

*7 Harris (Africa)*

**DURRANT'S PRESS CUTTINGS**

**St. Andrew's House, 32 to 34 Holborn Viaduct,  
and 3 St. Andrew Street, Holborn Circus, E.C.1.**

**Telephone: CENTRAL 3149 (TWO LINES).**

---

**National Review**

35 Wellington Street, Strand, W.C.2

JULY 1939

Cutting from issue dated.....193

Wat Rev

J. Harris

98 39

## THE EMPIRE'S RACIAL PERIL

THE pressure of interest in foreign affairs is deflecting public attention from a cancerous growth which threatens the very existence of the British Empire—racial discrimination advocated by Nazi-minded men inside the Empire. The policy of inflicting a colour or racial bar upon British coloured subjects has within recent years found its way increasingly to the statute book. This insidious development has been reinforced lately by two movements, first in point of time the introduction into South Africa of Hitler's racial policy with the issue of a South African edition of the *Beobachter* from a town in South-West Africa, and secondly the Voortrekker celebration.

The "Colour Bar" of which so much is now being heard in African and Indian circles has nothing to do with social customs; whether they be of whites marrying half-castes, or mixed racial dinner parties, these are social matters between the persons concerned. The "Colour Bar" is the infliction of a legislative or administrative bar upon British people of colour solely because of the colour of their skin. There is no question of criminal taint, capacity or incapacity of the victim; it has nothing whatever to do with moral character—if a person has any "colour in his blood," then he is by Colour Bar law put outside the circle of civilized man and stripped of most of the privileges of British citizenship, apart altogether from his qualifications, attainments or character.

It has always been a fundamental maxim of British overseas policy that the Empire must be broadly based regardless of race or creed, and this for the obvious reason that once colour or race becomes an acute Empire controversy it would require statecraft of divine calibre to avert Empire disaster. Mr. Winston Churchill emphasized this to the Conference of British Premiers in 1921, when he said:—

"I think there is only one ideal that the British Empire can set before itself in this regard, and that is that there should be no barrier



of race, colour, or creed which should prevent any man by merit from reaching any station if he is fitted for it."

The population of the British Commonwealth is now taken to be about 500,000,000 people; of these only about 70,000,000 are white. The vast Empire majority of 430,000,000 is composed of all races, creeds and languages. Thus, to make colour and colour alone the test of Empire citizenship is to court disruption.

The remote basis of Colour Bar legislation in South Africa is the old Transvaal Grondwet, which lays down the doctrine: "there can be no equality in Church or State between White and Black." Within the last five years racial propaganda has given a powerful stimulus to "Colour Bar" policy, whilst the racial attitude adopted by Hitler has greatly encouraged Nazi organizations in South Africa. The Rev. J. Reyneke, one of the most reasonable and influential men amongst the leaders of the Dutch Reformed Church, has recently stated:—

"The Afrikaner (Boer) is passionately race-conscious. Nazi-wise he is proud of the purity of his race and jealous of his recently acquired 'eie kultuur'."

Mr. Reyneke, explaining in this connection the "no equality" phrase, says:—

"'No equality' is also the correct translation for 'geen gelykheid, and there is a subtle difference between 'gelykstelling' and 'gelykheid.' When I hear an Afrikaans-speaking Christian use the phrase: 'geen gelykstelling' between White and Black, I do not interpret the words as conveying the idea of antagonism or repression, but rather of separation."

Lord Hailey, in his remarkable "Survey of Africa," quotes Theal in support of the view that slavery was the parent of the Colour Bar:—

"Theal has observed that it was largely the system of Negro slavery which caused early colonists to regard the native as the hewer of wood and drawer of water."

This is not, however, the Dutch view, for if Mr. Piet Grobler is to be accepted as an authority the Dutch received the doctrine of "no equality in Church or State between White and Black" from John Calvin!

The initial step in Colour Bar legislation was taken by General Botha when, in 1913, he decided to segregate the



population of South Africa into White and Black land squares. This action begun in 1913 is even now, after 26 years, far from being complete. The total land area of four Provinces of the Union is about 300,000,000 acres. General Botha, then Prime Minister and Minister for Native Affairs, decided to allot 260,000,000 acre squares to the 700,000 whites engaged on the land and 40,000,000 acres to the 6,000,000 natives.

The Great War then intervened, which with political and other changes in South Africa caused a postponement of any further legislative action based on colour. Then in 1926 came the most far-reaching measure in the form of an amendment to the Mines and Works Act. This measure is the only one of its kind in the civilized world. The Senate in South Africa threw it out twice and it was only by the expedient of a joint sitting of Senate and Assembly that the Bill was driven through. It was too much even for General Smuts, who predicted that it would lead to disaster:—

“The bill (‘Colour Bar Bill’) will be taken as an outrage not only by Black Africa but by Yellow Asia”—“We shall gather on our heads the hatred of the whole of Asia”—“We, a handful of whites, are ring-fencing ourselves first with an inner ring of black hatred and beyond that with a ring of hatred of the whole of Asia”—“The natives are seething with discontent all over South Africa”—“In these circumstances the Colour Bar Bill gratuitously produced here is a firebrand flung into the haystack.”

It is only fair to point out that the Boer section of the population in South Africa is not solely responsible for the industrial part of the Colour Bar legislation; the responsibility for this both in the Union of South Africa and for sympathetic support in Southern Rhodesia belongs to the White Trade Unions, for, as Lord Hailey says:—

“Though, however, the operation of the legal colour bar is confined to the mines, the trade union system applies in practice a colour bar discrimination in most of the skilled trades.”

The Rhodesia Labour Party’s statement of policy lays it down: “In white areas, therefore, the native will be confined largely to the performance of the unskilled work.”

Lord Bledisloe’s Royal Commission deals somewhat fully



with the effect of a Colour Bar policy in Rhodesia in the following striking passage :—

“ In these areas no career is open to natives, the pursuit of which would adversely affect the opportunities of employment, or the standard of living, of Europeans. Native unskilled labour is, however, indispensable for the economic prosecution of any industrial enterprise, and the native is therefore free to offer his service as a worker on the condition that he shall merely assist, and not compete with, the European.”

One of the most startling events of recent times for coloured races has arisen from the publication of *Mein Kampf* in English, in its unexpurgated form. The passages in Hitler's book in which he holds up to ridicule the folly of treating coloured people as fellow humans with the white races has spread alarm throughout the vernacular press of the coloured people of Africa, Asia and America. How could it be otherwise? There is nothing cuts “ to the quick ” the African and Indian races like racial discrimination. In *Mein Kampf* there is first the ridicule poured on the “ bourgeois blockhead ” for his admiration of the success of the negro “ lawyer, teacher and pastor.” Then there is the odium with which Hitler surrounds that “ murky bourgeois mind,” which does not realize that it “ is a sin against reason ” and that “ it is an act of criminal insanity to train a being who is only an antropoid by birth ” to become a lawyer, and thirdly that “ the bourgeois mind does not realize that it is a sin against the will of the eternal Creator to allow hundreds of thousands of highly gifted people to remain floundering in the swamp of proletarian misery while Hottentots and Zulus are drilled to fill positions in the intellectual professions.” It is useless to close our eyes to the fact that this marches with a similar trend amongst a large section in South Africa; even the official report of the Native Affairs Commission\* has committed itself to similar doctrine, when it says that the first fact to be faced in South Africa is that from the standpoint of policy the natives do not consist of a lower class of the population, because they form a separate race of beings from Europeans.

\* (U.G. 48, 1937.)



The advocacy of race discrimination by Nazis in Europe happened to coincide with the Voortrekker celebration in South Africa which, most unfortunately, was made the occasion of more active racial propaganda by the "Nazi-wise" section in South Africa. The Louw Anti-Jew Bill was introduced into Parliament, but more important than this was the petition of the Union Congress of the Nationalist Party which demanded the passing of legislation without delay for the following purposes :—

- (a) to prohibit all mixed marriages between Europeans and non-Europeans.
- (b) to make miscegenation a punishable offence.
- (c) the prohibition of residence in European areas of Jews, Indians, Africans, Malaysians and Japanese.
- (d) the segregation of economic and political relations so that Europeans were completely separated from all others.

The danger to the Empire of these proposals leaps to the eye; they would carry a step further the industrial colour bar and shut out from all skilled tasks not only every African, every coloured person, but everyone who was not "racially pure" according to the Nazi formula, and they would create a grave social upheaval. An attempt has been made to rouse anti-racial sentiment upon the corruption of the blood, as both Hitler and Mussolini call it, by the alleged increase of mixed marriages. The South African Institute of Race Relations has rendered a real service by knocking the bottom out of this argument. The Editor has taken the official figures of mixed marriages for the ten years 1927-1936, with the following interesting results :—

European males to	European females to
Native women 61, declined to 6.	Native males 3, declined to nil.
Coloured women 66, declined to 44.	Asiatic males 5, increased to 6.
Asiatic women 6 only in the 10 years.	Coloured males 18, declined to 16.

And this amongst a European population of nearly 2,000,000, and a coloured population of 6,000,000 !

This racial situation is fertile soil for Nazi propaganda in South Africa. Dr. Goebbels and other German leaders are kept well informed by persons of high authority in South Africa. British statesmen must indeed be slow witted not to see the danger towards which we are drifting.



