GETTING THERE

JAMES ROTH

A HISTORICAL COMPANION TO

BLESS•ED ONE

A PERSONAL NOTE TO PETER:

I'M THERE.

Africans

On July 23, 1950, Africans were enduring their five-hundredth year in a world that was focused on destroying them.

Africa's hemorrhaging of its people was slow at first. For centuries small amounts of African slaves had been transported to Europe as domestic servants, or to work on small-scale farms. A similar flow to the Arab world and other Muslim lands had begun even earlier.

The turning point came in the 1400s. Portugal decided to create a robust sugar industry in its West African island colonies of Madeira, and later Sao Tome. The architects soon realized, however, that building plantations and harvesting sugarcane required inexpensive and abundant labor. African slaves were chosen because of Portugal's experience bringing small numbers of slaves to Europe, and because of the islands' proximity to the West African coast. By 1500 Madeira was the leading supplier of sugar to the European market, and Sao Tome was home to approximately 60 sugar mills.

The historical significance was not in Portugal's ability to satisfy Europe's sweet tooth, but rather in the model that was created—the use of African slave labor on large plantations. The sugar industry on Madeira and Sao Tome marked the first time Europeans had transported vast numbers of slaves for large-scale agricultural production. And it couldn't have been timelier. Just as Portugal emerged as the world's dominate supplier of sugar, on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean an

event took place that dramatically advanced Africa's bloodshed and forever changed the complexion of the world—A Genovese explorer named Christopher Columbus landed in the Americas.

Columbus' "discovery" sparked a race between Europe's powers for colonial territories in the New World. The sheer abundance of land meant that agriculture could be grown at levels that would make the plantations on Madeira and Sao Tome look like backyard gardens. But if wealth was to be generated, they would need people to pick the cotton and cut the sugarcane. European wage earners were too expensive.

Over time it became known simply as "The Triangle." Traders from Europe would arrive in West Africa and exchange guns and other finished products for people. Once the human cargo was crammed into the ship's hold, traders would depart for the new world. The surviving slaves were sold on the American mainland or the Caribbean Islands. The final leg brought tobacco, sugar, cotton and other primary commodities back to Europe.

It is the second leg of this journey—the "Middle Passage"—where the starkest examples of human indecency caused Africans to suffer and die in deplorable conditions. For six-to-eight weeks slaves were packed below deck, chained together in darkness, and surrounded by human excrement. Epidemics were common, and the sick were often thrown overboard to limit the spread of disease. When the opportunity presented itself, some healthy slaves dove into the ocean, still shackled, preferring death to another day on board. According to some estimates, twenty percent never made it across the Atlantic. To be a slave in America meant that your identity, your entire existence, was erased.

Recognizing ethnic heritage and practicing native customs were forbidden. Everything was controlled. Plans for your life were made by

others. In short, you weren't human. You were property. Laws stipulated that murder of a slave by an owner was not a crime. Rape of a female slave was only a crime if the perpetrator was "trespassing" on the property of another. Educating slaves was illegal. Owners would sell slaves, even if doing so meant that spouses, parents, and children would be separated. The quality of housing and food was poor, and slave owners used extreme brutality to control behavior.

• • •

Meanwhile, long before their arrival in the Americas, Africans were forced into slavery in North Africa, along the coast of the Indian Ocean and throughout the Middle East. The "Muslim" or "Oriental" slave trade dates to the eighth century. Camels made it possible to traverse the Sahara Desert, opening trade routes that linked west and central Africa to the Red Sea and Indian Ocean. Gold, salt, ivory, wild animals, and slaves were brought to Arab and Persian lands. The slaves came from *bilad-as-Sudan*, "the country of black people."

Arab presence spread to east Africa, with Mogadishu, Barawa, and the Lamu Islands becoming important centers for international commerce. Between the tenth and fourteenth centuries slaves and ivory were exported from east African markets to Arabia, the Persian Gulf region, India, and the Far East. In the eighteenth-century Arabs took control of Zanzibar from the Portuguese, making it the largest slave-trading center in east Africa.

Transporting ivory and slaves to Africa's eastern markets was a brutal operation. In his book *Ivory: Scourge of Africa*, E.D. Moore wrote: "The horror, the misery, the cruelty of the slave coffle never has been nor can be adequately pictured. Probably not more than one in five of the captive marchers…ever reach the ocean. Bowed down by the weight

of fetters and the heavy ivory, starved so that the spark of life barely was kept aglow within them, ravaged by weakness and disease and the strain of marching, and overborne by the hopelessness and misery of their position, they died by the thousands. For those who lagged beneath the weight of misfortunes there was the whip; and when the lash could urge no longer, and the victim sank to the ground with the tusk he had carried for hundreds of miles fallen beside him…there was the Arab sword…long, straight, double-edged, and sharp as any razor." Those who survived the long journey to the Muslim world would look forward to lives as soldiers, sex slaves, agricultural workers, domestic help, and eunuchs.

African eunuchs were common in Muslim societies, serving as guards, messengers, and confidantes to their owners. Throughout history, white eunuchs in Europe usually retained the ability to perform coitus, and some even took wives and concubines. African boys weren't so fortunate. Often the entire penis and scrotum were sliced off, and the procedure was performed in primitive conditions. Estimates are that nine out of ten boys bled to death, but the high death rate was of no consequence to Muslim slave traders—black African children were cheap and easily obtainable.

As the demand for slave labor increased, acquiring Africans became a more savage process. Bands of raiders would storm villages, brandishing guns, swords and clubs. Amidst the chaos, older people were killed first, followed by anyone who resisted—all in search of those few who might fetch a handsome price. Richard Burton, a European explorer who witnessed this carnage firsthand, estimated that in one series of raids, ten villages were destroyed and between one and two thousand people were slaughtered to capture fifty-five women. The surviving few, after watching their families murdered, were chained to begin the long

march to the coast. The hunt for slaves pushed raiders from east and west deep into the African interior. Ancient cultures were eliminated. Entire populations were exterminated. Africa was torn apart.

The sheer numbers are staggering. Eleven million African men, women and children endured the "Middle Passage." An estimated seventeen million were forced into bondage as part of the Muslim slave trade. Millions more died in raids, forced marches, or lay buried at the bottom of the ocean.

To be a slave in America meant that your identity, your entire existence, was erased.

• • •

Today we ask: How could the world tolerate centuries of this barbarism? How could the perpetrators – who were devoutly religious— reconcile their behavior in the eyes of God? How could such an organized system of brutality have occurred? Such a well-oiled machine of death created? Money is the easiest answer, but it doesn't tell the whole story. For those who did not profit directly or whose benefits from the slave trade were merely tangential there had to be another explanation. Another justification. If you were an average person living in Europe, Persia, Arabia, or America, how could you justify the enslavement of people just like you? The mutilation and murder of men, women, and children, just like you? The answer is simple: They weren't *like you*. Africans were viewed differently.

In *White Over Black*, Winthrop Jordan points to the Oxford English Dictionary before the sixteenth century. Under the definition of *black* it reads: "Deeply stained with dirt…dirty, foul…Having dark or deadly purposes, malignant…wicked, baneful, disastrous, sinister…horrible…

Indicating disgrace, censure, liability to punishment…" In contrast, *whiteness* was the epitome of beauty and purity. Jordan stated bluntly that in Europe "[W]hite and black connoted purity and filthiness…beauty and ugliness, beneficence and evil, God and the devil." He couples these definitions with the strong ethnocentrism that pervaded England, who surpassed Portugal as the dominant country in the slave trade. Those who looked differently or practiced a different religion were ignorant and uncivilized. They were heathens. This worldview was engrained and made it easy to dehumanize black Africans into some form of lesser species. They were beastly.

