the Makoko treaties, and Bentley's testimony was expected to help the A.I.C. to combat these claims, for he could speak with exact knowledge of the extent of Makoko's territory, which was not as great as de Brazza had supposed. He arrived on 9 December, and reported at once to Strauch and Van de Velde, to discover what was wanted of him. The B.M.S. had counted the cost of supporting the A.I.C., and thought it to be worthwhile.<sup>126</sup> At that moment the Association was having a hard struggle to secure the south bank of Stanley Pool, and to get this it seemed that they must relinquish a claim to the Niadi Kwilu valley, which would go to France, and make concessions to Portugal in the south. The former did not affect the B.M.S., but the Society hoped that its station at San Salvador would not come outside the territory granted to the Association, with which it had entirely identified itself.<sup>127</sup> The final delimitation, however, left San Salvador in Portuguese territory to the Society's great regret.

Before going to Berlin Stanley had been working hard in England to get recognition of the A.I.C. by Great Britain, and this was formally accorded at Berlin on 16 December. Before the end of the conference the Association was recognised as an independent state by all the powers which had not formerly conceded this, and as such was able to sign the General Act of Berlin in February, 1885. By this act the Congo was to be a free trade region; an international commission was to be set up to carry out the provisions of the

conference for the river, and the powers were to combine to suppress the slave-trade. The Association was hardly mentioned by name during the debates, but all the delegates knew that it was the new state being formed on the Congo, which would carry out the programme they fixed. Nor were they under any illusion as to Leopold's position in the Association, and expected him to assume its direction in name, as well as in fact. In April, 1885 the Belgian legislature consented to the assumption of the title of the new state by Leopold, the union between Belgium and the Congo to be entirely personal. On 1 July de Winton, on orders from Brussels, directed a letter to all missionaries and traders in the Congo, proclaiming Leopold the "Sovereign of the Independent State of the Congo," and on 1 August Leopold himself notified the powers of Europe to the same effect.

The B.M.S. was delighted, since its relations with the Association were so cordial. In January, 1885 the committee, instead of ratifying the agreement which Comber and de Winton had made in September that A.I.C. officers at Ngombe should be treated when necessary by B.M.S. medical missionaries, for an annual payment of fifty pounds, offered this service free, pleased to "reciprocate in some slight manner" the generosity of Leopold towards the Society. If the L.I.M. was not so enthusiastic, their magazine at least quoted from Stanley's speeches on the civilising work of the A.I.A.<sup>128</sup> Stanley was honoured by the B.M.S. at a public breakfast on 28 May, when he was careful to state that the kindness to the missionaries for which he was thanked was shown "by command of the King." Article VI of the General Act accorded special protection to missionaries of all denominations, and there was no reason to expect, judging from the past history of the attitude of the Association, that this would not be given. *The Freeman* even thought it necessary to give warning against too close association with the state in Congo.<sup>129</sup>

In July, 1885 the B.M.S. presented to the King an address, mounted on rollers of African ivory, congratulating him on the creation of the new Independent State of Congo. In his speech of thanks, Leopold declared that his "one sole desire in connection with his efforts on behalf of Africa was the enlightenment and uplifting of the millions of her central region, suppression and extinction of the slave-trade, establishment of a reign of law and order, and the development of an upright and legitimate commerce." In this enterprise he "regarded the B.M.S. missionaries as his friends and helpers." With such a programme before the infant state in the Congo, the future of the new B.M.S. stations to be planted all along the upper river seemed bright indeed. With the recognition of the Congo Independent State, the period of its foundation was drawn to a close, a period in which the King and

the English Protestant missionaries had on the whole been of considerable mutual assistance. *The Freeman* had some foreboding that matters might not always continue to run smoothly, but was anxious "that there should be a grateful remembrance, should difficulties or misunderstandings arise, of the kindnesses shown by Mr. Stanley to our brethren in the early days of the mission 'by command of King Leopold.' God . . . grant to him . . . a rich reward in the establishment of a prosperous and wealthy kingdom on the banks of the Congo!"<sup>130</sup>

RUTH SLADE.

## NOTES

<sup>78</sup> "Yet . . . we thought the action of the A.I.A. quite right, and agreed with them that a severe lesson was necessary on this third effort of the people to drive away the Expedition. Bentley and I have had many a talk about it, and as to what line of conduct we as Christian missionaries under these circumstances." Comber to Baynes, 5 Sept. 1882. B.M.S.

<sup>79</sup> Two of the clauses read: "The chiefs are bound never to part with any ground to Europeans other than those connected with the Comité d'Etudes. An exception is the ground sold to the Baptist English Mission. This will become the property of the Comité d'Etudes if the lessee ceases to pay rent or leaves the ground," and "The Comité d'Etudes has the right of constructing houses, roads, etc. to the exclusion of any European except the Comité."