Nobody supposes that Hitler will immediately demand a sovereignty over South Africa, although this seems to have been clearly in the mind of General Smuts when he made his speech on April 13th at Malmesbury. But if the Government of Great Britain makes the blunder of sacrificing friends to placate Hitler, the "Nazi-wise" men may yet dominate Africa south of the Limpopo. Assume a normal development of the present trend of events. There will be a combination of two parties in favour of a form of Republican Government whose principal figures are even now in constant touch with Berlin. From this position when it matures it will be but a step to a Treaty of Amity with the German Nazi Government for the pursuit of certain specific objects, one of which would most certainly be the preservation of racial purity for Europeans—and that means the passing of the "Anti-Jew" Bill, the strengthening of all "Colour Bar" legislation south of the Limpopo, and yet another request to Kenya to adopt legislative policy of Colour Bar.

It is not too wild a stretch of imagination to link this developing situation with Germany's mandatory propaganda; Hitler, be it noted, never directs public attention to French mandated areas, it is always to British-controlled territories. If he ever makes an official demand for the return of mandated territories, he will have a second string and that will be the real objective, namely, a dominating position in some British territory which will give to Germany what neither one nor all the mandated territories together can ever give, namely, an area suitable for German colonization, and capable of producing the advertised six main raw materials. Only a British Dominion can do this, and of these only South Africa is ever likely to become the "ripe fruit" of such policy. There always has been and there always will be both room and a welcome for Germans or any other nationals to co-operate genuinely in the development for the good of all of any territory controlled by Great Britain. There is no room and should be no welcome for those bent on creating strife between the races.

In this situation of racial conflict, British negro policy asserts that all men are born equal and that every unit



of the human race is entitled to rise in the scale of civilization. A large section of South African opinion, making common cause with German propagandists, whose views they share, assert the opposite, and with Dr. Rauschnig hold British native policy to be proof of our national decadence. "If the Anglo-Saxons with their feminine and sensitive scruples still like to regard their mission as one of carrying the White Man's Burden, nothing can be better fitted to relieve them of it than the new racial doctrine of the right to mastery of the dynamic nations."

More than 8,000,000 British Africans, hundreds of thousands of Indians and coloured people, with other millions in India, are asking what Britain will do in the face of this racial menace. They know their own danger within the Union territories, they see more clearly than we do that the surrender to-day of British ideals south of the Zambesi means that the floodgates of race prejudice will sweep forward up to and beyond the Equator, and they fear the effects which loss of faith in British justice and integrity would have throughout the African Continent.

Britain to-day holds almost all the cards in her hands, in particular she possesses one which must never be surrendered until the policy of race prejudice and colour bar have been removed from native policy—namely, the "Protectorates." If the "Protectorates," or more correctly the High Commission territories of Bechuanaland, Basutoland and Swaziland, in which to-day there is no taint of Colour Bar, were to be deliberately surrendered by the British Government to a "Colour Bar" policy, with its ugly race contempts and race hatreds, the name of Britain which stands so high in the mentality of at least 50,000,000 Africans would become a byword in African history.

Great Britain is under no contractual obligation to transfer to the Union of South Africa the peoples of these three territories, who of their own free will placed the guidance of their destiny in the hands of their beloved Queen Victoria "and her heirs forever." They did this upon the basis of treaties and proclamations which guaranteed them against exploitation, against dispossession of their lands, and pledged



the British Government to preserve for all time their native rights and privileges—and above all, before all, that they should for ever rest “secure under the flag of Great Britain.” There is not one word in any treaty, in any commitment, in any document which gives Whitehall the power to transfer to another government, against his will, a single Basuto, Bechuana or Swazi native.

To-day the natives of these countries, numbering nearly 1,000,000, and living in territories with a total area larger than France, are to a man opposed to any transfer from the British flag they know, to the one they do not recognize and that as they say, is a “foreign” flag. British Secretaries of State have repeatedly discussed the question of transfer with General Hertzog, with the result that it is now agreed that there can be no transfer except after consultation with the inhabitants, and secondly, not until their full acquiescence has been secured. It may be possible to secure that acquiescence by giving guarantees upon land and labour conditions, but nothing but resolute hostility will be encountered by any proposal to transfer administration so long as the legislation of South Africa reposes upon a Colour Bar.

The Broad Stone of Empire is in all its essentials identical with Kenelm Digby’s Broad Stone of Honour—

“It is broad in respect to its principles and its law, ‘*latum mandatum tuum nimis*’; broad in acknowledging distinctly and broadly the eternal truths of religion, that all men are equal before God.”

JOHN HARRIS.

PHILIP *pp 12-13*  
NOEL-BAKER  
M.P.

---

**Common  
Sense  
about  
Colonies**

---

LABOUR



PARTY



*Read Also :*

The Colonial Empire.

Post free 2½d.

The Demand for Colonial Territories  
and Equality of Economic Opportunity.

Post free 5d.

*From*

The Labour Publications Department,  
Transport House,  
Smith Square, London, S.W.1.



# Common Sense About Colonies

In the House of Commons on December 7, 1938.

Mr. P. J. Noel-Baker, M.P., put the case for Labour's Colonial Policy.

He moved:

*"That, in the opinion of this House, no redistribution of Colonial or mandated territory should be made without the consent of the inhabitants; and that, as part of a general peace settlement, international agreements should be drawn up extending the application of the mandate system to all Colonial territories which are not ripe for self-government, providing equal economic opportunity in such territories for the nationals of all signatory Powers, and establishing as the primary purpose of Colonial policy the welfare and progress of the Native inhabitants."*

The motion was defeated.

Mr. Noel-Baker said:—

**T**HIS House has two constituencies—the 50,000,000 electors who send us here and nearly 70,000,000 in the dependent Empire over whom we also rule. We are ultimately responsible for the government of both, and to the latter task we give only a relatively small proportion of our parliamentary time. In consequence, every member could think of many Colonial questions which deserve debate and which he would like to see debated—The West Indies, the Protectorates, the Rhodesias and many more.

But I do not desire to raise any of these specific issues. I want to deal with Colonial policy in its broadest aspect as a factor in the international politics of the world, and, in particular, with the demand now made for Colonies by certain Governments, chief among them by Herr Hitler. I want to deal with the problem which that demand creates, and with the solution which we think that problem ought to have.



## The International Situation

I start with the general observation about the international situation as it is to-day. I do not think that any member will dissent from the view that the most important single fact in international affairs at the present time is the general hatred of the idea of war. Indeed, I would venture the assertion that for the first time in history the vast majority of all human beings in all countries consciously detest the idea of war, and consciously desire that war should, by government action, be ended now for evermore.

Yet in the last few years three Governments have deliberately forced aggressive war upon their neighbours. And they have not only been guilty of aggression : they have glorified war as it has not been glorified for 1,500 years.

Every month they plunge deeper into power politics of the most ruthless kind. Every month they bring forward some new demand which can only be obtained by war or threat of war.

The spirit in which they act is shown by a message which the *Times* correspondent in Berlin sent as lately as Sunday last. He reported that the Reich Minister for Church Affairs had suspended from office and stopped the salaries of five members of the Confessional Movement's Provisional Administration, including the chairman. This was done, says the *Times* correspondent,

"On the ground that they acted politically by arranging prayer meetings for peace to be held on September 30."

In the face of such facts not even the most optimistic pacifist, not even, I believe, the Prime Minister himself, can doubt that these Governments have deliberately adopted a policy, the conscious aim of which has now become the creation of new military empires, and perhaps the military domination of the world.

## Hitler's Claim Examined

It is in the light of these facts that all great questions of foreign policy must be now judged—among them, and not least among them, Herr Hitler's claim that the ex-German colonies should be returned.

What is Herr Hitler's claim ? On what ground of fact and argument has it been based ? What answer shall we give him ? What alternative policy shall we offer if we refuse his claim ? Those are the questions with which I want to deal.

What is his claim ? He stated it with brutal frankness at Munich a few weeks ago, shortly after the Conference of Munich. Speaking



of the leaders of the democratic countries, the Prime Minister and M. Daladier, he said:—

“They talk of understanding. The word ‘understanding’ is somewhat incomprehensible to us, because we do not want anything from these men, except perhaps our colonies, which were taken from us on false pretences.”

It is the claim that the ex-German colonies must be returned, all of them, without exception, without conditions, without the mandate system, and without delay.

By what arguments is this claim defended? By a great variety of contentions, some of them as old as Kaiser Wilhelm, and some of them quite new, contentions which taken together, would make it seem, if they were accepted, that a monstrous injustice had been done to the German people on legal, on ethnographic, on economic and on moral grounds.

Let me start with the argument from law. It has been stated thus by General Goering, who said a year ago:—

“Whether they like it or not the other Powers will be continually reminded by Germany that their method of Colonial robbery has no basis in any internationally ordered Statute. It is simply a system of illegal possession, repudiated by Germany now and in the future.”

Much could be said on either side about the morality of the Allies’ interpretations of the Fourteen Points in 1919, and particularly about their interpretation of Point 5, which dealt with Colonies; but the fact remains that by Article 119 of the Treaty of Versailles Germany “renounced in favour of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers all her rights and titles over her overseas possessions.” And in law, whether we like it or not, and whether General Goering likes it or not, that Article is absolutely decisive.