Prominent Europeans and Americans perpetuated these views throughout western society. Cotton Mather, the famous Boston Minister, authored a work entitled *Rules for the Society of the Negroes* (1693) in which he wrote that "[N]egroes were enslaved because they had sinned against God." It is true that the Old and New Testaments make specific references to slavery, and in no place is slavery disapproved.

But in stark contrast to the African slave trade, the Bible calls for the humane treatment of slaves, and does not attribute slavery to any particular race. Although any form of slavery is clearly immoral, it is worth noting the clear distinctions between Biblical slavery and the form that was practiced in the Americas. By overlooking these differences Mather and other religious leaders, as people have done throughout history, took Biblical references and distorted them into justifications for their own evil behavior.

The belief that Africans were inferior was also entrenched in some of the most brilliant and liberal minds of the day. The famous Scottish philosopher, historian, and economist, David Hume (1711-1776) was a leading figure in Scotland's Era of Enlightenment and a close friend of Adam Smith. Among his progressive theories for which he is still admired

was the notion that low interest rates are symptoms of a booming, commercial economy, and that international trade was not a zero-sum game—benefits flowed to both trading partners.

Unfortunately, when it came to race Hume was as backward as any person living in his era. He once posited "...the Negroes and all other species of men...to be naturally inferior to Whites. There was never a civilized nation of any other complexion than white, nor any individual eminent either in action or speculation...In Jamaica indeed they talk of one negroe as a man of parts and learning; but 'tis likely he is admired for very slender accomplishments like a parrot, who speaks a few words plainly."

Thomas Jefferson possessed one of the most progressive minds of his day. The third U.S. President drafted the Declaration of Independence, was a key architect of the Constitution, and authored numerous essays on government and society that remain of timeless relevance. Reflecting on the evolution of human thought and societal values, Jefferson asserted that "laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind as that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths discovered, and manners and opinions change." On the institution of slavery, Jefferson (a slave owner himself) once proclaimed: "Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate that these people are to be free."

Yet on racial equality even Jefferson could only go so far. In his published *Notes on Virginia*, he asserted that "blacks, whether originally a distinct race, or made distinct by time and circumstances, are inferior to the whites in the endowment of body and mind."

When comparing the views of these progressive thinkers with those in the Muslim world, the parallels are striking. The Qur'an, like the Bible, acknowledges slavery. Both contain passages urging kindness to slaves and neither includes racial distinctions. The Qur'an even suggests (but does not require) freedom to slaves. Tragically, Muslims, like followers of the Bible, proved equally unwilling to implement a system of slavery that was consistent with their holy book.

The enslavement of Africans in the Muslim world has been traced back to the biblical story of Ham, whose son, Canaan, was cursed with servitude. As the story was translated over time, the curse of servitude was combined with a change in Ham's skin color, to black. In the sixth century Muhammed ibn Abdullah al-Kisa'I makes the linkage between blackness and slavery in his book *Tales of the Prophets*. This version of the 'Curse of Ham' became widely known, and despite being refuted by some Muslim scholars, for many it became a justification for the buying and selling of human beings. This negative view of blacks fueled the enslavement of Africans.

The same ethnocentrism that Jordan identified in Europe could be found in the Muslim world. Muslims were held in the highest esteem—above Christians, Jews, and members of all other faiths. Respect was given to the accomplishments of Europeans and Asians, but they were still below Muslims in the natural order of things.

Prominent Muslim thinkers let their ethnocentrism translate into baseless stereotypes of Africans. Nasir al-Din Tusi, a noted thirteenth century writer, asserted that blacks differed from animals only in that "their two hands are lifted above the ground." He went so far as to proclaim, "many have observed that the ape is more teachable and more intelligent than the black." The great Muslim writer Sa'id al-Andalusi (d. 1070) labeled blacks as being "more like beasts than men." He asserted

that Africans "lack self-control and steadiness of mind and are overcome by fickleness, foolishness, and ignorance. Such are the blacks who lived at the extremity of the land of Ethiopia…"

Ibn Khaldun (1332-1406) is considered by some as the greatest historian and social thinker of the Middle Ages. Khaldun's theories on history were groundbreaking, and his approach to historical analysis is credited for laying the foundation of modern sociology. But his views on Africans were surprisingly ignorant. Khaldun asserted: "…the Negro nations are, as a rule, submissive to slavery, because [Negroes] have little [that is essentially] human and have attributes that are quite similar to those of dumb animals…"

These negative perceptions were compounded over centuries and eventually taken as truths. They justified slavery in Europe, the Americas, and the Muslim world. A belief system was created in which brutalizing Africans was acceptable. Still, no matter how far down black slaves were on the social hierarchy, wearing their masters' clothes and speaking their masters' language meant they were 'better' than those left behind, even though very little was known of those left behind.

• • •

The outside world had almost no knowledge of the African interior or African cultures. The only sustained contact with Africans was through the slave trade. The few Arabs who traveled inland were not there to study the local inhabitants, but to raid villages. Europeans usually remained in ports and coastal towns where they acquired people from local chieftains and African merchants. Not venturing inland, they never had the occasion (nor the desire) to observe Africans in their own communities or interact with them on a substantive level.

Information on the indigenous population remained scarce until the nineteenth century when Europe began exploring the African interior for sources of wealth. Europeans from every segment of society were intrigued by stories from the "Dark Continent," and those brave enough to traverse Africa's interior were celebrated as heroes. The most prominent among them received recognition from heads-of-state and widespread admiration. They were famous. Stories of majestic landscapes, strange animals and foreign civilizations left audiences hanging on their every word. As such, European explorers of Africa occupy a significant place in history—their message helped establish the foundation for how Africans would be viewed then, and now.

The message was overwhelmingly negative. For the most part, these men were deeply Christian and very ethnocentric. Their opinions were rooted in the conviction that European culture was superior. The less a community resembled Europe, the more it was dismissed as "basic" or "primitive."

The most famous of these adventurers was a Scottish missionary named David Livingstone (1813 – 1873). Many know of Livingstone from the tale of his encounter with fellow explorer Herbert Stanley. Stanley had been dispatched to the region to search for Livingstone, and upon finding him in the town of Ujiji on Lake Tanganyika, Stanley uttered the famous words, "Dr. Livingstone, I presume?" Livingstone spent nearly half his life venturing across sub-Saharan Africa – much of it in present day Zambia.

Livingstone's detailed journal best illustrates the narrow prism through which he and his colleagues viewed the outside world. A common term he used to describe Africans was "degraded." While observing one group, Livingstone asserted that they suffered from "mental and moral degradation, so much so indeed it must be difficult or rather impossible

for Christians at home to realize anything like an accurate notion of the grossness of the darkness which shrouds their minds." Livingstone held these views, though he made almost no effort to learn about the rituals he observed. On another occasion he bluntly asserted: "There is nothing interesting in a heathen town."

Although Livingstone claimed to never believe in "the stupid prejudice against color," he clearly believed Africans were inferior humans. Preparing for an expedition along the Zambezi River, he told European members of his party: "We come among them as members of a superior race and servants of a government that desires to elevate the more degraded portions of the human family." After encountering certain groups in Angola of mixed European and African heritage, Livingstone surmised: "It is probably that there will be a fusion or mixture of the black and white races in this continent, the dark being always of the inferior or lower class of society."

