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Abstract
This thesis explores the historical significance of kith and kin ties between white Rhodesia’s settlers and Britain from 1939 to 1980. It traces the extent to which kinship connections influenced the relations between white Rhodesian settlers and Britain from the Second World War up to the collapse of colonial rule in 1980. It uses kith and kin as a prism through which to understand the social and cultural connections between white Rhodesians and Britain, as well as the many ways in which these ties influenced the decolonisation of white Rhodesia. The thesis argues that kith and kin relations between white Rhodesians and Britain operated at both the familial and political level between 1939 and 1980. In addition, it demonstrates that these feelings and sentiments fluctuated throughout the period under the study. These connections reflected in the way Britain handled the Rhodesian problem in the 1960s and 1970s. Furthermore, the thesis traces how ideas of imperial loyalism, patriotism, allegiance, whiteness and Britishness played out within Rhodesian settler society. It demonstrates that these ideas wavered depending on the political circumstances and context. Broadly, this thesis engages with literature on Rhodesian settler colonialism and decolonisation in the British Empire. It contributes to scholarship about settler colonialism and decolonisation considering the significance of social and cultural ties for understanding relations between whites in the settler colonies and Britain in the twentieth century. The thesis engages with the historiography on the formation of British identities in the British Empire in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Key words: Kith and kin, settler, Britishness, whiteness, loyalism, decolonisation, Rhodesia, South Africa.
**Opsomming**

Hierdie tesis ondersoek die geskiedkundige betekenis van familie en kennisse as verbintenisse tussen wit Rhodesiese setlaars en Brittanje van 1939 tot 1980. Dit ondersoek die mate waartoe verwantskappe die verhouding tussen wit Rhodesiese setlaars en Brittanje tydens die Tweede Wêreldoorlog tot die ineenstoring van koloniale heerskappy in 1980 beïnvloed het. Familie en kennisse word as ’n prisma gebruik waardeur die sosiale en kulturele konneksies tussen wit Rhodesiërs en Brittanje verstaan word, asook die verskeie wyse waarop hierdie bande die dekolonisering van wit Rhodesia beïnvloed het. Hierdie tesis argumenteer dat familie en kennisse verhoudings tussen wit Rhodesiërs en Brittanje op beide die familiële en politieke vlakke tussen 1939 en 1980 geopereer het. Darby word gedemonstreer dat hierdie gevoelens en sentimente gewissel het gedurende die periode van hierdie studie. Hierdie konneksies reflekteer in die wyse waarop Brittanje die Rhodesiese probleem in die 1960s en 1970s hanteer het. Verder ondersoek hierdie tesis hoe idees van imperiale lojaliteit, patriotisme, getrouheid, witheid, en Britsheid uitgespeel het binne Rhodesiese setlaar samelewing. Dit demonstreer dat hierdie idees gewankel het afhanklik van die politieke omstandighede en konteks. Breedweg besig hierdie tesis homself met literatuur oor Rhodesiese setlaar kolonialisme en dekolonisering in die Britse Ryk. Dit lewer ’n bydra tot die literatuur oor setlaar kolonialisme en dekolonisering in ag genome die betekenis van sosiale en kulturele bande om die verhouding tussen wit mense in setlaar kolonies en Brittanje in die twintigste eeu te verstaan. Hierdie tesis besig homself met die historiografie oor die formasie van Britse identiteite in die Britse Ryk in die laat neéntiende en twintigste eeu.

**Sleutelwoorde:** Familie en Kennisse, setlaar, Britsheid, witheid, lojaliteite, dekolonisering, Rhodesië, Suid-Afrika.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glossary</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCS</td>
<td>Association of Chambers of Commerce of Southern Rhodesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>African National Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAM</td>
<td>British Air Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCATS</td>
<td>British Commonwealth Air Training Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEATS</td>
<td>British Empire Air Training Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSAP</td>
<td>British South Africa Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAF</td>
<td>Central African Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID</td>
<td>Criminal Investigation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Centre Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPGB</td>
<td>Communist Party of Great Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYL</td>
<td>City Youth League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Dutch Reformed Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Dominion Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCO</td>
<td>Foreign and Commonwealth Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRELIMO</td>
<td>Frente de Libertação de Moçambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICEM</td>
<td>Inter-governmental Committee on European Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLB</td>
<td>Bachelor of Laws degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOMA</td>
<td>Law and Order Maintenance Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Member of Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAD</td>
<td>Native Affairs Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAZ</td>
<td>National Archives of Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>National Democratic Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAU</td>
<td>Organisation of African Unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEC</td>
<td>Organisation of the Petroleum Exporting Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>Patriotic Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSB</td>
<td>Public Services Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAAF</td>
<td>Royal Australia Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF</td>
<td>Royal Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATG</td>
<td>Rhodesia Air Training Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>Rhodesian Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNP</td>
<td>Rhodesia National Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPD</td>
<td>Rhodesia Political Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAAF</td>
<td>South African Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRAF</td>
<td>Southern Rhodes Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDI</td>
<td>Unilateral Declaration of Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFP</td>
<td>United Federal Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPP</td>
<td>United Peoples Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAAF</td>
<td>Women's Auxiliary Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAAS</td>
<td>Women’s Auxiliary Air Service in Southern Rhodesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW2</td>
<td>World War Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZANLA</td>
<td>Zimbabwe African National Liberation Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZANU</td>
<td>Zimbabwe African National Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAPU</td>
<td>Zimbabwe African People’s Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIPRA</td>
<td>Zimbabwe People’s Revolutionary Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZNP</td>
<td>Zimbabwe National Party</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graphs and Cartoons