I would add that it is not the invaders of Austria, nor the victors of Munich, who can safely challenge the morality on which that law is based.

I turn to the far more important argument about population, an argument which sometimes excites sympathy in our country and elsewhere. Herr Hitler tells us that Germany’s “lebensraum,” her living-room, is far too small. “Volk ohne raum” is in the forefront of his propaganda slogans. General Goering says that the German people will “suffocate” or “burst” unless they have their Colonies as an outlet for their surplus population.

## Colonies and Population

The first point about that argument is that the rulers of Germany, like Signor Mussolini, are doing everything in their power artificially



to increase the population. They are doing so with one purpose in view—to increase the man-power which they hope to use in future wars. That is not an unjust interpretation of what they do; it is the boast they make themselves. We say that if such a policy is applied with such an object, it is no part of the duty of the peaceful world to provide colonial outlets in which that object can be achieved.

But what in fact have colonies got to do with growing population in the world in which we live to-day? Let me give the House some figures, some of which Mr. Amery has used before, but which, nevertheless, it may be useful to repeat. At the last census, according to the "Economist's" calculations, Germany had 140 inhabitants per square kilometre. We have 264, that is, there is nearly twice as great a pressure here in spite of the colonies which we possess.

Moreover, only one-tenth of Germany is uncultivable land, whereas one-fifth of our land cannot be cultivated. In spite of all our colonies, we have a net annual increment of population, due to the return of emigrants from Dominions overseas. Before the War Germany had an annual increase in population of 730,000. She had a total emigration of 25,000, but of these, according to the "Economist," the average emigration to the colonies in the last pre-war years was 33.

In 1913 the total number of all the Germans in the colonies, after 30 years of Empire, was 19,700, of whom more than 3,000 were German soldiers and police. The result of 30 years of colonial effort was that they had transplanted 1/37th of the annual increase in their population. In that year 1913 there were living and earning their bread on the Island of Manhattan alone three times more Germans than in the colonies.

## The Economic Agreement

Germany is not a special case in this regard. The same is true of the Dutch, who over a century of history have had a net increment of population in Holland as a result of the colonies they control; and I think the explanation was given by a Frenchman, who once said that his Government extolled the glories of their African Empire, "and indeed," he added, "there is only one thing wrong with it; it is impossible to live there."

The basic truth is this. There are only tiny fractions of the countries which are called colonies to-day where it is possible, even if it were desirable, for Europeans to live and work. The conclusion is plain. The colonies have not the slightest real significance for the German people as an outlet for her growing population.



Is there more reality in the economic argument used. Dr. Goebbels has said that:

"It will not do that we continue to live as a poor country while the rest of the world is rolling in wealth. We are beggars; we are confronted with difficulties which we cannot overcome by interior methods."

Even Herr Hitler's Minister of Finance, who is relatively instructed in economic matters, has talked as if the return of colonies would help Germany to acquire her raw materials. What is the truth? Again statistics give the answer. In 1914 the imports from the colonies to Germany were only 0.5 per cent. of her total imports, or 10s. in £100. The proportion of her raw materials, was very small; indeed, the proportion even of those raw materials which the colonies produced, was only 3 per cent. And what were those raw materials? Dr. Goebbels has said that coal, iron, oil, cotton, copper, and rubber are the basic materials of modern industry. The ex-German colonies have no coal, no iron, no oil, no rubber, very little cotton and rather less copper.

**The truth is that what are called colonies to-day are not an important source of raw materials for any nation.**

As the League of Nations Commission on the subject reported in 1937, raw materials are found in sovereign countries and all the colonies in the world produce only 3 per cent. of the raw materials that are commercially important at the present time.

Moreover, the German Government forget that in virtually every raw material market they can now buy on equal terms, that the restrictions which have operated against them have been almost nil, and that by the strangest paradox in history—for myself I wish it had not been true—the other nations have not hampered them as to .001 per cent. in their buying of the supplies which they have needed for the monstrous armament expansion on which they are engaged.

## Truth About Trade Equality

Is the case any stronger with regard to trade? In 1914 the German colonies took 0.6 per cent. of German exports, or 12s. in every £100. To-day no doubt their capacity is a little more, but if it has increased, it is entirely open to the Germans to take advantage of that increase.

Since Germany left the League of Nations, she has had no right to equal treatment in the mandated areas which she used to rule. But she has been given equal treatment all the same.

If those places were her colonies now, she might close them to other people's trade and gain a small increase in her own exports, but she



could do nothing in comparison with what she would lose by the reprisals of other nations in other markets on a larger scale.

The same conclusion is true of every economic aspect of this matter, and indeed it has been calculated by a committee of experts that if half the British colonies were handed over to Germany to-morrow, and if Germany did everything conceivable to increase their output in the German interest, it would add at the most only a few million pounds a year to the German national income. That would do nothing, or almost nothing, to help the German people to rise from the dire poverty in which so many of them live to-day. It is in quite a different direction that we and they must look for a solution.

### The Question of "Moral Right"

I turn to the argument of moral right. Last year Herr von Ribbentrop declared that "Germany claims the right to colonial possessions on principle, for this is a right which belongs to every other nation, even to the smallest in the world." Herr Hitler supported this line of argument in a characteristic way not long ago at Munich, when he said:

"The white race is destined to rule. This is its unconscious urge, which arises from an heroic conception of life and which is entirely non-pacifist. By what right do nations possess colonies? By the right of taking them."

That is an argument of pure prestige. We are back once more to the conception of power as the measure of national greatness—power gained and used, in Herr Hitler's words "by naked force"; power over subject peoples, to do with them what they will. That conception has led to fantastic mathematical calculations in Germany. It is said that Britain has an Empire 105 times the size of the Mother Country, that the Dutch have an Empire 60 times the size of Holland, and the implication is that Holland has 60 times as much honour and respect from the world as Germany can expect.

We utterly reject such ideas. We reject them for our own nation or for any other. If the Dutch owe any element of their national greatness to their Colonial Empire, we think that it is due, not to the power they wield over 50,000,000 people, but to the generosity and humanity with which they have ruled those people, and to the service they have rendered to those people and to the world.

The idea that prestige is based on power, that power over subject peoples adds to national greatness, is part of the thinking of a bygone age. It is part of the thinking that our generation must destroy if we are to rid ourselves of the nightmare horrors of modern war.



## Hitler's Racial Theories

Since, however, Herr Hitler does raise the question of prestige and of Germany's right to have these colonies without delay, there are other things that we must say. I have never argued, and I would never argue, that the Germans as a nation have proved themselves unfit to govern backward peoples. I do not forget the treatment of the Herreros in South-West Africa; I do not forget the suppression of the Maji-Maji rebellion in Tanganyika; I do not forget the fearful record of the man called in Germany "Hanging Peters."

But there is no colonial nation, we regret to say, that has not black stains upon its record. And I do not forget that "Hanging Peters" was dismissed by the Kaiser from his post; that Dernburg, Solf and Von Lettow-Vorbeck stood for a new and humane policy towards the natives; and that, as time went on, they seemed to be gaining the upper hand. But who believes that Herr Hitler would think of native rights and welfare, as Solf and Dernburg used to speak and think?

Herr Hitler's racial theories in themselves show that his Government and his party are utterly unfitted to be trusted with the fate of subject peoples.

It is true that he has promoted the Japanese to the rank of honorary Aryans; but by his personal conduct at the Olympic Games he has shown that he does not grant the same privilege to the negroes over whom he wants to rule.

## A Decisive Argument

His treatment of the Jews is showing us to-day what weaker subject races might expect at his hands. Have members really grasped the significance of what he is doing to the Jews? All the Jews who are capable of manual labour, every man from 18 to 60, is in a concentration camp. Those men are not in concentration camps because any court has found them guilty. They are not there for a fixed or legal term. They are there, so it appears, for ever, or until they die; and they are dying very fast. They are engaged in forced labour of the most brutal and brutalising kind. That is slavery, and slavery more fearful than the world has ever known since the Roman galleys.

Is Europe which, half a century ago, in a Conference at Berlin, began to wipe out slavery in Africa, going to send back to Africa a government which has re-established slavery in the very heart of this Continent itself?



It is unthinkable that we should do so. Men who have torn up every law of God and man cannot now be trusted with the fate of the weaker peoples who are struggling towards civilisation in the dim forests of the backward continents. That argument alone ought to be decisive against Herr Hitler.

But there is another which deserves attention. We are spending to-day £2,000,000,000 in preparing for a war. If that war comes, it will be against the governments which have been guilty of aggression, and because of the policy which those governments have pursued. Is it conceivable that, while there is still the risk that that war will happen, we should give these aggressor Powers new bases from which our shipping and our territories could be attacked?

### A Fundamental Principle

Once more, we arrive at the conclusion that, while aggressive war remains the basic fact in international life, it is impossible that the power of the aggressors should be increased in the way that Herr Hitler now imperiously demands. That conclusion I have tried to put into my motion, by saying that no Colonial or Mandated territories should be handed over without the consent of the inhabitants.

In our view it is fundamental that native peoples should not be handed over as part of diplomatic bargains made by foreign Powers. They are human beings ; they belong, as we are finding out, to highly gifted races ; and they are destined very soon, as history goes, to rule themselves. It is they who should decide.