Livingstone's failure to apply real depth, accuracy, or neutrality to his reports on Africans is demonstrated by the lack of detailed information in his journal on some of the societies he encountered, including the Lozi and Ngoni. The Lozi Kingdom of Barotseland dominated the vast upper-Zambezi flood plain (in present-day western Zambia). The Ngoni gained strength under the Zulu leader, Shaka, and later established their own empire that stretched from South Africa through Zambia and into Tanzania. Both societies maintained complex governments, with senior officials overseeing administrative, military, and judicial matters. The Lozi and Ngoni were also the dominant economic powers in their respective regions.

The Lozi, Ngoni, and other well-organized societies were given scant attention in Livingstone's reports or in those of his fellow explorers. European audiences were instead bombarded with descriptions of

"primitive" and "degraded" people. He qualified his positive references to African intelligence by asserting that the African mind could only reach its true potential with help from Europe: "when rescued from the degradation and superstitions of heathenism…[the African] evinces improvement in an eminent degree."

Livingstone did make significant contributions, including by bringing attention the slave trade. Livingstone had great compassion for Africans, and as a devout Christian he was appalled by the carnage he witnessed during his travels: "We passed a woman tied by the neck to a tree and dead…the people of the country explained that she had been unable to keep up with the other slaves in a gang…We saw others tied up in a similar manner, one lying on the path shot or stabbed, for she was in a pool of blood." Livingstone believed Africa to be a land of great wealth and he argued that the slave trade was preventing Europe from engaging in "legitimate commerce" in the region. His crusade to spread Christianity inspired the missionary movement in Africa, sparked Economic interest in the region, and generated opposition to the slave trade.

…abolition was one thing; equality was quite another…

Livingstone was not the only prominent figure to loathe slavery, and yet maintain a firm conviction that Africans were inferior. This dual mindset was also held by one of his contemporaries who, like Livingstone, found himself on the front lines in the battle over slavery, but in another part of the world – Abraham Lincoln.

In his biographical work "*Lincoln*," David Herbert Donald reveals that Lincoln was not a staunch abolitionist until he grew older. But as

his eyes were opened to the horrors of the slave trade, and his moral center was found, the sixteenth U.S. President articulated some of the boldest and most inspiring repudiations of slavery ever made: "Those who deny freedom to others, deserve it not for themselves; and under a just God, can not long retain it." On another occasion Lincoln quipped: "Whenever I hear anyone arguing for slavery, I feel a strong impulse to see it tried on him personally." The debate over slavery was a root cause of the American Civil War, and Lincoln was willing to sacrifice millions of lives to end the enslavement of blacks.

Still, abolition was one thing; equality was quite another: "I can conceive of no greater calamity than the assimilation of the Negro into our social and political life as our equal...We can never attain the ideal union our fathers dreamed, with millions of an alien, inferior race among us, whose assimilation is neither possible nor desirable." He punctuated these feelings during a presidential debate with Stephen A. Douglas in 1858: "I am not nor have ever been in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the black and white races." "I am not, nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people." "There is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will ever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality." "And in as much as they cannot so live, while they do remain together, there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I, as much as any other man, am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race."

There is no question that Lincoln and Livingstone have secured a place in history for hastening the end of the slave trade. And yet, the adherence of these and other leaders to the centuries-old mindset that

Africans were inferior humans effectively gave a green light to those who would engineer the next era of African oppression—colonialism.

• • •

No person embodied colonialism more than Sir Cecil John Rhodes—the most famous British imperialist in history. Rhodes was born in England in 1853 and moved to South Africa in 1871. Soon thereafter Rhodes found his life's purpose when diamonds were discovered in Kimberley. Securing diamond concessions became his sole ambition. His obsession. By 1888 he and his partners had virtually monopolized the South African diamond industry through a company he had formed—De Beers.

His lust for personal wealth was only paralleled by his desire to annex land for England. Through his British South Africa Company, Rhodes signed treaties and used trickery to enter tribal lands across the Zambezi to explore for potential wealth. To facilitate his objectives Rhodes formed a 'police force' to 'preserve order.' Claims were staked as far north as Lake Tanganyika, and east to Barotseland. Rhodes effectuated the seizure of African land for England. The Zambezi River divided the two territories that would bear his name—Southern Rhodesia and Northern Rhodesia. The vast region would be administered by the British South Africa Company, effectively making it a "company state."

Rhodes was a celebrity in England. A hero adorned by commoners, royalty, and statesmen. He believed his quest was good for Europe and the entire world: "I contend that we are the finest race in the world and that the more of the world we inhabit the better it is for the human race…more territory simply means more of the Anglo-Saxon race, more of the best, the most human, most honourable race the world possesses." A statement dripping with arrogance and racism, and yet a perfect articulation of British imperialist thinking. While today Rhodes'

name is more associated with the scholarships he created through Oxford University, he also played a key role in establishing apartheid in South Africa: "[T]he native is to be treated as a child and denied the franchise. We must adopt a system of despotism in our relations with the barbarians of South Africa." In more casual settings he would say flatly: "I prefer land to niggers."

• • •

Rhodes was not alone, as a new century was greeted with old thinking. World leaders invoked these same racist arguments to legitimize Europe's dissection of Africa into colonies. Prime Minister Jules Ferry of France asserted in the French Chamber of Deputies on March 28, 1884: "We must say openly that indeed the higher races have a right over the lower races…I reiterate that for superior races there is a right because there is a duty for them. They have the right to civilize inferior races." In 1912 Paul Rohrbach, architect of German immigration into Southwest Africa, identified at least one area where France and Germany were in agreement: "No philanthropy or racial theory can convince reasonable people that the preservation of a tribe of Cafre in South Africa…is more important for the future of humanity than the expansion of big European nations and of the white race in general…Whether it is peoples or individuals, beings who do not produce anything of value cannot pose claims on their right to existence."

Americans proudly recall President Theodore Roosevelt's bold leadership of the Rough Rider Regiment during the Spanish-American War. The twenty-sixth U.S. President is also remembered for offering some strait-forward advice: "Speak softly and carry a big stick; you will go far." Less celebrated are certain remarks he made near the end of his administration. A staunch supporter of colonialism, Roosevelt argued, "the expansion of the peoples of white, or European blood…has been

fraught with lasting benefit to most of the peoples already dwelling in the lands over which the expansion took place." He added that with "this expansion…has gone an increase in population and well-being among the natives of the countries where the expansion has taken place."

Through these clear and unwavering messages western leaders gave legitimacy to Europe's imperial ambitions. Cecil Rhodes died in 1902, but by then colonialism was well underway, and the British South Africa Company pressed forward under new leadership. For Africans, Rhodes' passing mattered little; the indigenous people would be treated in the manner he had envisioned. Colonialism steamrolled across the Zambezi, and for the next several decades it would leave a broken and dispirited people in its wake.

• • •

Defining territorial boundaries was followed by an influx of resources to locate and extract mineral wealth, develop agriculture, and build a railway system to transport these commodities for export. Colonialists were initially unable to attract a labor force because everything the Africans needed was provided by the fertile land, and through bartering with other tribes. The solution was simple—if Africans did not want to go, they would be forced.

Colonialists instituted the "hut tax," a monetary fee for living on "white land." Many Africans had little need for currency and no means to earn it. Colonial administrators knew this, of course. It was part of their strategy. Forced with losing their homes and land, thousands of African men left their families to earn tax money in far-off mines. Those refusing to pay would have their homes burned to the ground.

In Northern Rhodesia, those Africans who could earn tax money had their enterprises destroyed. Africans acquiring wealth through

livestock had their animals seized. In areas where tribes generated income through hunting and selling ivory, the practices were outlawed. If tribes produced salt to sell, colonial administrators would suppress its manufacture. Africans who made tools from iron were charged an exorbitant tax that they could not afford. While this subjugation fostered social unrest, any uprisings were quelled by brutal and well-equipped 'security' forces. Left with little choice, people were forced into labor migrancy. The colonialists had their supply of workers.