Graph 1 Southern Rhodesia Imports 1945-9 67
Graph 2 Southern Rhodesia Exports 1944-49 68
Cartoon 1, Wilson and Rhodesia Policy 113
Cartoon 2, ‘Republic of Enkeldoorn’ 153
Chapter One

Introduction

On 11 November 1965, Prime Minister Ian Smith and his Rhodesian Front government unilaterally declared settler independence from Britain. At the time of Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI), the majority of white Rhodesians were of British origin although there were small minorities of Afrikaners, Greeks, Italians and other Europeans.¹ As Britain failed to decisively deal with the rebellious Rhodesian regime, this prompted African nationalists to blame it for protecting its kith and kin.² For instance, in 1968, the Zambian vice president Reuben Kamanga noted that behind the Rhodesian crisis laid ‘the kind of sentimentalism that found expression in the concept of kith and kin’.³ By the late 1970s, African nationalists still believed that Britain protected its kith and kin at the expense of majority rule.⁴ Against this background, historians have acknowledged the importance of the kith and kin factor in explaining why Britain did not use force against Rhodesian settlers before and shortly after UDI.⁵ However, the focus on the significance of kith and kin covers a relatively short period – between 1964 and 1965. By contrast, this thesis will historicise the significance of ideas about kith and kin tracing the extent to which these notions shaped relations between white Rhodesia and Britain from 1939 to 1980.

In common usage, the phrase kith and kin refers to blood relations and applies to people descending from a common ancestor. For this study, this is applicable to white Rhodesians of British ancestry who had families and relatives in Britain – ties that continued in the post-colonial period.⁶ The thesis will examine the extent to which Rhodesian settlers conflated kith and kin with ideas of imperial loyalty, patriotism, Britishness, whiteness and these notions were more important at some periods than others.

This study argues that Rhodesian settlers and Britain embraced kith and kin notions for different purposes and in varying circumstances in the second half of the twentieth century. As Michael

---

¹ K. Young, *Rhodesia and Independence: A Study in British Colonial Policy* (London: Spottswoode, 1967), 8. The country had four different names during the entire period of settler rule. These are Southern Rhodesia, Rhodesia, Rhodesia-Zimbabwe and Zimbabwe. Unless otherwise stated during the colonial period, the territory will be interchangeably referred to as Rhodesia or Southern Rhodesia.
⁴ Parliamentary Debates, House of Assembly Debates, 16 August 1978, Col. 111.
⁶ For example, the National Archives of Zimbabwe receives researchers and visitors tracing their British ancestors in the death records, deceased estates and other documents.
Kenny and Nick Pearce have demonstrated that ideas about kith and kin helped to bind together the British Empire in the late Victorian era. The thesis revisits the intersection and divergences between Rhodesian settler interests and the changing British colonial policy in Africa during the period under examination. In addition, it will explore the extent to which ideas about whiteness, ethnicity, moral behaviour, wealth, class and political ideologies were part and parcel of imagined Rhodesian settler society. In doing so, the thesis addresses historian Rory Pilossof’s recent challenge that ‘much more considered work on the construction of who and what is white needs to take place in order to construct a much clearer idea of the historical trajectories of ‘being white’ in Rhodesia/Zimbabwe.’