<sup>80</sup> "The king of the Belgians is no doubt a kindly philanthropic man, but there is behind all a large amount of scheming and speculation, which is making use of his money, and repute, also the officers of his army. . . . The Expedition is without doubt a help to us, but might hinder and trip us up sometimes if we are not careful." Bentley to Baynes, 17 Nov. 1882. B.M.S.

<sup>81</sup> They even defended him against de Brazza's charges against the exclusiveness of the Comité d'Etudes du Haut Congo. In March, 1883 Baynes was able to deny publicly that the missionaries had agreed with the chief of Leopoldville station not to give help to any other expeditions, as de Brazza had stated, having, no doubt, seen a copy of the provisional contract signed by Comber and Braconnier, afterwards altered in Europe.

<sup>82</sup> In F.O. 84/1802. Left by Baron Solvyns, 5 Oct. 1882.

<sup>83</sup> 22 Aug. 1883.

<sup>84</sup> Dixon to Cohen, 2 Aug. 1882. F.O. 84/1807.

<sup>85</sup> Cohen to Dixon, 30 Dec. 1882. F.O. 84/1807.

<sup>86</sup> Draft Granville to Cohen, 17 Aug. 1883. F.O. 84/1640.

<sup>87</sup> "La lettre dans le Times est maladroite mais anti-portugaise. La Pall Mall Gazette, tres répandue à Londres, a eu quelques lignes anti-portugaises." Leopold II to Strauch, 24 Feb. 1883. Strauch papers, Min. des Aff. Et.

<sup>89</sup> "Le F.O. étant fermement résolu à conclure, des influences locales et dont il peut ne tenir aucun compte, ne modifieront pas, je le pense, ses intentions a cet égard." Solvyns to Frère-Orban, 7 March, 1883. A.I.C. 24. Min. des Aff. Et.



<sup>90</sup> E.g. Treaty with the King of St. Antonio, 1 June, 1865: "Missionaries . . . are to be allowed to reside in the territory of King Antonio and his successors, for the purpose of instructing the people. . . ."

<sup>91</sup> "On a cru indispensable de remplacer l'expression 'missionary operations' par celle de 'culto religioso,' 'religious worship.' En laissant subsister le premier expression, le gouvernement portugaise aurait de grandes difficultés avec le Vatican." Eclaircissements donnes par M. d'Antas, 10 Jan. 1883. F.O. 84/1803.

<sup>92</sup> Memorandum by H. P. Anderson. "D'Antas begs us not to let them into difficulties with the Vatican—this is balanced by our difficulties with Parliament." F.O. 84/1803.

<sup>93</sup> "Il est bien difficile que la cour de Lisbonne concède explicitement à des étrangers dissidents ce qu'il refuse à d'autres professant la religion de l'état. C'est pourquoi M. de Serpa ne voudrait s'engager qu'à accorder la tolérance religieuse sans le définir d'une manière plus précise." Greindl to Frère-Orban, 17 Jan. 1883. A.I.C. II. 5. Min. des Aff. Et.

<sup>94</sup> Draft Granville to d'Antas, 15 March, 1883; F.O. 84/1804. Greindl to Frère-Orban, 9 April, 1883. A.I.C. II. 39. Min. des Aff. Et.

<sup>95</sup> F.O. 84/1806. 29 May, 1883.

<sup>96</sup> Greindl to Frère-Orban, 26 July, 1883.

<sup>97</sup> Note by Lister on interview with d'Antas. 1 Aug. 1883. F.O. 84/1807.

<sup>98</sup> Article VI: All forms of religious worship and religious ordinances shall be tolerated, and no hindrance whatever shall be offered thereto by the Portuguese authorities.

Missionaries of religion, whether natives or foreigners, and religious bodies, shall have a perfect right to erect churches, chapels, schools, and other buildings, which shall be protected by the Portuguese authorities.

<sup>99</sup> B.M.S. missionaries were to be advised "in a sympathetic manner" not to marry in view of "the unsettled position of the political questions relating to the sovereignty of the Congo river." *Minutes*, Jan. 1883.

<sup>100</sup> B.M.S. memorial to Lord Granville, 21 March, 1883, F.O. 84/1804: *Regions Beyond*, June, July, 1883.

<sup>101</sup> Stanley to the head of the Baptist mission, Manyanga, 24 July, 1883. *Tervueren* 50, 47, 174. F. Guinness to T. F. Buxton, 21 Feb. 1883, left by Buxton for Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice, 6 March, 1883. F.O. 84/1804, 21 Feb. 1883.

<sup>102</sup> ". . . Stanley is simply working on behalf of a Belgian *commercial* company. De Brazza has higher and nobler aims."