The need for labor generated the first mass migrations in Northern Rhodesia since the slave trade. A more gruesome reminder occurred during World War I. British troops were battling Germans in central Africa, and supplies had to be transported. Hundreds of thousands of Africans from Northern Rhodesia were taken from their homes and forced to carry equipment and other materials for the British Army. Many died from malnutrition and disease. Those who tried to escape were murdered. With legions of African men having already been driven away to earn tax money, the removal of this many others drained families and entire communities of the labor they needed to survive.

Decades had passed since Africans were taken from their homes, weighted down with ivory, and forced into grim death marches, during World War I as Northern Rhodesian carriers labored and died in support of their oppressors' war effort. They must have remembered the plight of their ancestors and wondered whether slavery and colonialism shared a common definition. While there are clear distinctions, those who advanced the two institutions were guided by the same perceptions of African inferiority.

In 1924 the British Colonial Office assumed control of Northern Rhodesia while the British South Africa Company maintained mineral rights. The Company's rule was over, but the effects remained. In only

a quarter century the Company had transformed community-based, self-sufficient entrepreneurs into wandering laborers, dependent on outsiders for sustenance. African way of life was destroyed.

• • •

Northern Rhodesia's first governor was driven by an ambition to create a "white man's country" north of the Zambezi. Sir Herbert Stanley convinced himself that attracting white settlers would require ridding the best land of its African inhabitants. Commissions were established to identify suitable lands for Europeans. Any Africans residing in these areas would be removed to 'Native Reserves.' Approximately 60,000 Africans had been moved by 1930.

African families tried to forge a life on the reserves, but the circumstances wouldn't allow it. With so many people squeezed into such a small area, farming was almost impossible. The poor soil further eliminated any chance of self-sustenance. The packed reserves became havens for disease and death. In the end Africans were left with little choice but to seek work with white-controlled enterprises.

Europeans never came—at least not in the numbers Stanley envisioned. Meanwhile, the land remained vacant and much of it reverted to wild country, or "the silent land." From their crowded, disease-ridden purgatories the natives could do nothing but watch the vast, fertile land go unused. Their despair was captured in a complaint to a Northern Rhodesian government official in 1937: "We were moved from our homes....that Europeans might come to live there. No Europeans have come and soon there will be none of us left here. If we stay here we shall know that the Government has destroyed us."

Of course, the well-being of Africans mattered little to England's leaders. Just a couple years before becoming Prime Minister, Winston

Churchill made clear his beliefs on such matters: "I do not admit…that a great wrong has been done to the Red Indians of America, or the black people of Australia…by the fact that a stronger race, a higher-grade race…has come in and taken its place."

• • •

Northern Rhodesia eventually experienced an influx of Europeans, but fertile land wasn't the attraction. Vast copper deposits were discovered near the upper Kafue River in the 1920s. By 1930 large mines were being developed on what became known as the Northern Rhodesia Copperbelt. Whereas agriculture once dominated the economy, in 1938 copper and other minerals were 97 percent of the country's exports. There was a substantial demand for copper during World War II, and Northern Rhodesia emerged as a dominant supplier. Robust economic growth fueled immigration. In 1946 the European population in Northern Rhodesia was 22,000, and by 1951 in had climbed to 37,000.

Rapid integration brought severe discrimination. European mine workers assumed high-paying senior positions, while Africans were given the worst jobs and paid minimal wages. Whites had access to nice homes and were provided with other benefits. African workers and their families were poorly fed and housed in unsanitary compounds, unworthy of satisfactory living conditions. A healthy and stable urban black population was seen as a potential threat to white domination. Northern Rhodesia now had a system in place resembling that in South Africa.

After suffering for years under this disparate treatment African resentment finally boiled over. In 1935 the government levied a tax increase against mine workers. The Africans engaged in a strike to press for higher wages and better living conditions. There were no negotiations,

and no effort was made to reach a compromise. Instead, government forces opened fire on the Africans, killing six and wounding seventeen.

One year later European mine workers formed a union that was recognized by the mine owners. They struck and, after peaceful negotiations, achieved pay increases. African workers were not permitted to join the white union, so they organized amongst themselves. Observing the success of the white miners' strike, Africans struck again on March 28, 1940. Again, there were no negotiations—government forces opened fire on the workers, killing thirteen and wounding seventy-one.

In 1950 Africans in Northern Rhodesia were facing a stark reality—a white minority was working to ensure they remained powerless, impoverished, and disenfranchised.

Over time the human conscience came to accept and justify the enslavement, oppression, and murder of Africans.

While no world-changing phenomenon begins at a precise moment, history was substantially altered by the ripples extending outward from Madeira's colonization. Over time the human conscience came to accept and justify the enslavement, oppression, and murder of Africans.

As the world entered the second half of the twentieth century, advances in media and communications were bringing people together, the United Nations had been established to build international cooperation, and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade was created to foster economic integration. Yet while a new world was emerging, much of the old one remained.

Dr. John Colin Carothers was a native South African who became a respected researcher and writer on the mental health of Africans in the 1940s and 1950s. He served as Director of Nairobi's Mathari Mental Hospital, and also worked in Northern Rhodesia and Uganda. In 1952 he was commissioned by the World Health Organization to complete a study on African mental health. That Carothers was selected among several notable candidates is evidence of the respect he garnered at the time. His finished work was entitled *The African Mind in Health and Disease* (1953). In *The African Mind*, Carothers issued one of history's most condemning verdicts on Africans.

Carothers referenced the conclusions of other western writers, and flatly asserted that "European conceptions of the African" are representative of the "truth." The following diatribe is perhaps the most poignant summation of his conclusions: "The African accordingly has been described as conventional; highly dependent on physical and emotional stimulation; lacking in...foresight, tenacity, judgment and humility; inapt for sound abstraction and for logic, given to phantasy and fabrication; and in general, as unstable, impulsive, unreliable, irresponsible, and living in the present without reflection or ambition, or regard for the rights of people outside his own circle." These comments resemble Carothers' earlier writings where he compared Africans with schizophrenics.

Public response to *The African Mind* was overwhelmingly positive. One prominent expert referred to Carothers' work as a "brave adventure into new and untried fields, a tremendous undertaking in a few months by a physician who has spent his life working among the peoples of Africa." Not only did the substance of Carothers' study avoid criticism, but readers also failed to question the timing of its release. *The African Mind* was published during a period when European countries were

struggling to rationalize their hold on colonial territories. With its conclusion that Africans were incapable of mature behavior or even rational thought, *The African Mind* offered a timely and convenient justification for ruling Africa's people and looting its natural resources.

The harm caused by The African Mind was not in its racial stereotypes. People had held these beliefs for centuries. Rather, Carothers' work was damaging because it went beyond theories, and was seemingly grounded in science. It gave racism increased legitimacy. For this reason, Carothers and his colleagues had secured for themselves an elevated place in history, alongside others whose assertions of racial inferiority significantly contributed to the abuse of Africans. Although Carothers and his work were later discredited, in the 1950s he was praised.

And the world's view of Africans remained unchanged.

Golf

On July 23, 1950, Golf was enjoying its five-hundredth year as history's game of royalty and science.

The earliest known reference to the game was also a foreshadowing of its future significance. It wasn't a local records keeper, journalist, historian, or even a player who delivered proof of golf's existence to modern historians. It was King James II of Scotland.