This thesis will argue that kith and kin feelings in Rhodesia worked on political, cultural or social levels throughout the twentieth century. These notions among white Rhodesians meant different things to various classes of settlers. At least until UDI in 1965, the majority of Rhodesian whites – whether from Britain or South Africa – looked towards Britain with complicated emotions, ranging from admiration for its greatness through a desire to maintain established economic and political ties. Post-war British immigrants who still considered Britain ‘Home’ were intensely loyal to their own idea of Britain. This class of whites strongly valued kith and kin ties with Britain. However, these ideas quickly shifted to blend with old settlers’ views of resentment towards British oversight over their politics from the 1960s until the end of colonial rule. The older upper classes, farmers and business people, looked to Britain with nostalgia, hoping to emulate what they understood to be British culture in Rhodesia. This category of settlers regarded kith and kin conservatively – they cherished their sense of Britishness but resented imperial political control and did not welcome changes in British colonial policy. Whites that settled in the colony after 1947 had indifferent kith and kin attitudes towards Britain. To them, Rhodesia was the last country where white people could survive under minority rule. They believed that Britain should not have retreated from India; a mistake they hoped would not happen in Rhodesia. To African nationalists, these different classes of whites who held varying kith and kin attitudes towards Britain were one and the same. Despite a tiny minority of white liberals that believed in racial harmony, Africans were critical at Britain’s handling of the Rhodesian problem, claiming that

---

9 Young, *Rhodesia and Independence*, 10.
British politicians were determined to protect their kith and kin in Rhodesia. As this thesis will argue, African nationalists made little distinction between these conflicting meanings of kith and kin within the Rhodesian settler society. To them, the majority of settlers were Britain’s kith and kin whom it protected at the expense of majority rule.

The rhetoric of Britishness in Rhodesia refers to the sense of belonging and being one with Britain, which strengthened notions of kith and kin within the Rhodesian settler community. This idea was largely a construction of the Rhodesian settlers, many of whom had come directly from Britain or were South African but had British origins.\(^{14}\) The historian Saul Dubow has suggested that scholars should treat the term – “Britishness” – as an adjective to show how English-speaking settlers appropriated the term to express their own affinities and values.\(^ {15}\) In the early colonial period, Southern Rhodesian settlers regarded themselves as an integral part of the British Empire and strove to maintain imperial connections.\(^ {16}\) Similarly, this thesis will use this term to reflect how white Rhodesians expressed their loyalty and allegiance to Britain for their own social and political benefit.

Southern Rhodesian was established by conquest in the early 1890s. Thereafter, migration was the main source of the white population for long periods of time. Mahmood Mamdani notes that settlers are unique migrants; they are made by conquest and not just by immigration.\(^ {17}\) Furthermore, Lorenco Verancini argues that ‘settlers are founders of political orders and carry their sovereignty with them (on the contrary, migrants can be seen as appellants facing a political order that is already constituted).’\(^ {18}\) This thesis will refer to Southern Rhodesian whites as settlers because they established the colony by conquest, migration thereafter playing a crucial role in boosting the white population. Before examining kinship relations between white Rhodesians and Britain, it is important to briefly reflect on the scholarship dealing with Rhodesia settler colonialism and decolonisation.

**Historiographical Reflections on Rhodesian Settlers**

This thesis draws upon three main historiographical strands. First, it engages with literature on Rhodesian settler colonialism, its nature and culture. Secondly, it considers scholarship about the decolonisation of Rhodesia. Thirdly, it looks at literature about settler societies in the British world.

---


\(^ {15}\) S. Dubow, ‘How British was the British World? The Case of South Africa’, *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 37, 1 (2009), 1.


A common feature in all three strands is the limited space devoted to kith and kin as a possible factor influencing settler and imperial relations and the decolonisation process within the British Empire. This is particularly so in the case of Southern Rhodesia.

Rhodesia settler culture and behaviour in the early colonial years has received a certain amount of scholarly attention. Barry Kosmin’s assessment of ethnic and commercial relations in Southern Rhodesia between 1890 and 1943 explored the extent to which ethnicity and class were important aspects of the settler community. His study examines tensions within the Rhodesian settler community but was limited in focus to the early 1940s. Dane Kennedy traced early Rhodesian and Kenyan settler culture up to the 1930s, revealing tensions and insecurities within white communities since settlement. These attitudes were informed by a perceived need to maintain white supremacy in a hostile and alien environment. Ian Phimister showed that in the early colonial years, Rhodesian settlers were compromised by metropolitan capital interests and for the greater part of the 1920s, foreign capital dominated Rhodesia. This influenced economic relations between white Rhodesians and Britain but these studies do not explore how cultural forces also shaped settler and imperial ties.

Donal Lowry alayed the participation of white of women in shaping national politics in Rhodesia in the early settler politics. Kate Laws’ study addresses white women’s participation in politics and the construction of whiteness and Empire since the 1950s. However, this literature does not engage with the construction and shifts of identities based on Britishness and Rhodesianness. Julie Bonello showed that Rhodesian settlers constructed their early identities in relation to Africans, South Africans and the imperial homeland of Britain. These forces were influential in shaping white Rhodesian identities based on insecurity and ambivalent imperial feelings. Alison Shutt further expanded our knowledge about Rhodesian identity by exploring how settlers developed a Rhodesian identity and culture in the 1940s. New immigrants flocking into the country after the Second World War had to be educated about the nature of white Rhodesian culture and manners.