And if the peoples of the mandated territories were asked to-day about Herr Hitler, there is no doubt what answer they would give. In Tanganyika the British, the Dutch, the Indians and the Moslems are all, for the first time, united in a single league to resist a transfer. Far more significant and important, the natives think the same. I have a report of a speech by a great native leader, Martin Kayamba, at a mass meeting of the native inhabitants, in which he said that they are bitterly opposed to any transfer to Hitler's Germany. I have also, and I think it even more important, a translation of a leading article from a native paper, the only independent paper published in Swahili. In the article, the editor says that they must not be handed back to Germany, and he ends with these words:

"If it is possible for Tanganyika to come under the rule of another regime, then will not we inhabitants be like people who are put in pawn? The thought gives us great uncertainty."

There is only one answer which we can make to the plea that is thus made to us by the inhabitants of the Mandated areas.



I hope that so far I have spoken with a very considerable measure of agreement throughout the House, and I hope that the authors of both amendments will make it plain that they agree with the first part of my motion, and that in their view no colonies of any kind should be given to Herr Hitler's Government. If they do that, and I beg them to make it plain, then a great part of my purpose in putting down this motion will have been achieved.

## The Great Illusion

I pass now to what Lord Beaverbrook and some others regard as the more controversial part of the motion. We are convinced that it is not enough to say that colonies are of so little value to Germany that she ought not even to want them, but that they are of such immense value to us that we can make no concessions of any kind.

We feel that we cannot argue that we must refuse colonies to Germany because she might do in them things which other nations are doing in their colonies to-day.

We shall deceive ourselves if we think that this aspect of the colonial question is not of great importance in determining the future issues of peace and war. It is true that in the modern world the conquest or the possession of other people's country does not make a nation rich. That is "The Great Illusion," exposed by Norman Angell long ago. It is true that conceptions of prestige and power have no reality and no meaning for educated men and women at the present day. But it is also true that these ideas have immense importance in the minds of some of the rulers of the world. They are, indeed, as someone has very aptly called them, "the unseen assassins of the happiness of mankind."

Can any member honestly survey the history of the last 50 years, the history of Africa and Asia, the history of the origins of the war in 1914; or can any member look around the world to-day and deny that those ideas are a very potent contributory cause of war? Manchuria, Abyssinia, China, Spain, the mere catalogue of names proves that those ideas, which we on our side call "militarist imperialism," are still a devastating force in world affairs. The ideas are false; but they are still alive. We must have some policy by which they can be exorcised and laid to rest.

## New Start Must Be Made

How can that be done? We believe that it must be done; that, as the *Times* demanded in a leading article three weeks ago, we must



Cols ( Noel Baker's speech )  
38

"rule out, once for all, the theory that the backward races are ever again to be regarded as a factor in the power politics of Europe."

We believe that that must be done ; that it can be done. But it can be done only by a great new start in colonial policy, in which all nations must make what they call sacrifices. It can be done only if the false conceptions of the past are driven out by new conceptions founded in the realities of to-day.

It can be done only if the ideals of British colonial government at its best are, if I may use the phrase, sublimated in a modern, realistic, universal ideal of common service to mankind at large. We believe it can be done; but it will not be done unless we, as the greatest colonial Power, can prove that we no longer seek exclusive national advantage, economic, political or strategic, at the expense of other nations, from the colonies we hold.

We have to prove that we are in earnest when we say that we are trustees for these colonies. How can we prove that? We say: only by offering to accept the application of the mandate system to our colonies.

Let the House observe the three conditions which we lay down. The first is that it does not apply to places where the inhabitants are ripe or almost ripe for self-government, and we exclude at once not only India, which is a Dominion, but Ceylon, the West Indies, and other places. Secondly, it is to apply to all colonies; all colonial Powers must play their part. Thirdly, it is to be part of a general peace settlement; it is part of the price which all nations must pay for peace. If we are to have peace we must have a change of international system; we cannot get it by staggering on from crisis to crisis as we are staggering to-day.

### Return To International Law

But the new international system which is required can be built only on a return to international law; and it will succeed only if it removes some at least of the causes of war, and, among them, what I have called militarist imperialism. Some members may be ready to sacrifice colonies to Herr Hitler to-day without any solid guarantees of peace. Surely our plan is far safer than that? What is our plan? It is the acceptance of the three principles upon which the mandate system is based. Those three principles are these: first, that the progress and welfare of the native population must be the primary purpose of colonial government; second, that there shall be economic equality for all nations; and, third, that there shall be full publicity with regard to the administration.



But these are also the very principles of British colonial government on which our own statesmen have always boasted that their policy was based. The first has never been better stated than it was by the late Duke of Devonshire in 1923 in regard to Kenya. I do not propose to read the passage, but everyone will remember the declaration and how it placed the interests of the natives supreme above those of the settlers or anyone else. Can anyone doubt that it would be an advantage to us to have that principle embodied in an international obligation by which we should be bound? I am certain that it was an advantage to us in Tanganyika when we came to organise the government, and that it would be an advantage to us in the Rhodesias to-day. In any case, that principle, as far as we are concerned, is one which every British man or woman should be ready to accept.

### No Exclusive National Advantage

The second principle is that the mandatory Power shall not seek to gain exclusive national advantage, economic or strategic. Again, is there any difficulty in accepting that? Already we have the open door with regard to 47,000,000 out of 68,000,000 people in our Colonial Empire. We have hardly any restrictions on the export of raw materials. There is some restriction with regard to public works, but can anybody doubt that it would be to our advantage to abolish these restrictions if we could get a general system of the kind I have described? It is 40 years since Mr. Joseph Chamberlain urged that we should do it in our own interest, and Lord Lugard urges it upon us, in our own interest, to-day.

Lastly, the mandate system is founded on the principle of full publicity through the Mandates Commission, the Council and the Assembly of the League. It is debate in this House, it is publicity, which is our only guarantee against abuse and maladministration in the colonial Empire; and we know that this guarantee works uncertainly and unevenly in many ways. Would it really be a disadvantage if it were supported by the additional international publicity of the machinery of the League? What that publicity may mean in practice has been best expressed by the greatest of our recent Governors, Sir Donald Cameron, who claims from his experience under mandate in Tanganyika that it was a great advantage to the Tanganyikan administration that "from the date of their foundation they had been exposed to the full glare of public opinion, which must be, and does act, as a stimulus and a corrective."

Certain it is that on the day in 1922, when the Bondelzwart massacres were debated in the Assembly of the League and the delegates from India and Haiti rose to plead, on equal terms, the cause of the coloured



peoples in subjection, something new was born in world affairs, something of infinite importance, and something I hope which will never die.

Lord Beaverbrook says that we want to break up the British Empire; give colonies to Hitler now and see how far and fast you go towards that end.

We believe that by our plan we shall preserve for ever, for ourselves and for mankind, everything in the British Empire of which we can be proud.

We want to extend the mandate system, because it has set a new standard of colonial ethics; because in practice it has proved an instrument by which justice and progress can be secured; and, above all, we want to extend it because we believe it will give the peoples, including the people of Germany, a new vision of what colonial trusteeship in our generation ought to mean.

### The Path To Real Peace

We need that new vision, and we need it now. Our generation seems to be afflicted by a kind of curse. It can only think of its problems in terms of conflict; conflict between the interests of the white employer and his native labour; conflict between the interests of subject peoples and the nations who have them in their control; conflict between the colonial and the non-colonial Powers.

Can we not show that we in this House understand that the epoch of force and exploitation in colonial countries has long gone by; that it is in the interests of the white man, even in his long term economic interest, if he would only see it, that subject peoples shall be happy, prosperous and free; that it is in the interest of every nation to ensure that the rivalries of the past shall be ended now and for evermore?

I believe that the eyes of other Governments and peoples are on the House to-day. If this motion were adopted, we might start a process by which, in due course, the curse of distorted thinking might be removed, by which the archaic policies of oppression and exploitation might be ended, and by which the nations might begin their long and painful journey back to peace.



## PLANS FOR THE NEXT LABOUR GOVERNMENT

Labour's Immediate Programme.  
Labour's Claim to Government.  
International Policy and Defence.  
Labour's Aims.  
Labour's Policy for Coal and Power.  
Labour's Policy for our Countryside.  
Labour's Policy of Food for All.  
Labour's Policy for the Schools.  
British Transport at Britain's Service.  
The Nation's Wealth at the Nation's Service.  
Labour's Fair Rent Policy.

1 copy 1½d.; 12, 9d.; 100, 6s.

*From*

The Labour Publications Department,  
Transport House,  
Smith Square, London, S.W.1.



PRICES POST FREE

1 Copy	1½d.
12 Copies	9d.
100 Copies	6s.

From  
The Labour Publications Dept.,  
Transport House,  
Smith Square, London, S.W.1

January, 1939.

Reprinted May 1939



L R Buxton

# DURRANT'S PRESS CUTTINGS

St. Andrew's House, 32 to 34 Holborn Viaduct,  
and 3 St. Andrew Street, Holborn Circus, E.C.1.

Telephone: CENTRAL 3149 (Two Lines).

## Manchester Guardian

3 Cross Street, Manchester.

Cutting from issue dated.....18 FEB 1939.....