A Scottish King in the fifteenth century had one paramount priority—defending his country against its "auld enemies of England." Having endured centuries of invasions and occupations, troop preparedness was Scotland's highest priority. Yet James II was becoming increasingly distressed because his soldiers were neglecting their archery practice in favor of engaging in a sport where the object was to use sticks to hit a ball into a hole in the ground. Having seen enough of this growing distraction, in the 1450s the fourteenth Parliament of King James II decreed "that the Fute-ball and Golf be utterly cryit doune, and nocht usit (not used)..." This single edict was the world's first recorded reference to golf.

Despite a seemingly unequivocal prohibition, history suggests that Scotland's monarchs were – at least on this issue—unable to control the actions of their citizens. For if the decree instituted by James II had truly resolved the matter, it leaves to wonder why the Parliament of King James III needed to reaffirm the ban in 1470, just thirteen years later. Golf's popularity was spreading.

Finally, in 1491 the third Parliament of King James IV would make one last attempt at quelling what was fast becoming a national obsession. In that year, for the common good of the "realme," and "defense thairof…" Parliament decreed "that in na place of the realme there be usit Futeball, Golfe, or uther sik unprofitabill sportis…" James IV would enforce his decree with stiff punishment, including a fine and imprisonment. It would have no effect.

By the turn of the sixteenth century, Scottish royalty had spent nearly fifty years waging an unsuccessful campaign against Golf. For them the game remained a dangerous diversion. One could almost picture each new King receiving two heirlooms upon his ascension to the Scottish throne—the crown, and a firm education on the dangers of golf. Yet as entrenched as this belief was in the minds of Scotland's kings, the love of golf among Scotsmen ran even deeper.

Perhaps James IV knew the futility of trying to extricate a pastime that was so woven into the tapestry of Scottish society. But like his father, grandfather, and centuries of Scottish leaders before him, James IV ruled under the constant threat of war with England. For him there seemed to be only one solution—make peace with England. This he did in 1502 by signing a peace treaty with King Henry VII at Glasgow Cathedral. The following year he married Henry's daughter, Princess Margaret.

The Glasgow peace agreement was one of the many accomplishments of James IV ('James of the Iron Belt'). Despite being only 15 when he assumed power, James IV proceeded to build a strong military and extend Scottish rule over outlying areas. A staunch advocate of education, he made it mandatory for affluent Scotsmen to send their sons to school, and under his reign the Royal College of Surgeons in Edinburgh, St. Leonard's College, St. Andrews, and King's College were founded. A

learned man himself, he spoke several languages, practiced dentistry, and was a student of science and literature.

James IV is equally well-known for an act that required far less effort. One day in 1502 some Scottish nobles invited the King to join them outside on the castle lawn. When he arrived a golf ball was placed on the turf in front of him. After some prodding, he reluctantly took a few swings. The club rarely found its intended target. When contact was made the ball rolled only a few yards. The King went grumbling back inside. But this was a man who had expanded and united his kingdom, made peace with England, and was a true Renaissance leader. He was not going to be outdone by a wooden stick and a little ball! The next day he emerged from the castle to have another go. He was hooked.

With this brief foray, James IV unceremoniously became the first Scottish monarch to play golf. History also shows him to be the first known purchaser of golf equipment. Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer from 1502 and 1503 confirm that the King purchased clubs and balls from a Perth 'bowar' (bowmaker). The King's change of heart and the peace with England reduced the ban to nothing more than a few empty words on paper, although playing golf on Sundays was still prohibited. For fifty years golf had raised the blood pressure of Scottish royalty, but now this dire threat to national security would become a favorite royal pastime and a symbol of the unity between Scotland and England.

James IV enjoyed the game for ten years following the Glasgow peace accord until he once again found himself at war with England. He was duty-bound to honor Scotland's "auld alliance" with France, so when Henry VIII invaded France, James IV retaliated by invading England. He and his army were massacred by the English at the Battle of Flodden in 1513. Scotland had lost a great leader, and its first to play golf.

James V was 17 months old when his father died, yet he would eventually inherit his father's throne and his love of golf. After an unstable childhood that included being kidnapped by his stepfather, James V assumed power in 1528. His reign was marked by violent conflict. He continued the war with England on behalf of the 'auld alliance,' and he ruthlessly eliminated any potential rivals in Scotland. His personal life was tumultuous as well, losing his first wife to tuberculosis and fathering numerous children by several different mistresses.

Amidst this turmoil the King needed a peaceful distraction. He didn't have to look far. James V played golf regularly at Gosford in East Lothian. He established a private course there and was so particular about its care that he permitted players to only use wooden-headed clubs.

Golf was surely an escape from his troubles, and he enjoyed the game until he was stricken with fever in 1542. Confined to his bed at Falkland Palace, the King was delivered two messages that were thought to have hastened his death. He learned that his army had been crushed in the marshes separating Scotland and England—at the Battle of Solway. A short time later he received some information that may have troubled him even more. James V desperately wanted a son to carry on the Stuart line, believing that a woman could never successfully rule Scotland. But in early December a messenger informed him that his second wife had given birth to a girl, Mary. Six days later King James V was dead.

Mary became Queen of Scots on December 8, 1542. She was six days old. The young queen received golf lessons at a very young age and was an experienced player by the age of five. Scottish Catholics assumed responsibility for Mary's upbringing and sent her to be educated in

France, a Catholic country. Golf had become a Scottish royal pastime. Mary built on this tradition during her time in France. Through her childhood and into her teens she found time to enjoy the game amidst a demanding academic schedule—by age seven she could speak several languages and play the lute. When the Queen played golf, it was customary for others to carry her clubs for her. These porters were known as "cadets" (pronounced "cad-day" in French). Many golf historians believe this to be the origin of the term "caddy."

Mary Queen of Scots never enjoyed sustained happiness. It seemed at every turn tragedy robbed the young queen of her *joie de vivre*. Yet through her turmoil she would find refuge in the royal pastime. In 1558 she married Francis II, son of King Henri II of France. Her dreams of ruling France and Scotland with her new husband were soon extinguished when Francis died of an ear infection in 1560. Mary returned to Scotland, and a few years later married her second cousin, Henry Stuart, Lord Darnley, in 1565. The following year she gave birth to her only child, James VI, on June 19, 1566. During this period Mary played golf regularly with one of her attendants, Mary Seton. She even presented Ms. Seton with a necklace after Seton had beaten the Queen on one occasion. This seemingly joyful period in Mary's life would again be short-lived.

Scottish nobles, believing Mary was a threat to their power, murdered Darnley on February 10, 1567. The Queen was twenty-three years old and had just become a widow for the second time. In what may have been a simple attempt to take her mind off her troubles, Mary grabbed her golf clubs and stepped outside the castle to take a few swings. Critics believed her behavior was inappropriate for a woman in mourning. It fueled speculation that she participated in her husband's murder. Support for Mary waned, and in 1567 she was forced to abdicate her throne in favor of her thirteen-month-old son.

In 1568 she fled south to seek asylum in England, without her child. More important than being Mary's son, James VI was now Scotland's reigning monarch. When Mary arrived in England, Queen Elizabeth I placed the former Scottish Queen under house arrest where she would remain for 18 years. She was eventually charged with treason and beheaded on February 8, 1587. When Mary last held her son, twenty years earlier, she could not have envisioned the tremendous influence he would have on golf, and the way he would impact western civilization.

King James VI & I shared his forebears' belief that golf was a noble pursuit, deserving of an elevated status.

Like his mother, James VI found time to play golf amidst a rigorous academic curriculum. The young king studied history, arithmetic, and theology, and mastered several foreign languages. The result was a shrewd intellectual—one of the most learned men ever to sit on the throne of Scotland. He was an avid golfer during his formative years. He reportedly golfed at Musselburgh, near where his mother had her fateful outing following the death of her second husband.