However, this literature rarely explores the possibility that notions of kith and kin were an important aspect of the Rhodesian settler community.

Other works focus on the later stages of Rhodesian colonial rule and the liberation struggle. Peter Godwin and Ian Hancock explored the changes brought by the war in the late 1970s in white Rhodesia. They revealed that whites who arrived in Rhodesia before 1921 carried the pioneering attitudes and expectations of British South Africans rather than those of residential British nationals into their new settlement. Their attitude congealed into ‘a self-centred “Rhodesian-ness” which appeared to express itself negatively in opposition to Africans, Afrikaners, or non-British whites. This was complicated further by the fact that they frequently disagreed among themselves, often in a manner influenced by ethnic origins. Drawing from these studies, the thesis broadens our understanding of Rhodesian settler identities at different times.

Studies reflecting on the emergence and demise of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland have noted that it left a bitter taste of betrayal among some Southern Rhodesian whites after Britain dissolved it. Ian Hancock discussed divisions within the white community between moderates, liberals and radicals. Liberal ideas flourished during the Federation, while some contemporary observers called this period the ‘lost chance’ and bemoan the failure of racial partnership. Recently, Susan Woodhouse explored the life of Garfield Todd and the liberal era in Southern Rhodesia. Anthony King discussed the various ways in which the print media framed race relations inside the Federation. While King explored local race relations, Andrew Cohen examined how the Federal Government recruited overseas publicists to present Salisbury in the best possible light in Britain. Recently, Cohen examined the politics and economics of British decolonisation, focusing on the international dimension of the Federation during its existence and dissolution. This thesis builds upon this literature to rethink race relations, contestations of whiteness and identities during this period.

An important theme in the literature on white Rhodesia is immigration and settlement in the colony. A. S. Mlambo has significantly contributed to the history of white immigration in Southern

---

26 Godwin and Hancock, ‘Rhodeians Never Die’, 19.
31 S. Woodhouse, Garfield Todd: The End of the Liberal Dream in Rhodesia (Harare: Weaver Press, 2018)
Rhodesia, demonstrating how chauvinistic tendencies underpinned immigration regulations.\textsuperscript{35} Josiah Brownell has recently considered how the demographic and migration patterns of Rhodesia led to the collapse of settler rule in 1979.\textsuperscript{36} Building upon this literature, the thesis explores patterns of white immigration and the challenges it had in Rhodesia especially in the post-war years and the late stages of settler rule.

For all of the strengths of Robert Blake’s expansive survey of the economic, political and ideological forces that shaped the history of Rhodesia, it lacks certain nuances captured in other studies.\textsuperscript{37} By focusing on Britain’s constitutional responsibility for Africans, Clare Palley’s examination of the legal system in Rhodesia before UDI, demonstrated how race affected laws.\textsuperscript{38} Palley challenged the view that after 1923, Southern Rhodesia enjoyed full internal self-government. Instead, her study reveals the degree to which Britain maintained its overriding authority in Rhodesia.\textsuperscript{39} While Kenneth Young traced the events which led to UDI and the subsequent political effects on British colonial policy and the world at large, James Barber focused on the racial divisions in Rhodesia and the political developments.\textsuperscript{40} Other scholars traced the political developments, which led to UDI and the decolonisation process.\textsuperscript{41} Similarly, Robert Good’s study focused mainly on the international politics of UDI showing that the Rhodesian crisis attracted global press coverage, which affected the image of Britain and the Commonwealth.\textsuperscript{42} Ken Flower offered a revealing analysis of the decolonisation of Rhodesia using his knowledge as the chief intelligence officer of Rhodesia.\textsuperscript{43} Much of this literature discusses aspects of settler society in an endeavour to explain the Rhodesian problem, but largely overlooks the possible significance of kith and kin. By contrast, Eshmael Mlambo’s analysis of Southern Rhodesian independence comes close to the conclusion that Britain and white Rhodesians, despite all the quarrels, had one thing in common – keeping Rhodesia as a white country.\textsuperscript{44} His work captures an important strand of nationalist feeling towards the decolonisation of Rhodesia,

\textsuperscript{35} A.S. Mlambo, ‘Some are more white than others’: Racial chauvinism as a factor in Rhodesian immigration policy, 1890 to 1963’, Zambezia, xxvii, ii (2000), 160; Mlambo, ‘Building a Whiteman’s Country’, 123-146; White Immigration into Rhodesia: From Occupation to Federation (Harare: University of Zimbabwe Publications, 2002).