### TRANSFER OF COLONIES

#### Wishes and Welfare of Peoples the Vital Consideration

#### MEMORIAL TO THE PREMIER

An appeal addressed to the Prime Minister, Mr. Neville Chamberlain, signed by peers, archbishops, bishops, Free Churchmen, and M.P.s, dealing with the transfer of colonial territory and urging that the wishes and welfare of the inhabitants should be a vital consideration, was issued last night by the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society, which pressed the same views upon the Government at the time of the Great War.

The signatories say that the basis of colonial policy must be a form of trusteeship and quotes the Berlin and Brussels Acts, together with the mandate system, as "a kind of international charter" for colonial inhabitants. The appeal, it is stated, is concerned with "a possible demand by the German Government and other Governments for the transfer of colonial territory." A resolution passed by the society is submitted, and the appeal then states:

#### VITAL CONSIDERATION

"In principle we believe that the wishes of the inhabitants are a vital consideration. We do not necessarily suggest the taking of a plebiscite in the ordinary acceptance of the term, but there should be no difficulty in obtaining by means of an impartial commission the predominant wishes of the inhabitants. More especially would this be the case if such commission included either native members or some persons appointed specially to represent the native standpoint. In this connection we may observe that most colonial territories have come under European control by means of an initial approach to organised native institutions (such as Native Chiefs in Council) competent to sign and ratify treaties.

"It is sometimes urged that native opinion was not consulted upon the question of the disposal of the mandates, but in any case this society has always upheld the principle of consultation. In January, 1917, in our appeal to Lord Balfour, which was influentially signed, whilst recognising the difficulties we urged that "the inhabitants should be given a voice in shaping their own destiny," and in the following July the Prime Minister in his Glasgow speeches supported the views expressed in our memorandum when he said that in any rearrangement of the map the governing principle ought to be the interest and, so far as it can be ascertained, the will of the populations affected by the change. At a later date Lord Balfour and other statesmen expressed approval of the principle of consulting the wishes and welfare of the inhabitants.

#### TREATY OBLIGATIONS

"Our society could not contemplate with other than the deepest concern any proposals involving the forcible transfer of people shown by impartial inquiry to be overwhelmingly hostile because it could hardly fail to lead to widespread victimisation or bloodshed or both. We do not, however, wish to assert that transfer of colonial territories from British administration would necessarily be against the interests of this country or the native peoples—everything would depend upon conditions.

"As the Government is aware, there exists in connection with every colonial territory in Africa a series of treaty and other obligations made between colonial Powers and the inhabitants. We submit that there must be in every case a due observance of all obligations arising therefrom in the spirit as well as the letter.

"If transfer of colonial territory, where native inhabitants predominate, should take place our committee are of opinion that the territory so transferred should still remain under some form of collective control by some or all of the Powers. But, in saying this, we would urge that there should be no rigid adherence to the existing systems and terms of mandate, which have, in fact, already disclosed certain weaknesses in

their capacity to secure the study and redress of alleged grievances.

"Fundamental to the whole question is the purpose for which colonial territories are desired. It is undeniable that in the past some colonial territories, though by no means all, have been acquired by right of conquest or for purposes of economic exploitation. But we hold most strongly that the basis of colonial policy must be a form of trusteeship which makes service to the inhabitants and territory the only justifiable moral ground for securing and holding colonial territory.

"This conception of colonial policy has been built up during more than a century of effort by statesmen and others drawn from all parties in the State. It has received increasing recognition during the past fifty years.

"The stipulations of existing instruments for safeguarding the native interests in the Berlin and Brussels Acts reproduced in the Convention of St. Germain, 1919, together with the mandate system, constitute a kind of international charter for the inhabitants of the territories concerned. We believe that if these instruments, forged through many years of experience and effort, could be expanded, adapted, and made effective under international control it would make for a considerable advance in the contentment and prosperity not only of the colonies but of the trustee Powers themselves, and indeed of the whole world.

The society's resolution declares

that its main consideration is the preservation of justice for the natives, with freedom to develop their capacities, whatever their race, creed, or colour, and therefore, while holding that any transfer must be made in accordance with the four principles referred to, expresses no opinion in advance, favourable or unfavourable, on the proposal to transfer colonial territory to any other administration.

The four principles referred to are—

Respect for the wishes of the inhabitants, these being ascertained as far as possible by an impartial inquiry.

The observance of treaty obligations with native rulers and their councils.

The acceptance of a system of mandatory trusteeship, the primary object of which should be that of seeking to advance the moral and material conditions of the inhabitants.

The prohibition of slavery in all its forms, of the economic exploitation of the territory in the interests of a single power, and of the creation of native armies for purposes outside the territories concerned.

Among the signatories are—

Lord Lytton and Lord Meston (joint presidents), Mr. Charles Roberts (chairman), Mr. Charles Roden Buxton and Mr. Travers Buxton (vice-chairmen),

The Archbishop of Canterbury, Cardinal Hinsley, the Archbishop of York, Lord Balfour of Burleigh, Lord Cecil, Lord Clwyd, Lord Dickinson, Lord Faringdon, Lord Gainford, Lord Illingworth, Lord Lamington, Lord Leverhulme, Lord Listowel, Lord Olivier, Lord Rea, Lord Sanderson,

Lord Sankey, Lord Snell, Lord Stanley of Alderley, Lord Strabolgi, the Bishops of Aberdeen and Orkney, Bradford, and St. Andrews, Dr. W. R. Matthews (Dean of St. Paul's), the Rev. F. J. H. Humphrey (president of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland), the Rev. R. W. Thompson (chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales), Dr. J. Scott Lidgett,

Sir Francis D. Acland, M.P., Mr. A. V. Alexander, M.P., Sir E. Graham-Little, M.P., Mr. Arthur Henderson, M.P., Mr. G. le M. Mander, M.P., Sir Henry Morris-Jones, M.P., Colonel H. L. Nathan, M.P., Mr. Philip Noel-Baker, M.P., Miss Eleanor F. Rathbone, M.P., Mr. Wilfrid Roberts, M.P., Mr. Reginald Sorensen, M.P., Colonel Josiah C. Wedgwood, M.P., Mr. Graham White, M.P.

Sir Atul Chandra Chatterjee, Lieutenant General Sir William T. Furse, Lieutenant Colonel Sir Henry Galway, General Sir Alexander J. Godley, Sir Thomas Henderson, Sir Alfred Claud Hollis, Lady Milner, Professor Gilbert Murray, Lady Sanderson, Mr. W. S. Thatcher (Cambridge), Dr. J. A. Venn (President of Queens' College, Cambridge), and Sir Herbert Wilberforce.



# THE COLONIAL LEAGUE

Telephone :  
SLOane 9226.

2 Chesham Place,  
London, S.W.1.

## COUNCIL

*Chairman:—*

The Rt. Hon. The Lord Lugard, P.C., G.C.M.G.,  
C.B., D.S.O.

\*The Rt. Hon. L. S. Amery, P.C., M.P. (Chairman,  
Executive Committee).  
\*Sir Clive Baillieu, K.B.E., C.M.G.  
\*John Cadbury, Esq.  
Sir Donald Cameron, G.C.M.G., K.B.E.  
\*Sir Henry Chapman, C.B.E.  
The Rt. Hon. The Lord Cranworth, M.C.  
Dr. L. Haden Guest, M.C., M.P.  
The Lord Hailey, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E.  
W. L. Hichens, Esq.  
The Rt. Hon. The Lord Harlech, P.C., G.C.M.G.  
Sir John Harris.  
\*F. S. Joelson, Esq.  
\*Sir Humphrey Leggett, D.S.O.  
\*Sir Dougal Malcolm, K.C.M.G.  
\*John McLean, Esq.

Colonel H. L. Nathan, D.L., M.P.  
The Hon. Harold Nicolson, C.M.G., M.P.  
\*Geoffrey Peto, Esq., C.B.E.  
\*Colonel C. E. Ponsonby, T.D., M.P.  
Sir Cecil Rodwell, G.C.M.G.  
\*James de Rothschild, Esq., D.C.M., M.P.  
\*Duncan Sandys, Esq., M.P.  
The Rt. Hon. The Earl of Selborne, K.G., P.C.,  
G.C.M.G.  
\*Rennie Smith, Esq.  
The Rt. Hon. The Viscount Stonehaven, P.C.,  
G.C.M.G., D.S.O.  
The Rt. Hon. Colonel Sir Josiah Wedgwood, P.C.,  
M.P.  
Sir Samuel Wilson, G.C.M.G., K.C.B., K.B.E.  
The Rt. Hon. The Viscount Wolmer, P.C., M.P.

*Joint Hon. Treasurers:—*

Sir Henry Chapman, C.B.E.

Sir Dougal Malcolm, K.C.M.G.

*Secretary:—*

John Summerscales.

\* Also Members of the Executive Committee.

---

---

## WEEKLY NEWS BULLETIN, No. 1

Editors and others are invited to make the fullest use of the information contained in these Weekly Bulletins, as well as the services of the Special Bureau which has been created to give or check information for use in the Press.

### Strong Support for the Colonial League

Evidence that public opinion in this country is ready to take a firm attitude in resisting the German Colonial demands is forthcoming in the large numbers of people making application for enrolment as members of the Colonial League formed a fortnight ago. The objects of the League are to bring before the public the importance of the British Colonial Empire, and in particular to stress the human, moral and political objections to any concession to the German demand for the surrender of British Colonial or Mandated Territories.