James IV began ruling Scotland at age nineteen, but his ambitions lye beyond Solway Firth. As the great-grandson of James IV and Princess Margaret, his bloodlines gave him a rightful claim to the thrones of Scotland and England. James realized his dreams when Queen Elizabeth, the woman who approved his mother's execution, died in 1603. In that year, he became King James VI of Scotland & I of England. He and his wife, Anne of Denmark, moved south to England with their two sons—Prince Henry and Prince Charles. He brought his golf clubs, of course.

King James VI & I shared his forebears' belief that golf was a noble pursuit, deserving of an elevated status. He spread its popularity throughout his kingdom, doing more than any previous monarch to preserve the game in a manner consistent with its royal pedigree. In 1603 the King appointed William Mayne to be royal clubmaker. Creating this 'royal' distinction enhanced simultaneously the prestige of golf, and the art of clubmaking. Later he would grant James Melville, a student at St. Andrews, a 21-year exclusive right to produce feather golf balls. In 1608 James and a few of his Scottish courtiers traveled to Blackheath and reputedly laid-out a seven-hole course and played golf with "hockey-shaped sticks and feather balls." Through these actions James succeeded in enhancing the stature of golf in Great Britain, but three years after Blackheath the majority of the western world would be permanently impacted by the King's most lasting achievement.

Following his ascension to the English throne James VI & I gathered several notable experts at the Hampton Court Conference "for the hearing, and for the determining, things pretended to be amiss in the church." The King decided that a new translation of the Bible was needed. He appointed a committee of top linguists and theologians to begin work. The process took seven years to complete, and the result far exceeded expectations. The King James Bible of 1611 was not only a benefit to English-speaking Protestants, it was also a masterpiece of the English language. Today the Authorized King James Version of the Bible stands as the most widely read book in history. For millions of Christians it is the definitive word of God.

King James VI & I made several additional contributions to British society, and to golf. A strong supporter of the performing arts, King James was a loyal patron to a certain British playwright of his day—William Shakespeare. In fact, James was such a big fan that Shakespeare's troop

became known as "the King's men." James even made weekends better when he lifted the ban against playing golf on Sundays, although playing during times of service was still prohibited.

The King's health declined over several years until finally, on March 27, 1625, James VI & I died at Theobolds Park in Herts, England. Just as he had used his power to clarify and improve the Bible for millions of Christians, King James elevated golf from its already lofty position, spreading its popularity throughout England. Through his passion for the sport, and his actions to preserve its rich heritage, King James VI & I further solidified golf as the royal game.

• • •

King James believed golf to be "great recreation for the young," and his heir was introduced to the game at an early age. It is believed that Charles I first played golf in his native Dunfermline, Scotland. As an adult, King Charles I shared his father's passion for golf, but his failure to build political support and his eventual demise would more closely parallel the reign of his grandmother, Mary Queen of Scots.

Opposition to Charles I increased as he stubbornly advanced several divisive policies. He approved military action against Spain and France that proved unsuccessful and costly. He insisted on strict adherence to certain religious practices that were unacceptable to English and Scottish Protestants. He dissolved Parliament when they criticized him, and he maintained policies that fueled Irish unrest, eventually leading to the "Irish Uprising of 1641" —a response to the seizure of Irish land for Protestant settlers. At the height of his unpopularity, during this violent unrest, and with the prospect of civil war increasing, where was King Charles I when word of the Irish Uprising finally reached him? He was playing golf.

The King was enjoying a round on the Links at Leith, Scotland, when he learned of the rebellion. While some may have frowned on the King for playing golf at such a critical time, it was the King's reaction to the news that sparked discussion. Some historical accounts have the King distressed and leaving immediately for Holyrood. Another version has him finishing the round. Neither story places Charles I in a positive light. Either he is viewed as lacking courage (by stopping play and fleeing), or as taking the crisis too lightly (by finishing his round). In reality, there was probably no proper course of action. His opponents were going to interpret any behavior negatively—a lesson he could have learned from his grandmother.

The division caused by Charles I lead to civil war in England. Loyalists to the King were eventually defeated, and he was confined to New Castle-upon-Tyne. Even then he could not take his mind off the royal game. The King played golf at Shield Field outside the castle walls. Charles I failed to regain power, and was ultimately charged with high treason and "other crimes against the realm of England." He was found guilty and sentenced to death. After pleas by Charles II to spare his father's life went unanswered, King Charles I was publicly beheaded on January 30, 1649, sixty-two years after his grandmother received the same punishment.

• • •

The attitude of Charles II toward golf reflected his broader life experiences. Scottish leaders, appalled by England's execution of Charles I, maintained their allegiance to the royal family and proclaimed Charles II King of Scotland. Several demands were placed on the new king—a result of Scottish distrust after the divisive reign of Charles I. Charles II was "made to bewail the sins of his father and the idolatries of his mother in solemn public fasts." So often was Charles seeking repentance

for his parents' misdeeds he one once quipped: "I thought I ought to lament to that I was ever born."

They even prescribed the conditions under which the King could play the royal game. He could only partake in the "sober vanity of golf in the company of staid persons." Throughout its history, golf was never intended to be a completely "sober" activity, played by "staid" persons. Golf had become a noble and distinguished activity, but these qualities never detracted from its central purpose—amusement.

Charles II ascended to the English throne in 1660, again putting Great Britain under one crown. He promptly moved to London, leaving behind the drudgery that defined his life in Scotland. His reign was marked by continued feuds over religion and the role of the monarchy, an outgrowth of his firm belief in royal absolutism. Charles suffered a severe stroke and died on February 6, 1685. Although Scotland enabled his rise to power, Charles II had few fond memories of his years under the overbearing Scottish Ministers. This may be why there are so few historical references to him playing golf. For the rest of his life, he surely associated the royal game with the other dreaded aspects of his time in Scotland.

• • •

Charles' apparent aversion to the game separated him from his royal ancestors, but it also identified a common thread shared by the Stuart monarchs since James II—golf played an integral role in their lives and could be viewed as symbolic of their reigns. Under James II and James III golf symbolized war, and for James IV it represented peace. The use of French cadets by Mary Queen of Scots added glamour and prestige to the game, coinciding with the optimism that surrounded the beautiful young queen. Of course, golf was also associated with her decline, as

it was with Charles I. And in England during the reign of James VI & I, golf signified the arrival of a Scottish king who ignited passion for a Scottish game.

Luckily, the distaste for golf held by Charles II did not pass to the next King, a man who rejoined the union of crown and club, and who ushered in traditions that are still part of the game today.

In May of 1680, King Charles II named his brother, the Duke of York, Lord High Commissioner of Scotland. It was during his years in Scotland that James VII & II found himself defending the Scotsmen who had frustrated his family two-and-a-half centuries earlier. Two English noblemen asserted that England, rather than Scotland, was the birthplace of golf. The Duke firmly disagreed, perhaps remembering the Scottish archers who had put down their bows and arrows in favor of golf clubs. Whatever his reasoning, James disputed their claim and the three men agreed to settle the issue by playing one round on the links at Leith. James was allowed to choose any Scot as his partner.

James conducted a thorough search of the surrounding area, making numerous inquiries about the golf playing abilities of the local inhabitants. One name kept surfacing—John Patersone. Patersone was a poor shoemaker, but also the local champion. James decided to approach him. One can only imagine Patersone's reaction when James VII & II, the Duke of York, asked him to defend his homeland's claim as the birthplace of the royal game. And so it was that in 1682 that the Duke of York, two English Noblemen, and a cobbler met on the links at Leith to finally resolve the issue.