\textsuperscript{37} R. Blake, A History of Rhodesia (London: Eyre Methuen, 1977).


\textsuperscript{39} Ibid, vi.

\textsuperscript{40} Young, Rhodesia and Independence, J. Barber, Rhodesia: The Road to Rebellion (London: Oxford University Press, 1967).


\textsuperscript{43} K. Flower, Serving Secretly: An Intelligence Chief on Record, Rhodesia into Zimbabwe, 1964 to 1987 (London: John Murray, 1987).

\textsuperscript{44} E. Mlambo, Rhodesia: Struggle for a Birthright (London: C. Hurst and Company, 1972), vii.
although he overlooks kith and kin ties between white Rhodesians and Britain. These studies provide useful insights on Anglo-Rhodesian relations and the decolonisation of white Rhodesia which this thesis will build upon.

In studying negotiations for independence between Rhodesia and Britain from 1959 to 1965, J. R. T. Wood’s work does not engage with the idea of kith and kin during the talks.45 Philip Murphy’s work focuses on the prospects of using force against the settlers in Central Africa against the idea of UDI.46 However, in his analysis, Murphy refers more to political and military reasons to justify why Britain did not use force against Rhodesia. While Carl Peter Watts’ work on UDI enriches our understanding of settler relations with Britain, when explaining Britain’s response to UDI, Watts focuses on the importance of ‘more compelling economic and political factors at the time.47 These scholars give primacy to economic and political reasons over cultural ties. Similarly, Luise White’s recent reinterpretation of Rhodesia’s UDI and the decolonisation gives greater credence to political, military and economic aspects in explaining why Britain eventually failed to use force against the Rhodesians.48 Only Michael Evans’ assessment of the role played by ideology in Rhodesian Front rule between 1962 and 1979 emphasises cultural issues, a useful intervention indeed.49 By emphasising the sense of betrayal, white Rhodesians felt in the 1960s, after helped Britain in both World Wars; Evans noted the importance of kith and kin.50 It is this fluctuating sense of alienation from Britain that this study traces.

More broadly, this thesis also draws important insights from the literature on the British world and settler societies. British settlers worldwide embraced the idea of Britishness to identify themselves with the Empire.51 John Lambert argues that settlers in South Africa’s Natal were similar to British settlers elsewhere in the British Empire. Socially and culturally, they shared broadly common attitudes towards Britain, the Empire and the Monarchy.52 Lambert also explores the historical construction and changes of Britishness among English-speaking South Africans.53 By

46 P. Murphy, ‘An intricate and distasteful subject’.
disaggregating hegemonic representations of the British into distinct groups, he notes how the presence of Afrikaners and Africans helped to shape these identities.\textsuperscript{54} Ideas of Britishness changed over time and context, acquiring a new salience after the 1948 Nationalist Party victory in South Africa. Recently, scholars such as Danelle van Zyl-Hermann have explored white histories using class rather than race, especially among Afrikaners in South Africa.\textsuperscript{55} Neil Roos’ analysis of the men who took voluntary service during the Second World War explores the formation of whiteness and identity during the mid-twentieth-century in South Africa.\textsuperscript{56} This literature on whiteness and identity formation in South Africa illuminates aspects of the white Rhodesian past.

More broadly, white British settlers in Australia similarly constructed their identity in terms of Britishness. Scholars such as Deborah Gare and Neville Meaney reflect on this historiography and contestations of Britishness in Australia, especially the country’s constitutional links with Great Britain.\textsuperscript{57} However, by the twentieth century and especially during the interwar period, changing political attitudes in Australia and in Britain challenged this sense of British identity. Despite the impact of the Second World War, Meaney concludes that Britishness became more important in Australia than in Britain after the 1940s and well into the 1960s.\textsuperscript{58} Other scholars have discussed connections of trade, capital and demographic change in the British world.\textsuperscript{59} Gary Magee and Andrew Thompson, for example, considered how the networks of goods and people linking colonies and the metropole contributed to the Empire and globalisation.\textsuperscript{60} As far as other white settler colonies are concerned, this all suggests that, Rhodesian settler’s experiences were not wholly unique when it comes to its relations with Britain.

**Methodology and Sources**

This thesis is based on archival documents consulted in the National Archives of Zimbabwe (NAZ), the National Archives of South Africa; Historical Papers in the University of the Witwatersrand’s William Cullen Library; Britain’s National Archives at Kew in London and the

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid, 602.
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Bodleian Library at the University of Oxford. Ann Stoler argues that 'the archive was the supreme technology of the late nineteenth-century imperial state, a repository of codified beliefs that clustered (and bore witness to) connections between secrecy, the law, and power.'