<sup>103</sup> Such actions were strongly disliked by the representatives of Leopold, Feb. 1883: "Très défiants à l'égard des missionnaires anglais, qui fort souvent précédent les factionnaires de Sa très gracieuse Majesté, nous voyions d'un œil soupçonneux les nombreuses démarches directes et secrètes que faisaient ces messieurs chez les chefs indigènes. Coquilhat, C. *Sur le Haut-Congo*, 1888, p. 103.

<sup>104</sup> Africa No. IV, 1884. Despatches from the Consul at Loanda, 6 Nov. 1883.

<sup>105</sup> Note of Leopold on Strauch's letter of 23 Sept. 1883: "Je n'aimerais pas avoir trop l'air de nous abriter derriere lui. (M. Baynes). Il le saura et deviendra plus exigeant a notre egard." Strauch papers. Min. des Aff. Et.

<sup>106</sup> "Braconnier reported Stanley to have told him that in giving the B.M.S. their site he had given them 'command of the Expedition'." Bentley to Crudgington, 20 March, 1883. Crudgington papers.

<sup>107</sup> *Minutes*, 18 Sept. 1883.

<sup>108</sup> Bentley, *op. cit.*, II, p. 53.

<sup>109</sup> Stanley to Comber, 16 Feb. 1884. B.M.S.

<sup>110</sup> Storme, *art. cit.*, pp. 15-16.

<sup>111</sup> Note by Lister: "I believe these things are got up by paid agents, who go a round of dissenting chapels. . . . Shall we acknowledge merely, or answer that a careful study of the treaty will show that all points to which they refer have been considered?" F.O. 84/1810.

<sup>112</sup> Fitzmaurice to Granville, 23 April, 1884. F.O. 84/1810.

<sup>113</sup> Crowe, *op. cit.*, pp. 23-33.

<sup>114</sup> *Daily News*, 12 April; *Times*, 14 April, 1884.

<sup>115</sup> "The best course would be to refuse to ratify the treaty, and then to hand over the lower Congo to the A.I.A. . . . the King of the Belgians, not the King of Portugal, is the man who ought to be trusted with the guardianship of the gates of one of the greatest waterways of the world."

<sup>116</sup> Strauch to Leopold, 27 May, 1884: "M. Forster a désiré voir M. Bentley le missionnaire, et c'est a la suite de la visite de ce dernier que M. Forster a en quelque sorte obligé le Pall Mall Gazette a publier l'article que Votre Majeste a pu lire." Bull. I.R.C.B., 1953. Rapport sur le dossier—"Correspondance Leopold II—Strauch" par J. Stengers, Annex I.

<sup>117</sup> *Id.* Annex II.

<sup>118</sup> Fitzmaurice, *Life of Lord Granville*, London, 1905, II, p. 356.

<sup>119</sup> *Minutes*, 17 June, 1884.

<sup>120</sup> Bentley, II, p. 634.

<sup>121</sup> *Missionary Herald*, Aug. 1884.

<sup>122</sup> Strauch to Lambermont, 2 Oct. 1884: "Les dispositions du public anglais a notre égard . . . serviront probablement de base aux instructions de sir Edward Malet." Conf. de Berlin, I, 59 bis. Min. des Aff. Et.

<sup>123</sup> 3rd Oct. 1884.

<sup>124</sup> Baynes' report to the committee, 30 Sept. 1884. B.M.S.

<sup>125</sup> The Belgian plenipotentiaries were Lambermont and the Belgian minister at Berlin, and Banning was one of the Belgian delegation, while the American minister, a sympathiser with the Association, co-opted Sanford and Stanley.

<sup>126</sup> "There is no doubt that if the French get the territory they want, they will remember anything the B.M.S. says or does. But after all . . . it would be pretty much the same, whether we speak or not, if the French succeeded. However, you will have counted all that cost, and if you have brought me here you mean me to open my mouth. . . ." Bentley to Baynes, 10 Dec. 1884. Bentley papers.

<sup>127</sup> "I have begged Mr. Stanley not to yield to the Portuguese north of the Ambriz River, on which are the Arthington Falls; as the Portuguese will then get the great ivory factories but it will save San Salvador, all the Bakongo, and the best part of the Zombos. . . . You will see the A.I.A. will have to make large concessions, but nothing vital to us, for what is vital to us is vital to them." Bentley to Baynes, 12 Dec. 1884. Bentley papers.

<sup>128</sup> *Regions Beyond*, Feb. 1885.

<sup>129</sup> "We hope our missionaries will not put their trust in princes, that they will jealously guard the independence of the communities they found, that they will not covet the patronage nor ask for any exclusive privilege of "the powers that be" on the Congo." *Freeman*, 5 June, 1885.

<sup>130</sup> *Id.*, *art. cit.*