### And German Reactions

Comments in the German Press are fairly represented by the following:—

*Hamburger Fremdenblatt*: "Germany is very greatly surprised that the first audible echo to the Fuehrer's clear statements on the Colonial problem, apart from the daily Press, is expressed in the founding a body of such a refusing nature."

*Boersen Zeitung*: "Its programme is obviously to unloose a Colonial incitement against Germany and Italy, to repeat the Colonial lies, and to instruct the British nation falsely."



### Poland States her Claim

The strikingly novel doctrine expounded by Herr Hitler in his recent Reichstag speech, that a nation should be entitled to a share of the "riches of the earth" in proportion to its numbers, its courage, and its worth, has found a sympathetic echo in the Polish Parliament. The Foreign Under-Secretary, Count Szembek, at a meeting of the Senate Commission held recently, declared that when the international discussions on Colonies took place Poland would reserve the right to present her case.

### A Plea for the Natives

An impressive list of signatories is appended to the appeal recently addressed to the Prime Minister on behalf of the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society, urging that the question of the transfer of Colonial territory should be judged from the viewpoint of the inhabitants concerned. In addition to the Joint Presidents of the Society, Lord Lytton and Lord Meston, the signatories include religious leaders like the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, Cardinal Hinsley (Archbishop of Westminster), the President of the Baptist Union, and the Chairman of the Congregational Union; several peers like Lord Cecil, Lord Sankey and Lord Leverhulme; and a number of prominent M.P.s.

The appeal states that the Society "could not contemplate with other than the deepest concern any proposals involving the forcible transfer of people, shown by impartial inquiry to be overwhelmingly hostile, because it could hardly fail to lead to widespread victimisation or bloodshed, or both."

### Nigeria Rejoices

Natives all over Nigeria are rejoicing over the recent categorical statement by the Governor on the future of the country. For some months a number of rumours had been circulating even in the more remote villages that Nigeria was to be handed over to Germany as part of a world appeasement bargain. Satisfaction is expressed at the official denial of the truth of these rumours at demonstrations now taking place in various parts of the country.

This aspect of the Colonial question was referred to by Mr. C. C. Ammon, M.P., a member of the Leverhulme Trust Commission to West Africa, at a luncheon meeting this week of the Royal Empire Society. He said that while in West Africa the Commission had been bombarded with inquiries concerning rumours of a possible transfer of territory to another country, and some Natives had even hesitated to pay their taxes lest they be demanded again by the newcomers.

Speaking at the same meeting, Dr. L. Haden Guest, M.P., another member of the Commission, stressed the need for a policy of African development.

### Tanganyika League Progress

Nazi propaganda in Tanganyika and the neighbouring territories took a prominent place among the questions discussed at the Conference of the Tanganyika League recently held in Nairobi. To combat the serious anti-British activities now at work it was resolved that the East African Governments should be urged to lose no time in strengthening the *personnel* and powers of the local police establishments. The Conference was attended by some 52 delegates representing no fewer than 26 branches. Lord Francis Scott presided over the proceedings. The League continues energetically to make progress, and activities have now extended into the Rhodesias. Arrangements are being made to hold an All-African Conference in Salisbury in March.

### New German Party for South-West Africa

Under the title of Deutsch-Afrikanische Partei a new German political party has been formed in South-West Africa. The objects of the movement are to share more fully in the political life of the Territory, to co-operate with the authorities in its economic development, and to link the South African and German sections of the population in cultural and social matters. Headquarters have been established at Windhoek, and branches have already been started in three towns. The new party is expected to make a strong appeal to local naturalised Germans who are reluctant to accept orders from the authorities in Berlin as to how they should conduct their political and social activities.

### German Colonial Demands

In a recent speech to members of the French Colonial Union in Paris, Mr. L. S. Amery pointed out that the German demand now was no longer for restitution of the former German Colonies, but, to use Herr Hitler's words, for a "redistribution of the riches of the earth" in accordance with "the numbers, the courage, and the worth" of the nations concerned. The German Colonial propaganda organisation had been instructed to take the same line. This clearly justified those who, like himself, had always argued that the specific demand for restitution was mainly camouflage, and covered a revival of the old German dream of world empire, to be achieved with Italian and Japanese help, at the expense firstly of Britain and France and then of the minor Colonial Powers. No partial concessions could do anything but encourage that dream, and the only possible policy was for Britain and France to meet it with an unqualified negative. The two Governments should be absolutely agreed on that point, and should also lose no time in concerting together their defence in Europe and the Mediterranean.



**Feeding German Hopes**

Nothing is so likely to encourage the fond hopes of foreign countries that Great Britain will be persuaded ultimately to make Colonial concessions on a generous scale than the expression of opinions in that sense which have lately appeared in the German Press as coming from a number of British public men. That most of these views were originally expressed some years ago, and that they represent the standpoint of only a meagre and insignificant section of the public opinion in this country, are facts not disclosed to the German readers.

**Faked Palestine "Atrocities"**

As part of the output of anti-British propaganda in Syria and elsewhere the German Press has been making much use of faked pictures of a highly coloured nature. Reproductions of photographs of "atrocities" alleged to have been committed by the British Army in Palestine are now appearing in various publications abroad, two of which have been specifically identified as having been taken in a tribal war between the Rualla and the Shammar tribes of Northern Arabia as far back as 1926-1927!

**The Voice of the People**

The real opinion of the people in this country was expressed in clear and unmistakable terms in the referendum which the *Leicester Evening Mail* has lately conducted among its readers as to whether or not Germany should be handed back the Colonies lost by her during the War. The results of the referendum are as follows:—

	Percentage of Total Vote	
	No	Yes
1. Are you in favour of restoring ALL former Colonies to Germany at present held by the British Empire? ... ..	93%	7%
2. Are you in favour of restoring ANY of these Colonies? ... ..	91%	6 $\frac{2}{3}$ %
3. Are you in favour of defensive action in event of aggression on the Colonies issue? ... ..	61 $\frac{1}{3}$ %	92%

The ballot reveals an overwhelming vote against the surrender of the ex-German Colonies in any shape or form, and declares solidly for defensive action should Germany seek to regain them by a resort to force.



The Voice of the People  
The bulletin - of the people of the colonies  
is published in a fortnightly issue in  
the form of a newspaper. It is intended  
to be a platform for the expression of  
the views of the people of the colonies  
on the various questions of their  
common interest. It is published  
in the form of a newspaper and is  
intended to be a platform for the  
expression of the views of the people  
of the colonies on the various questions  
of their common interest.

The bulletin - of the people of the colonies  
is published in a fortnightly issue in  
the form of a newspaper. It is intended  
to be a platform for the expression of  
the views of the people of the colonies  
on the various questions of their  
common interest. It is published  
in the form of a newspaper and is  
intended to be a platform for the  
expression of the views of the people  
of the colonies on the various questions  
of their common interest.

Issues of the Bulletin  
The Bulletin is published in a fortnightly issue in the form of a newspaper. It is intended to be a platform for the expression of the views of the people of the colonies on the various questions of their common interest. It is published in the form of a newspaper and is intended to be a platform for the expression of the views of the people of the colonies on the various questions of their common interest.

Issues of the Bulletin  
The Bulletin is published in a fortnightly issue in the form of a newspaper. It is intended to be a platform for the expression of the views of the people of the colonies on the various questions of their common interest. It is published in the form of a newspaper and is intended to be a platform for the expression of the views of the people of the colonies on the various questions of their common interest.



C. R. Buxton

## DURRANT'S PRESS CUTTINGS

St. Andrew's House, 32 to 34 Holborn Viaduct,  
and 3 St. Andrew Street, Holborn Circus, E.C.1.

Telephone: CENTRAL 3149 (TWO LINES).

### The Times

Printing House Square, E.C.4.

Cutting from issue dated.....1 - MAR 1939.....193

#### GERMANY AND COLONIES

#### THE CONSTRUCTIVE ANSWER

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES

CRA  
Sir,—The formation of a new "Colonial League," with Lord Lugard, Sir Donald Cameron, and Lord Hailey among its patrons, raises anew the colonial issue, and gives a certain importance to the "no surrender" agitation which has hitherto been carried on by smaller fry. It seems, however, to argue a simplicity, and a susceptibility to the emotions of the moment, which I had not expected of these great pro-consuls.

Is it seriously suggested that the German people will be, could be, or even ought to be compelled to accept the colonial *status quo* established at Versailles in 1919, and excluded for all time, or even for a long time, from the colonial field? To think thus (as the league thinks, according to the quotation given by your Parliamentary Correspondent) seems to me a lamentable example of the danger of being dominated by the emotions of the moment, to the exclusion of long-range considerations and of the lessons of history.

I, at any rate, though yielding to none in my horror at the Jewish persecution in Germany, and my desire to help its victims, refuse to let this blind me to the great underlying realities of the international situation. I submit to you that this question of colonial readjustment should not be allowed to drop into the background: that it should be raised by the British Government, and not left to be raised by Herr Hitler.

The Government, it is true, has encouraged the "no surrender" agitation by its almost (though not quite) unequivocal declarations in the last debate on colonies. Were they wise to go so far? It is quite certain that the colonial issue will be raised, not perhaps as a single issue involving a threat of war but as part of a complex of issues demanding solution. May they not then have to eat their words?