This statement informs the use of archival sources for this thesis. No single archival document is dedicated to kith and kin; rather, colonial authorities reflected on these ideas in their official records, which also included correspondence and other writings. I critically examined kith and kin sentiments in the various sources that I used to write this thesis.

The NAZ provided me with immigration documents and other archives on Afrikaners in Southern Rhodesia. Trade and industrial journals such as the *Rhodesian Recorder* and *New Rhodesia*, covered many aspects of Rhodesian economy. *Illustrated Life Rhodesia, Rhodesiana* periodicals and the *Walrus* weekly magazine covered many aspects of Rhodesian society, social life and the Second World War. Newspapers such as the *Rhodesia Herald*, *Bulawayo Chronicle*, *Salisbury Evening Standard*, *Federation Newsletter* and *De Burger* provided useful information. In many documents, sentiments of kith and kin and the language of loyalism and imperial patriotism were manifest. The NAZ also holds recorded oral histories of life accounts and reflective memories concerning important events such as the WW2, post-war immigration, UDI, and Anglo-Rhodesian relations. These recorded interviews provided a window into the way settlers thought and imagined kith and kin as well as whiteness and Britishness. *Legislative and Parliamentary Debates* of the Federal period were very informative for understanding race relations, partnership and class conflicts in the 1950s. Rhodesian *Parliamentary Debates* for 1970s were scrutinised, revealing anti-British sentiments held by RF, as well as African MPs’ opinions of kith and kin.

Novels provided another source of material for this thesis. In particular, two novels by Doris Lessing, *The Grass is Singing* and *Going Home* provided insightful information on Rhodesian settlers in the post-war years. Phimister, amongst others, described Lessing’s novels as valuable historical sources. Another noteworthy novel, was Alexander Fuller’s, *Don't Let's Go to the Dogs Tonight*, which provided useful information about white morale in the liberation struggle.

At the National Archives of South Africa, I accessed documents produced by the South African High Commissioner resident in Salisbury, especially during the Federation period. The South African High Commissioner’s correspondence with the Secretary of External Affairs in Pretoria were useful in capturing anti-British sentiments in Rhodesia at the dissolution of the Federation.

---

Moreover, I read newspapers such as the *Rand Daily Mail* and the *Cape Times* which covered racial partnership stories in Rhodesia. These regional newspapers offered external insights into social and political developments in Rhodesia. The University of the Witwatersrand’s Historical Papers provided manuscripts on political developments in Rhodesia in the 1960s. In particular, the papers of the journalist Kenneth Milward and his private correspondence with Sir Roy Welensky were useful for understanding Rhodesia-British relations during and after the dissolution of the Federation.

Britain’s National Archives were very informative, especially in providing metropolitan perspectives on ideas about kith and kin, imperial loyalty and allegiance. Documents from the British Air Ministry helped me understand the language of imperial patriotism in Southern Rhodesia during the Second World War. Dominions Office and Commonwealth Relations Office documents on UDI were useful for following how notions of kith and kin played during the decolonisation of Rhodesia. Interestingly, these archives contain valuable information on secret British government initiatives to help white Rhodesians. Manuscripts from the University of Oxford’s Bodleian Library were also valuable for tracing kinship relations between white Rhodesians and Britain.

**Thesis outline**

This thesis is comprised of seven chapters, chronologically arranged. Chapter One examines the historiography of Rhodesian settler colonialism and decolonisation, noting that it has rarely engaged directly with the historical trajectory of notions of kith and kin as they developed between Southern Rhodesia and Britain.

Chapter Two discusses Southern Rhodesia’s contribution to the Imperial war effort between 1939 and 1945. It argues that there were competing notions of imperial loyalty and patriotism towards Britain among many white Rhodesians. Additionally, it analyses differences within the Rhodesian settler community based on ethnicity and loyalty towards Britain. Moreover, it pays particular attention to the Empire Air Training Scheme, and its implications for Southern Rhodesian and British relations.

Chapter Three traces developments in Southern Rhodesia between 1946 and 1952. It discusses post-war immigration campaigns and the conflicting ideas which emerged about desirable and ‘undesirable’ white immigrants. It suggests that Anglophile tendencies and imperial loyalty were dominant in Southern Rhodesia across this period, as were strong kinship and economic ties between the two countries.
Chapter Four focuses on racial partnership, liberalism and the development of white Rhodesians’ conservatism between 1953 and 1962. It suggests that the rise of African nationalism, the emergence of a black educated elite and politics of partnership significantly contributed to the development of white conservatism during this period. It also discusses changes in Britain’s colonial policy and growing anti-British feelings in sections of Rhodesian settler society.

