

Editorial & Publishing Offices :

MACMILLAN & Co., LTD.  
ST. MARTIN'S STREET  
LONDON, W.C.2



Telegraphic Address :  
PHUSIS, LESQUARE, LONDON

Telephone Number :  
WHITEHALL 8831

Vol. 143

SATURDAY, MAY 20, 1939

No. 3629

## Ideals in Africa\*

ON March 9, 1938, H.M. the King appointed a Commission "to inquire and report whether any, and if so what, form of closer co-operation or association between Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland is desirable and feasible". The Commissioners were five in number, of whom Viscount Bledisloe acted as chairman. After preliminary inquiry and the hearing of evidence in England, the Commission proceeded to Africa, arriving at Bulawayo on May 16. When evidence had been taken in Southern Rhodesia, the Commission visited Portuguese East Africa, passed on to Nyasaland and returned through Northern Rhodesia to Salisbury.

Taken together, the three territories which came under the purview of the Commission include an area of approximately 500,000 miles, with a total population estimated at roughly 4,300,000. Of these, approximately 68,000 are European, 8,000 are Asiatics and 'coloured' in the sense in which that term is used in southern Africa, namely, the offspring of union between non-native and native, and 4,230,000 are natives. The proportion of Europeans to natives in the combined territories is 1 to 62; but the ratio is more significant when the territories are distinguished: in Southern Rhodesia it is 1 to 22, in Northern Rhodesia 1 to 129 and in Nyasaland 1 to 881. While both European and native populations have increased between 1926 and 1936, the rise among Europeans has been relatively more rapid owing to the development of the copper mines. It shows a decrease in the later return owing to the interruption of development work in the mines; but with the renewal of activity it is again increasing slowly.

\* Rhodesia—Nyasaland Royal Commission. Report. (Cmd. 5949.) Pp. x+283. (London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1939.) 7s. 6d. net.

It is especially important to bear these figures and their inter-relations in mind, in view of the conditions which were imposed on the inquiry of the Commission and its findings. In the Royal Warrant, it was specifically laid down that in reporting on the desirability and feasibility of co-operation or association between the territories, due regard was to be had to "the interests of all the inhabitants, irrespective of race . . . and to the special responsibility of Our government in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for the interests of the native inhabitants". As will appear, the members of the Commission, collectively and individually, have given full weight to this instruction. The manner in which they have discharged their obligation raises issues in native policy of the gravest importance, not only as affecting the territories immediately concerned, but also as touching the interests of all natives throughout British colonial possessions in Africa. Indeed it may not be without repercussion elsewhere, in territories other than British, should certain suggestions which arise out of the report be given practical effect.

Broadly speaking, the recommendations of the Commission do not favour the proposal of an amalgamation of the three territories, at any rate in the near future. While there is a suggestion that they may look forward ultimately to becoming one great united territory, which might well aspire to dominion status, the time for such a development is far from being yet. Certain suggestions are put forward as practicable, with the view of securing greater uniformity in administration, especially in finance and education, as well as affecting labour, while certain measures in what may be termed the machinery of government are

adumbrated as likely to secure an even greater measure of association in organization and policy. On the whole, however, unless and until conditions change, the Commission is adverse from the close union, if not amalgamation, which for some time has been the subject of consideration and much discussion.

The report, in regard to its recommendations, is a document of singular interest. The main recommendation is, of course, unanimous; but in certain respects the report is exceptional. We are accustomed to reports of commissions in which the main recommendations are accompanied by a minority report; but a report in which each member of the commission, including the chairman with one other, makes what is virtually a minority report, is surely unusual. In fairness to the members, however, it must be stated that some of them add their individual statements with reluctance, and as a measure of self-protection lest silence should be misconstrued as complete acceptance.

The explanation of this remarkable position is that the circumstances with which the members of the Commission had to deal are of singular difficulty, even among matters of native policy in Africa. The crux of the situation is that of outlook in native policy. The difference between Southern Rhodesia and the two remaining territories of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland, which in this matter for practical purposes are at one, is so great, so fundamental, as to form an obstacle to amalgamation which in present circumstances is felt to be insuperable. In this the members of the Commission are agreed. Their differences lie in the degree to which they regard a measure of co-operation as immediately possible, and ultimate closer union as both practicable and desirable. At the same time, however, it is pointed out that native policy and the methods of native administration in all three territories are to a great extent still experimental; and it is by no means impossible that, as experience grows, modifications may be effected which will bring an outlook, at present diverse, into greater harmony.