The outcome was decisive. James and Patersone trounced the two English Noblemen, with Patersone being the star. The Duke rewarded the cobbler handsomely by sharing with him the considerable wager

that had been placed on the match. Patersone invested wisely, building a house in the Canongate of Edinburgh. Hung on a wall in the house was a gift from the Duke—an escutcheon bearing the coat of arms of the Patersone family. Above the coat of arms was a depiction of a hand gripping a golf club, next to the motto 'Far and Sure.' Inscribed below the arms is 'I hate no person,' an apparent dedication to John Patersone. The house, known as 'The Golfer's Land,' still exists.

The match itself carries more historical significance than a friendly wager between blue bloods. It is believed that the Duke and the cobbler won the first recorded international match. ome golf historians credit this single round at Leith with being a precursor to the present-day Ryder Cup and Walker Cup competitions.

The Duke became King in 1685 following the death of his older brother. James VII & II was a devout Catholic, and like previous Stuarts he advanced policies that alienated powerful English Protestants, including those in parliament. The King's enemies finally took action in 1688, inviting James' son-in-law, William III, to invade England. William, the 'Prince of Orange,' was living in Holland and had garnered the respect of Protestants after battling France's powerful Catholic King, Louis XIV. On November 5, 1688, William III invaded England, sparking "The Glorious Revolution." Lacking support, James VII & II left the country, taking with him a rich and tumultuous two-hundred-and-forty-year relationship between the monarchy and golf.

• • •

To appreciate golf's image during this period requires an understanding of the beliefs held by those living under Scottish and English monarchs in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries. Most were convinced that the royal family had a divine right to rule—they were chosen by

God. Consequently, their words and actions had a significant impact on public perceptions. For nearly two centuries Scotland and England watched their rulers play golf with passion and take actions to preserve the game's heritage. As a result, people viewed the game differently. Golf had achieved its own distinct image. It had become a sacred institution with no need for a king or queen to legitimize its royal status.

By the early 1700s the royal pastime was an indicator of social status. Players gathered at the links to organize matches and dine together. Finally, in 1744 "Several Gentlemen of Honour, Skillful in the Ancient and Healthful Exercise of Golf…" petitioned the Town Council of Edinburgh for the donation of a prize—a silver club—for annual competition on the links at Leith. The club was presented, and a series of rules were prescribed to ensure the dignity of the competition. The players would include "as many Noblemen or Gentlemen or other Golfers, from any part of Great Britain or Ireland." The winner of the club would be named 'Captain of the Golf.'

A decade later, twenty-two "Noblemen and Gentlemen, being admirers of the ancient and healthful exercise of the Golf," founded their own society in a historic town just a short distance away. Rules were drafted and a silver club was again used as a prize. With a golf tradition that dated back centuries, the establishment of a club here was long overdue. The founders agreed to name their club after the town—The Society of St. Andrews Golfers.

Edinburgh, St. Andrews, and other early societies treated golf with the respect it had earned—the drafting of rules, references to "gentlemen," "noblemen," and "honour," and the awarding of valuable prizes. Officers kept precise minutes of club meetings. Members were expected to wear official uniforms when playing. These rules-based membership societies added an element of prestige to golf that never

existed under the Stuart monarchs. Citizens (not kings or queens) were now elevating the royal game. Seven golf societies were in existence by the end of the eighteenth century, and even more were created in the first half of the nineteenth century.

• • •

Shortly after the Perth Golfing Society was formed in 1824, a request for special designation was submitted to King William IV. The request was granted, and on June 4, 1833, the club became the Royal Perth Golfing Society, "an honour which no other Golfing Society could boast of."

The reaction from St. Andrews was swift—if any golfing society deserved such a title, it was theirs. St. Andrews predated Perth by seventy years, and no club had done more to preserve and dignify the game than the Society of St. Andrews Golfers. As the former Duke of St. Andrews, William IV needed little convincing. In recognition of St. Andrews' distinguished history, in 1834 the King bestowed a title held by no other society—The 'Royal and Ancient' Golf Club of St. Andrews. The King became a patron and presented St. Andrews with a gold medal with a green ribband as a prize for the club's annual competition. William IV died three years later, but the revitalized union between club and crown would continue under his successor—a woman who would become England's longest serving monarch.

• • •

William's niece, Princess Victoria, ascended to the throne in 1837. Her strict upbringing had molded her into a cold and uncompromising woman. At a time when England was transitioning to a constitutional monarchy, her pride and obstinacy would lead her to exact royal influence where possible. During Victoria's reign England seized lands in Africa and Asia. The Queen was crowned Empress of India, and Victoria Falls

in Zambia still bears her name. It was said that under Queen Victoria, Britain built an empire on which the sun never set. The "Victorian Era" is widely considered to be the greatest in England's history.

She also found ways to bolster royal popularity in her own country. The Queen followed her uncle's lead and provided several golf clubs with royal pedigree, including Royal Blackheath, Royal Ashdown, and Royal Eastbourne. Victoria may not have been a golfer herself, but she surely understood the value of attaching 'royalty' to an activity that held such a lofty place in British society and was inextricably linked to the lives of so many Scottish and English monarchs.

• • •

Royal christening of golf clubs would continue under Victoria's heir, Albert Edward ("Bertie"), but mother and son had little else in common. The same unyielding personality that led to Victoria's success as a queen would contribute to her failure as a mother. Victoria showed little or no affection to her children, often deluging them with verbal abuse. Bertie responded by disobeying authority figures, throwing tantrums, and engaging in other acts of resistance against the childhood that his abusive mother had designed for him.

As a young man the prince continued his disdain for the script he was supposed to follow. Bertie enjoyed gambling, alcohol, and women. Yet he was also loyal, charming, and blessed with an open mind and sense of morality that was advanced for his time. His friendships with Catholics and Jews raised eyebrows among England's elite. He loathed the cruel way British colonialists treated the natives in India, once remarking that just "because a man has a black face and a different religion than our own, there is no reason that he should be treated as

a brute." His compassion remained after he ascended to the throne in 1901, as King Edward VII.

Like his mother, King Edward was intent on carving out a substantive and visible role for himself, Prime Minister notwithstanding. He boldly took it upon himself to strengthen Britain's foreign relations, forging successful alliances with France, Russia, and other European neighbors. His skilled diplomacy and warm demeanor earned him the affectionate title "Uncle of Europe." Edward's passion for life and his love of celebrations may have been a motivating factor in his decision to bestow royal patronage on several golf clubs, including Royal Aberdeen, Royal Dornoch, Royal Cromer, Royal Mid Surrey, and Royal Wimbledon. He took a leading role in continuing this tradition as Prince, and King. King Edward VII, one of Britain's most colorful monarchs, died in 1910, leaving the throne to his oldest son, George V.

• • •

The twentieth century brought substantial changes to the British monarchy, and to golf. King George V did not share in his father and grandmother's struggle to preserve a substantive role for the monarch. He chose instead to set the modern standard. George V believed the duty of the sovereign was to symbolize the strength and dignity of Great Britain—to generate national pride and serve as a vehicle for preserving the best of royal traditions. George V leveraged his position to generate sympathy and strength during challenging times, including by visiting British troops during World War I.

Nevertheless, George V ensured that the royal family retained exclusive authority to administer at least one important responsibility—bestowing royal distinction on golf clubs. Royal Burgess, Royal Cinque Ports, Royal Lytham & St. Annes, and Royal Norwich all received their

distinctions from King George V. He also provided royal designation to Royal Calcutta Golf Club and Royal Johannesburg Golf Club when he traveled to India and South Africa. The King was an avid player as well. Articulating the frustrations of many golfers, George once summed up his feelings toward the sport by stating that: "Golf always makes me so damned angry."