Chapter Five traces political developments between 1963 and 1971 and discusses British efforts to settle the Rhodesian independence problem. It examines the contradictory importance of kith and kin feelings between Rhodesia and Britain during this period. It examines the extent to which notions of loyalty, allegiance and kinship ties shaped the activities of successive British governments between 1963 and 1971.

Chapter Six explores how kith and kin ties played out between white Rhodesians and Britain between 1972 and 1980. It shows that even in the last stages of Rhodesian settler colonialism, notions of kith and kin remained relevant between Rhodesia and Britain, as military and political developments inside and outside Rhodesia led to the Lancaster House Conference in 1979.

Concluding the thesis, Chapter Seven offers an overview of the main arguments raised in the substantive chapters. It argues that from 1939 to 1980, notions of kith and kin fluctuated between Rhodesia and Britain and often conflated with ideas about whiteness and Britishness. Overall, it concludes that kith and kin ties were an important factor in understanding relations between white Rhodesia’s settlers and Britain.
Chapter Two

Introduction
When the Second World War (WW2) broke out in 1939, Southern Rhodesia had only been British self-governing colony for sixteen years. However, the colony significantly contributed to the imperial war effort despite its relatively small economy and white population. This chapter first discuss how the war acted as a test of loyalty in the British Empire and Southern Rhodesia in particular. It shows that by supporting Britain, white Rhodesians wanted to project a different image from the many Afrikaners in South Africa who were predominantly anti-British. Many white Rhodesians saw the war was an opportunity for them to express their ambivalent sense of imperial loyalism and patriotism towards Britain. The war provided for the development of strong kith and kin feelings towards Britain in Southern Rhodesia. It demonstrates that feelings of imperial loyalty and patriotism were also a source of divisions within white Rhodesia settler community. The overtly British Rhodesian settler community did not trust other white groups, especially Afrikaners, whom Southern Rhodesian English-speaking settlers believed to be disloyal to Britain and sympathetic towards Germany or Italy. It moves on to explore the British Empire Air Training Scheme, the Rhodesian Air Training Group and other contributions on the battle front. The colony’s participation in the British Empire Air Training Scheme was probably its greatest contribution to the war effort. This chapter shows that unlike in Australia and Canada, the scheme strengthened military and cultural ties between white Rhodesian settlers and Britain. Lastly, it discusses Southern Rhodesia’s economic and humanitarian contributions to the war.

A Test of Loyalty: The British Empire at War
At the outbreak of war, Britain was unprepared to engage in a protracted struggle to defend both the home front and its imperial possessions. Deborah Shackleton argues that when the war broke out, Great Britain had limited resources and work force to wage a successful war against Germany.¹ To ease this deficit, the Imperial government looked for support from its colonies and the Dominions. This resulted in men from all over the Empire – both the coloniser and colonised – to enlist by their thousands in the imperial forces.² According to the historian Ashely Jackson, ‘for the first time in its history, the centre [Britain] did have a plan, as well as the conviction, the

technology and the need to carry it through and make every single part of the Empire jump to its tune.\textsuperscript{3} In a speech at the Guildhall in London on 30 June 1940, the British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, attested to the perception that the Empire supported Britain during the war. In part, he stated that ‘the Dominions upon whom there rests no obligation, other than that of sentiment and tradition, plunge into war at the side of the Motherland.\textsuperscript{4} Churchill assumed that all people in the colonies and Dominions considered Britain as the motherland buttressing the idea of a shared Britishness despite the prevailing ideas of sovereignty and self-determination in these places.\textsuperscript{5}

The ‘old Commonwealth’ was made up of Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, Dominions which had conflicting loyalties towards Britain. Scholars suggests that these countries supported Britain because of their own diplomatic, economic and political reasons and for their post-war needs, although not necessarily for imperial loyalty and allegiance.\textsuperscript{6} For instance, on the eve of the war, Australians did not necessarily contradict the ideals of Empire and nationhood. Prime Minister Robert Gordon Menzies was a devotee of the Monarchy and an imperial admirer who could not separate the aspirations of his country from those of Britain.\textsuperscript{7} Both in the First and Second World Wars, the rhetoric of Empire and the language of loyalism dominated Australian politics. Australia’s Governor General reinforced these sentiments when he read the King and Queen’s telegrams in 1940 during a commemoration day. Part of the speech read thus, ‘once again, the peoples of the Empire have received the call to take up arms in defense of justice and freedom….’\textsuperscript{8} Despite Britain’s failure to support Australia from the threat of Japanese attacks, and the subsequent fall of Singapore in 1942, Australians still held with high esteem to the idea of their British identity. As the writer Jack Lindsay described, during the interwar period, many Australians were ‘raised on a diet of English literature and imperial rhetoric, saw pilgrimage to London as a return to their true cultural domicile and referred to England as “Home.”’\textsuperscript{9} However, those who remained in Britain did not entirely regard with high esteem those in the Dominions and colonies. By 1945, however, notions of Britishness and loyalty towards Britain in Australia had changed.