In order to understand a situation which is regarded as of such gravity as to block a proposal which has much to recommend it in the many advantages, administrative, economic and financial, which would immediately accrue, especially to the less prosperous of the territories, it is perhaps necessary to recall that it is only within the last few years that certain important changes have

been made in the principles and methods of native government in all three territories. While, however, in Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland the principle of indirect rule has been applied with all that it involves in regard to the respect paid to native law and custom in matters affecting the natives—that is while, in the words of the White Paper which stands as a charter of the principles of British Colonial government, the interests of the natives are paramount—in Southern Rhodesia, where the lead of policy in the Union of South Africa has been followed, the principle of segregation has been applied, and in the enthusiasm of reform, it must be admitted with some rigour. Not only is segregation physical—not only are native lands inaccessible to Europeans, but also native ownership or occupation of European lands is forbidden—and the opportunities open to Europeans in the higher branches of education, in certain occupations, and so forth are debarred to all natives. In short, a ‘colour bar’ no less strong and no less rigid than that which exists under the Union has been instituted in Southern Rhodesia. The problem raised by this difference in outlook to some extent is aggravated in Northern Rhodesia by the difficulties which arise from the poverty of the people and overcrowding, in itself a consequence of the poverty, alleged to be irremediable, of large parts of their lands, as well as the special problem, which has already arisen through the development of industry, of the urbanized native—a problem which will require, but has still to receive, adequate special treatment.

A factor in the situation which should not be overlooked or underrated is the attitude of the natives themselves in both Rhodesia and Nyasaland. Their opposition is “unmistakable, pronounced and strikingly unanimous”.

The position of Southern Rhodesia in following the lead of the Union, is, of course, one that is readily comprehensible, and to a great extent arises out of its history. Like the Union, its policy is based upon the ideal of a white civilization in a country that has been regarded as eminently suitable for remunerative and permanent white settlement with a white civilization as predominant, while its main preoccupation in domestic economy has been the provision of an adequate and readily available supply of labour. With such an outlook, Southern Rhodesia, being, as she would, the predominant partner in any amalgamation, many features in the present situation, which are not in the best interests of the natives of the other

two territories, might be rendered permanent, if not intensified. For example, much attention has been devoted to the question of the supply of labour, and the danger is stressed whereby it is feared that the native populations of these territories might become permanently no more than feeders of the labour supply.

The inquiries of the Commission have covered a wide field and the members have made full use of the labours of the numerous commissions and inquiries which have preceded them. They have taken a wide view of the departments of native life which they feel would be affected by the proposed changes in administration. They have, therefore, not hesitated to direct attention to matters affecting the development of the native in which they feel a progressive policy should now be applied, and in which rapid progress might be made by the measure of co-operation between the Rhodesias and Nyasaland which they recommend. Education, instruction in agriculture and technical training, instruction in the care of the soil and in hygiene and the principles of

nutrition, the fostering of the development of the peasant farmer class, are some only of the fields to which they point as urgently requiring development.

Fundamentally, however, the importance of this report lies in the stress laid, unostentatiously but nevertheless with unmistakable strength, on the difference in outlook of what may be termed the two schools of native policy, segregation and indirect rule, taking the latter in a broad sense. This antinomy prompts inquiry whether the white peoples in exercising their rule over Africa, and accepting their responsibilities for the welfare of the African as they profess to do, have any clear idea of the end to which they are directing him in assuming that responsibility for his development. Is indirect rule, which rests upon native custom, unless we do it no more than lip service, likely to lead either to stagnation, or a masked tribal disintegration, or is segregation, which sets the bounds of native development and that not beyond his presumed powers, the choice of the better part?

---

## Prehistoric Crete

### The Archæology of Crete

An Introduction. By J. D. S. Pendlebury. (Methuen's Handbooks of Archæology.) Pp. xxxii + 400 + 43 plates. (London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1939.) 30s. net.

IT was in 1894 that Sir Arthur Evans made his first journey in Crete, and in 1899 that his excavation of Knossos commenced. His own account of "The Palace of Minos" began to appear in 1921 and was completed in 1936. From time to time others have tried to summarize both the progress of discovery in Crete and the general bearings of it on the prehistoric archæology of the Mediterranean. But Mr. Pendlebury's book is the first thorough and satisfactory account of the work of many travellers and excavators; his numerous maps show how vast an accumulation there has been of observations and finds, and the lists of sites appended to them how much he has himself contributed by persistent exploration, covering now every district of the island. As curator formerly of Knossos, where the Palace and its surroundings have been made over by Sir Arthur Evans to the British School of Archæology at Athens, he has not only written an invaluable

"Handbook to the Palace", but has also himself examined and catalogued the stores of classified objects from every room and corridor, and from every stratum from the neolithic *tell* on which the Minoan settlements stand, to the sparse relics of classical antiquity, when the site had become a 'no-man's-land' in the outskirts of the Greek and Roman city. After directing excavations at Tell-el-Amarna, the Egyptian site most closely connected with Ægean peoples in the fourteenth century B.C., just after the fall of the 'Palace' regime, he has devoted himself to a series of small but most significant excavations in the Lasithi district of Crete itself, on sites ranging from the earliest human occupation to the turbulent age which intervenes between the latest Minoan and the earliest Hellenic periods. Here are, therefore, all the qualifications for an "Introduction", as the author modestly describes it, to the archæology of Crete.

The greater part of the book is inevitably concerned with archæological detail, most carefully selected, and clearly described; but it begins with a convenient retrospect of Cretan discoveries, and a presentation of the physical characteristics of Crete, and of the topography and routes,