• • •

George V and Edward VIII shared a passion for golf and a common belief in the role of the monarch, but father and son would have vastly different reigns. Early on, Prince Edward used his position to bolster national morale during troubling times. He uplifted spirits (and increased his own popularity) by visiting poor areas during the Great Depression. Although he showed great promise as prince, Edward abdicated the throne in 1936, the same year he became King. Edward was in love with a divorced American woman, Mrs. Wallis Simpson. Marriage to Mrs. Simpson was unacceptable to his ministers, so the King was forced to choose between the crown and marrying the woman he loved. He chose the latter. He would thereafter be known as the Duke of Windsor.

Some speculate that Edward also wanted more time to play golf. He served as captain of Royal St. George and Royal St. David. He even made a hole in one at Royal Wimbledon. The Duke traveled the world, playing golf in Europe, Canada, the United States, South America, Africa, India, and the Middle East. A King with such a hectic golf schedule would have little time for royal duties.

• • •

In 1936 George VI suddenly found himself on the throne following his older brother's abdication. He followed the example set by his father, George V, and established himself as a good will ambassador and symbol

of national strength. Buckingham Palace was bombed nine times during World War II, and yet George V refused to leave. After German air raids he would visit damaged areas of London.

Although he didn't share his older brother's passion for golf, George VI enjoyed the game, nonetheless. Royal Perth and Royal Birkdale received their royal credentials under George VI. He even became Captain of the Royal and Ancient Club of St. Andrews and competed in a match-play tournament at Ton Pentre. George VI maintained the close relationship between club and crown until his death in 1952.

• • •

While George V, Edward VIII and George VI were gracefully accepting the monarchy's diminished role, the popularity of golf was expanding. The bug was biting leaders across the ocean. In 1909 William H. Taft became the first U.S. President who displayed a true passion for the game. Taft once remarked that, "The beauty of golf is that you cannot play if you permit yourself to think of anything else."

President Woodrow Wilson loved golf so much that hardly anything could keep him off the course, including harsh weather conditions. Wilson used black golf balls so that he could more easily find them in the snow. He even refused to stop playing golf at the outbreak of World War I, perhaps following the example of King Charles I. Warren G. Harding was an avid player, as was Franklin D. Roosevelt until poor health eventually prevented him from playing.

• • •

Golf's prestige was enhanced as Kings and Presidents were sharing a love of the game. But the surge in golf's popularity in the first half of the twentieth century was mostly due to the increased attention

given to major golf tournaments. Stories of masterful performances at the U.S. Open and U.S. Amateur Championships and the Open Championship (British Open) fueled interest in the game and sent many weekend hackers on a quest to learn the secrets of top amateurs and professionals, including Willie Anderson, Walter J. Travis, Francis Ouimet, and of course, Bobby Jones.

In "A History of Golf," Browning credits the Americans with developing specific methods to achieve lower scores. People began studying the physics of the game—the swing, the stance, and how the club needed to strike the ball to increase accuracy. Golf was becoming a science.

The demand for knowledge led to an explosion of golf instruction books. "How to Play Golf" by Spalding and Bros. is typical of the works that promised lower scores. Published during the height of Bobby Jones' career (1929), this comprehensive instruction manual gave detailed explanations on proper techniques from tee to cup. There were even sketched illustrations and photos of players, including Bobby Jones.

Jones decided to cash in on the golf craze by sharing his own insights into the game. With 13 major championships under his belt, what competitive golfer could resist an opportunity to learn the secrets of the master? Through his books, syndicated columns, and instructional motion pictures, Jones broke down every aspect of the game, explaining the proper method for hitting each shot in each situation.

A few years later "Slamming" Sam Snead released his own performance enhancer entitled: "How to play Golf" (1946). Much like Jones, Snead took a very scientific approach—breaking the game down into technical components. He also stressed the value of professional instruction,

emphasizing "why certain fundamentals are adhered to, and what can be expected if they are not."

Those who studied and taught the game knew that golf was a mental, as well as physical science. Jones and Snead both emphasized the importance of "concentration" in their published works. Jones asserted "the most perfect swing in the world" mattered little if "its possessor begins to do a little mental daisy picking." Referring to the "finest players," he said, "their concentration is not occasional, but extends to every single shot."

Snead similarly concluded that among concentration, confidence, and relaxation, "concentration is the most important." He called it a key ingredient to mental discipline—the ability "to eliminate everything from the mind except…the proper line to the hole, the proper stance and grip, and estimating correctly the length of the backswing."

In "The Mental Side of Golf," (1929), perhaps the first book dealing exclusively with the player's mind, Charles W. Moore advanced that golfers must possess certain mental strengths to succeed. Moore delved into psychology and cautioned that "behavior disturbances" and "mental maladjustments" had a substantial negative impact on performance. He explained that "misapplied mental activities" such as "a compulsion of some kind" or "wanderlust of attention" will follow a player to the course, just as they go with him to his home, office, or factory. The assertion was that a mind prone to distraction was weak and could not produce consistently on the golf course.

Indeed, golf places more demands on the mind than perhaps any other sport. In addition to concentration and focus, a golfer must possess a firm understanding and command of his body and equipment. Distance to the hole is only one factor in club selection. Effective course

management means that consideration be given to altitude, weather conditions and course peculiarities. Should a player always attack a 340-yard par 4 with a long opening drive, or do narrow fairways and carefully placed hazards mandate a different approach? Success is determined by the ability to calculate the percentages for success on each shot, of each hole, of each round. No sport requires the mental capacity to compete with so many weapons, on such varied terrain.

• • •

By the middle of the twentieth century golf was known around the world as an activity reserved for the lucky few with the resources to play. Even though affordable equipment made the game more accessible to middle-income Americans and Europeans, players were still wearing slacks, sweaters, and collared shirts when playing golf. Golf's emerging status as a mental and physical science further enhanced the game's standing. And of course, in the background was golf's rich and unparalleled history.

In 1950 golf was viewed differently than other major professional sports. It was perceived as it had been for five centuries—a dignified, noble, and royal game.

"A meaningful event cannot be fully appreciated by its witnesses unless they understand how history molded the key institutions and actors involved, and this includes the way that history shaped peoples' views."

— PETER MUTHIYA

Peter's vague statement became clear over the months I spent researching and gathering information that became the source of these summaries. A Black African achieving a milestone in golf could not be fully appreciated without understanding history on two levels—how history impacted these people *and* this sport, and the way history shaped peoples' opinions of each.

Golf was a game of royalty.
Africa was a continent of slaves.

Golf was a game played by "Gentlemen of Honour."
Africans were "degraded portions of the human family."

Golf was a game whose players benefit greatly from personal instruction.
Africans were less "teachable" and less "intelligent" than "the ape."

Golf was a game whose heroes won championships.
Africans at most could only be "admired for very slender accomplishments."

Golf was a game that required full body control.
Africans were "unstable," and "impulsive."

Golf was a game that required concentration, and would not tolerate "misapplied mental activities," or "wanderlust of attention."
Africans were "lacking in…foresight, tenacity, judgement," and were "inapt for…logic, given to phantasy and fabrication."

Golf was a game of science.
Africans were people that science had proven were inferior.

After centuries of reinforcement, these were commonly held 'truths' about golf and the people of sub-Saharan Africa. These were the world views that existed on **July 23, 1950**, when Sandikonda and Kaliwé Muthiya, two uneducated laborers living in a mud hut in the heart of colonial Africa, gave birth to their sixth child—Peter.