I submit, moreover, that the policy of "no surrender" is not in the interests of Africa itself. Since (to be plain) Britain will not go to war to keep the Cameroons, the final result of this policy is only too likely to be the handing over of the ex-German colonies, in full sovereignty, in the old-fashioned style. Either this or war—which would be the worst disaster of all for Africans.

Whereas a reasonable scheme of colonial readjustment might be put forward now—if the British Government would but take the initiative. The announcement of such a scheme would put the negotiations (which are bound to come) on the right basis, instead of the wrong basis, from the start. It could be of such a nature as not only to avoid the bare "handing over" of colonies, but to constitute an advance, even if a small one, towards the principles of trusteeship and of joint European action in Africa. Such a scheme would take as its basis and starting point the extension of the Congo Basin Treaties, to be discussed at a conference of the signatories of the Berlin Act, 1885. Subject to such a collective control, applicable to all the Powers concerned, there should be a redistribution of territory, which would enable Germany to play her part on equal terms.

This initiative need not be a mere concession to Germany. It might take the form of a declaration of British policy, made *urbi et orbi*—a recognition on our part that the colonial *status quo* is not eternal, and that the experience of the past 56 years has something to teach us.

As I listen to the speeches of the advocates of "no surrender," I find that they are primarily interested not in colonies but in "standing up to the dictators." Their case is against Germany as such, and in urging it they draw upon the inexhaustible sources of vituperation to be found in the anti-German oratory of 1914-18. While I welcome their new-found enthusiasm for native welfare, I must point out that they are not among those who have tried to promote that welfare in the past.

Should not all this give pause to those distinguished men who are now lending the weight of their names to the "no surrender" agitation?

Yours, &c.,

CHARLES RODEN BUXTON.

6, Erskine Hill, N.W.11.



*C. C. Buxton*

# DURRANT'S PRESS CUTTINGS

St. Andrew's House, 32 to 34 Holborn Viaduct,  
and 3 St. Andrew Street, Holborn Circus, E.C.1.

Telephone: CENTRAL 3149 (TWO LINES).

## The Times

Printing House Square, E.C.4.

Cutting from issue dated..... 3 - MAR 1939

### Letters to the Editor

## GERMANY'S CLAIM TO COLONIES

### TRANSFER NO SOLUTION

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES

Sir,—Bismarck hated the idea of colonies, but he gave his Germans advice which, if the principle he laid down could be followed, would be of enormous benefit to civilization. To a deputation which had waited upon him to urge colonial expansion he said: "Gentlemen, the friendship of Lord Salisbury is worth more to us than twenty colonies"—and every prediction of the consequences of Germany and colonial policy made by Bismarck to that deputation has, alas, come true!

In the letter of Mr. Charles Buxton, published in *The Times* of Wednesday, he makes a point which is of enormous importance—namely, the folly of waiting for Hitler or anybody else to make formal demands. I submit that no time should be lost in making the British official position quite plain. The first point in that position is surely that even if it were possible to return all or any of the former colonial areas, that would be no "solution" of the colonial question; secondly, that nobody has been more emphatic on this feature than Germany herself. I believe that anyone who has studied this problem would agree that a crude transfer of mandated territory is neither possible nor desirable—therefore, why not say so? The way would then be clear for making alternative suggestions, such as an enlarged "Conventional area," with wide opportunities covering all fields of colonial activity.

The scope and nature of such alternatives is too vast for a letter, but, as Mr. Buxton rightly indicates, it might easily lead to the inauguration of a new colonial era, with enormous benefits to the inhabitants and a permanent effect upon European peace. But the "royal road" to that solution is the way marked out by Bismarck. I am yours, &c.,

JOHN HARRIS,

Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society, Denison House, 296, Vauxhall Bridge Road, S.W., March 2.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES

Sir,—No better justification for the foundation of the Colonial League could possibly be afforded than the letter from Mr. Charles Roden Buxton which appears in your columns to-day. For it is based on precisely that complete ignorance or disregard of the facts of the situation which constitutes the danger of the present position, and which it is the object of the Colonial League to dispel.

The Colonial League is a non-political body whose members by no means necessarily hold the same opinion on questions of colonial administration, or even on the ultimate future of Africa. Some of them may sympathize with the ideal of a collective control of tropical Africa on the lines favoured by Mr. Buxton, and it is not my concern at this moment to argue the many practical difficulties involved in the realization of such an ideal—they have been admirably stated in your columns on a previous occasion by Lord Lugard himself. The Colonial League, as such, is concerned with facts and not with hypothetical schemes, and one of the cardinal facts of the situation is that Mr. Buxton's plan has not the slightest interest for Germany's present rulers.

Herr Hitler has stated quite plainly that what he is concerned with is "the redistribution of the riches of the earth," and his argument has since been even more explicitly developed by the official head of the Reich Colonial League. Speaking at Würzburg last week General von Epp declared that:—

It is absolutely necessary both for us and the world that the German demands should be satisfied. And the sooner the better. Growing peoples require space which produces what they or others need, with a population that can be fitted into a production plan and can provide the necessary labour.

We demand the abolition of the ridiculous guardianship of our oversea property. But over and above this we demand, as one of the leading civilized nations of the world, our share in a coming planned redistribution of world space which is necessary for the future of a nation of 80,000,000 people.

What is the use of shutting our eyes to the plain meaning of such a demand, or deluding ourselves with the fond notion that it can be met by offering Germany a "constructive" alternative which would not be looked at but only encourage the conviction that we are prepared to surrender our responsibilities and abandon the peoples under our charge, if the pressure put upon us is strong enough?

Mr. Buxton, indeed, assumes as indisputable that, if we were actually faced with war, we should surrender, and that then the ex-German colonies would be handed over "in full sovereignty in the old-fashioned style." If that is really the case then why waste time in putting forward face-saving alternatives which have no chance of acceptance? Why not honestly admit that we are no longer prepared to defend either our own rights or our pledged responsibilities to the native and other inhabitants, whether of the ex-German colonies or of any other part of the British Empire? That is the real issue to-day, and the main object of the Colonial League is to bring out the facts which should make this clear to our fellow-citizens.

Yours faithfully,

L. S. AMERY.

112, Eaton Square, S.W.1, MARCH 1.



*L. R. Buxton*

# DURRANT'S PRESS CUTTINGS

St. Andrew's House, 32 to 34 Holborn Viaduct,  
and 3 St. Andrew Street, Holborn Circus, E.C.1.

Telephone: CENTRAL 3149 (TWO LINES).

## The Times

Printing House Square, E.C.4.

Cutting from issue dated.....14 MAR 1939.....193

### Letters to the Editor

#### GERMANY AND COLONIES

##### COLLECTIVE CONTROL

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES

Sir,—Mr. Amery is of opinion that "Mr. Buxton's plan has not the slightest interest for Germany's present rulers." Mr. Amery seems to know. The rest of us simply do not know. Mr. Amery's dogmatic assertion leaves me totally unconvinced.

The fact that in present circumstances Germans think of nothing but the return of the former colonies proves nothing whatever: first, because every bargainer begins by stating his claim in its simple and complete form; and secondly, because the only suggestions coming from the possessing Powers involve imposing upon Germany some special restrictions, such as mandates, not applied equally to all other Powers concerned. Assuming equality, their whole approach would be different.

To quote General von Epp, the leader of colonial agitation, is singularly unenlightening as to what the ultimate attitude of the German Government would be. As well quote Mr. Amery to prove what will be Mr. Chamberlain's policy a year hence.

It is not necessary for my argument, however, that there should be positive proof of Germany's "interest" in the matter. I contended that Britain should take the initiative in laying before the world—*urbi et orbi*—a reasonable scheme of collective control, combined with a redistribution of territory, which would give Germany colonies on equal terms. The effect on world opinion would be great. It would be evidence that Britain was reasonable; recognizing that the "exclusive" Empire was out of date, and that a beginning should be made with collective responsibility and trusteeship. The effect on the opinion of the German people would not be less marked. Such plans are not without interest for the German people. At any rate they are reported and discussed in the German Press.

If the "no surrender" policy is adopted, it means that we wait until Herr Hitler presents his demand in its complete form; that we then refuse it; and that the whole issue becomes a mere struggle for "possessions." If Britain takes the initiative, on the other hand, we put the other party (if he proves intractable) in the position of refusing even to discuss a proposal which is recognized by the world as reasonable and progressive.

I suggest that we should lay before a conference of the signatories of the Brussels Act, 1885, as a basis for discussion, the following plan:—

(1) A new convention to provide for complete equality of economic opportunity throughout West Central Africa, together with protection for the rights of native races; a development, in the light of modern conceptions and experience, of the Congo Basin treaties, the mandates, and the relevant I.L.O. Conventions; to include the non-militarization of the natives, a certain minimum of self-government, and the opening of the various administrations to foreign nationals suitably qualified.

(2) A permanent commission or federal council with wide powers, whose main purpose would be to watch over the strict execution of the convention.

(3) Subject to the collective control established by the convention, a redistribution of territory in West Central Africa, to which Britain, France, Belgium, Portugal, and also the Union of South Africa, would each contribute, thus forming two new German colonies, one north and one south of the Congo. East Africa, it will be noted, is not included in this redistribution.

Incidentally, the new frontiers (after an ethnological inquiry) would be made to correspond with the racial boundaries which are at present completely ignored.

Yours, &c.,

CHARLES RODEN BUXTON.

6, Erskine Hill, N.W.11.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES

Sir,—Your correspondent Mr. Charles Roden Buxton, in *The Times* of March 1, suggests that the British Government should take the initiative in putting forward a scheme of colonial readjustment in Africa which would be based upon an extension of the Congo Basin Treaty and also be an advance in the principles of trusteeship.

I submit that it would be useless to put forward such a scheme because (a) the principle of trusteeship, as we understand it, could not be accepted by other nations concerned who consider a colony as an integral part of the mother country, and (b) the Congo Basin Treaty, designed to provide equal opportunity for importation to a colony, is not, experience shows, necessarily in the interest of the export trade, which provides the means for raising the standard of living in a colony. Any scheme which denies to colonial producers and Governments some freedom to bargain for reciprocal trade may seriously hamper economic development and the social progress which depends upon it.

In the House of Commons debate on February 23 the steady advance in our application of the principle of trusteeship was apparent; the establishment of Makerere College, for example. During a recent visit to Ceylon I was impressed by the progress made there in self-government.

Any alternative to Mr. Buxton's scheme is not easy to suggest; it is idle to pretend, however, that in the present international situation, the problem is capable of a simple solution which would be in the native interest as we see it. Schemes like Mr. Buxton's suffer from a fatal defect: apart from damage to the natives' economic well-being they are injurious to their deepest feelings, since they involve a severance of the personal link which binds them to the British Crown.

I am, &c.,

W. H. McLEAN.

The Athenaeum, Pall Mall, S.W.1.



DURRANT'S PRESS CO

St. Andrew's House, 32 to 34 Holborn  
and 3 St. Andrew Street, Holborn Circus, E.

Telephone: CENTRAL 3149 (TWO LINES).

The Times

Printing House Square, E.C.4.

Cutting from issue dated.....

5 AUG 1939

## Letters to the Editor

### FUTURE OF THE RHODESIAS

#### NATIVE POLICY IN THE SOUTH

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES

Sir,—In your issue of July 30 Miss Perham has cogently indicated the grounds which militate against premature amalgamation of the two Rhodesias with Nyasaland.

May I, as one of the presidents of the Anti-Slavery Society, testify to the volume of public opinion which on similar grounds supports the report of the Bledisloe Commission where it insists on the interests of the native population? The Commission, while it comments with due respect on the administration of Southern Rhodesia, is definitely critical of its native policy. It exposes the evils of the policy of segregation, of colour bar legislation, of the restriction of governmental employment of natives, and of the pass laws. On these accounts it urges that amalgamation should be delayed. The colour bar alone would justify this recommendation. It has been described by the well-known authority, Sir John Harris, as the infliction of a legislative or administrative bar upon British people of colour, solely because of the colour of their skin. . . . If a person has any "colour in his blood" then he is by colour bar law put outside the circle of civilized man and stripped of most of the privileges of British citizenship, apart altogether from his qualifications, attainments, or character.

It is true that in the Reserves the native can rise to any post except the highest; but since the white population possesses (in spite of its small numbers) the best land, the mines, the industries, and the towns, there are no positions of importance which the native can occupy. The position is reached by the wholesale deprivation of land. The report of the Select Committee of 1839, urging the necessity of leaving the native populations in possession of their land, has been ignored, with dangerous result.

When we consider further the extreme length to which the pass law is carried, with its vexatious complication of documents and its convictions for offences which the native cannot understand, it is not surprising that the Commission supports ultimate amalgamation only on terms—namely, the retention of the vote (on an educational and property basis) and the reservation to Whitehall of legislation affecting native interests.

The motto of Cecil Rhodes, "Equal rights for all civilized men," should guide the policy of the lands which bear his name. The orientation of Rhodesian policy towards the Union would be opposed by strong sections of opinion in the Rhodesias as well as in Great Britain. It would run counter to the tradition of trusteeship, a tradition expressed by Mr. Churchill in well-known words:—

There is only one ideal that the British Empire can set before itself and that is that there should be no barrier of race, colour, or creed which should prevent any man by merit from reaching any station, if he is fitted for it.

Yours truly,

NOEL-BUXTON.

18 Cowley Street, S.W.



Aug 2, 1937  
ES TUESDAY AUGUST

Letters to the Editor

## NATIVES IN RHODESIA

### THE SOUTHERN POLICY

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES

Sir,—The presence of the Prime Minister to discuss with the Imperial authorities the question of amalgamation between Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia, and Nyasaland has created a certain interest and correspondence in your columns, and as there appears to be some misunderstanding, both in the Bledisloe Commission Report itself and in the minds of those interested in the problem, I think it advisable to ask you to be good enough to publish this letter.

In the first instance the Bledisloe Report is rather misleading in its reference to the effect of the Industrial Conciliation Act in restricting the employment of natives, particularly in the building industry.

In Section 400 of the report it is stated:—

The economic prospects of the native in the European areas are limited owing to the policy of segregation. In these areas no career is open to natives, the pursuit of which would adversely affect the opportunities of employment or the standard of living of Europeans. . . . This policy finds expression in an agreement made under the Industrial Conciliation Act, 1934. . . . This agreement, which applies in the areas of, and immediately around, the principal European centres, stipulates that no employee shall receive wages at less than certain rates. . . . Pending the development of opportunities within the native areas this limitation of employment is calculated to act as a deterrent to the development by the native of his efficiency as a skilled worker.

These passages seem to convey the impression that natives may not be employed in skilled or semi-skilled work in the building industry in European areas. This is by no means the case. When the report was written the building agreement applied only to three main centres, Salisbury, Bulawayo, and Umtali. It has since been extended to Gwelo, Gatooma, and Victoria. The whole of the remainder of the "European area"—including the mines and agricultural areas—is therefore open to the employment of natives and in fact almost all farm buildings are built by natives under European supervision, and the Government itself is employing natives for the construction of native villages in the neighbourhood of Salisbury and Bulawayo.

The Act of 1934 excluded the native from the definition of employer, but by an amendment of the Act in 1937 it was provided that where the object of an agreement was likely to be defeated by the employment of natives, the terms of such agreement might be applied to natives so that any native employed on skilled work should be paid the standard rate of wage. This admittedly has the effect of excluding natives from employment by contractors skilled labourers, but only within municipal areas.

Actually the restriction does not apply outside the environs of the six towns, and there is complete freedom on the numerous mines and farms and in all other parts of the colony. Moreover, the enactment does not prevent persons who are not regularly engaged in the building, printing, and motor trades from employing natives at less than the fixed wage—e.g., as bricklayers, carpenters, plasterers, masons, &c., even in the six towns, and large numbers of natives are so employed. It is admitted that the general welfare of the natives is higher in Southern Rhodesia than in the other two territories, or Bechuanaland. This has been achieved by the leadership and guidance of the larger European population resident in Southern Rhodesia exercising a mass education for the natives. Without protection in the special areas, the number of Europeans engaged in the mass-educated effort would be considerably less.

Is not the position similar in the Colonial Service itself? No Barotse or Nyasa native would be accepted by the Colonial Office for the higher ranks of its service although he could show university qualifications for the post. The higher ranks of the Colonial Service are reserved for Europeans, not by the Act of any Parliament, but by a colour bar of custom, which is equally as effective. The reasons for the custom are sound, and I understand them. I only ask for similar understanding respecting some of the provisions of our Conciliation Act, which will possibly be only as temporary as the colour bar of custom of the Colonial Office.

I would also like to be allowed to refer to a letter from Miss Perham, which appeared in your paper on July 29. This, quite candidly, I do not understand. She states *inter alia* that there are only two native policies in British Africa, but I am unable to discover the Southern Rhodesia policy in either of them, and, moreover, we in Southern Rhodesia implicitly believe that the adoption of the policies enumerated by Miss Perham would ultimately be disastrous both to the African and to the European.

I have taken the opportunity of the Prime Minister's presence in London to show him this letter, and I may say that he concurs with it.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

S. M. LANIGAN-O'KEEFE,

High Commissioner for Southern

Rhodesia.

Rhodesia House, 429, Strand, W.C.2.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES

Sir,—Lord Noel-Buxton, in your issue of to-day, does not make it clear that there is no statutory "colour bar" (in the sense of Sir John Harris's definition) in operation in Southern Rhodesia; it is confined to the Union of South Africa, an independent, self-governing Dominion.

The only "colour bar" in Southern Rhodesia is the restriction imposed by the white trade unions on the employment of skilled natives in the large towns, such as Salisbury and Bulawayo. Outside these, skilled natives do excellent work. The object of the trade unions is, of course, to prevent competition and maintain their wage rates.

The whole question was admirably debated in the House of Lords last Monday by Lord Elibank, Lord Bledisloe, Lord Harlech, Lord Lugard, and others; and Hansard's report of that debate deserves careful study by all interested in this amalgamation problem. Lord Noel-Buxton was, apparently, not present on that occasion—at any rate, he took no part in the discussion. If he had been he might have modified his opinion of the pass-laws.

Yours truly,

ALLEYNE LEECHMAN.

91, Great Titchfield Street, W.1, Aug. 5.