\textsuperscript{3} A. Jackson, \textit{The British Empire and the Second World War} (London: Hambledon Continuum, 2006), 21.
\textsuperscript{5} For example, see K. Fedorowich, ‘Directing the War from Trafalgar Square? Vincent Massey and the Canadian High Commission, 1939–42’, \textit{Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History}, 40, 1 (2012), 88.
\textsuperscript{6} F. McKenzie, ‘In the National Interest: Dominions’ Support for Britain and the Commonwealth after the Second World War’, \textit{Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History}, 34, 4 (2006), 553-561; K. Fodorowich, ‘Directing the War from Trafalgar Square?’
\textsuperscript{8} Ibid, p. 302.
\textsuperscript{9} A. Rees, ‘Australians who come over here are apt to consider themselves quite large people’: The Body and Australian Identity in Interwar London’, \textit{Australian Historical Studies}, 44, 3 (2013), 405.
Although it was not part of the Old Commonwealth, Southern Rhodesia provided a different case concerning the way it supported the war.

Before the Dominions declared war, Southern Rhodesia had already proclaimed its intentions to support Britain against Germany. It is important to note that Southern Rhodesian settlers had long regarded themselves not as merely members of a small community isolated in Africa but as citizens of the British Empire. This is despite the fact that imperial ideas were disappearing during the inter-war period in Britain. According to the historian Andrew Thompson, English-speaking South Africans expressed a sense of loyalty towards Britain for different purposes. Similarly, the overtly British Rhodesian settlers demonstrated a sense of loyalty towards Britain and the Crown for cultural, political and sentimental reasons. Since Britain granted Southern Rhodesian settlers Responsible Government in 1923, they regarded themselves as a bastion of imperial loyalty. The 1923 constitution gave Britain the position to surveillance legislation in Southern Rhodesia closely tying the two countries together. On the eve of WW2, Southern Rhodesia demonstrated its unswerving loyalty by assuring Britain that, without reservations, it placed its resources at the disposal of the imperial government. This speaks to the readiness on the part of Southern Rhodesia to help Britain.

As the historian Robert Blake stated, ‘patriotism certainly would have brought Rhodesia into the war, even if there had been an option to stay out and self-preservation was another guiding factor.’ This is not surprising of the ways some companies and individuals in Southern Rhodesia supported Britain. White writers in Rhodesia testified that although many settlers, before the war, had never been to England, the overseas ties were strong. For example, the poet and journalist Philippa Berlyn recalled that ‘we grew up thinking of England as home, a sort of Mecca where some of us might go and visit when the war was over, or when we had enough money.’ Real familial ties strengthened this sense of attachment to Britain. Berlyn further testified that towards the end of the war she married an Englishman and spent four years in post-war Britain. ‘I can still remember the ramrod straightness that ran down my back at the first notes of the British
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national anthem. I would have died for the Queen in those days, and for a country that I had never seen.” Other white Southern Rhodesians joined the government and volunteered their services for the defence of the British Empire. Some offered their farms and provided their car workshops to build armoured vehicles free of charge. Some individuals and communities supported the scheme by offering resources at their disposal towards the imperial war cause. For instance, the Indian community of Salisbury generously gave two ambulances to the Air Force, one of which went to the Belvedere school. Many people of Indian descent stay in Belvedere; arguably, they wanted to show the government that they fully supported the colonial state’s war effort as a political gesture. Southern Rhodesia whites donated about five aircrafts to the Rhodesian Air Training Group out of their own will and initiative on top of the £70,000 from the National War Fund.

Most white men in the colony (including some First World War veterans) enlisted for the imperial war effort. For example, some white men in the Marandellas District travelled to Salisbury to interview the Prime Minister Godfrey Huggins about the conditions of service, and other logistics with regards to war. Noel Hunt, who fought during the war, remembered that ‘when war broke out, all the Rhodesians [white] rushed into the army or the air force’. The encounter between Huggins and Robert F. Halsted is yet another clear testimony to demonstrate the rhetoric of imperial loyalty among white Rhodesians. When war broke out, Halsted went directly to Huggins to express his keen desire to join the service members. Huggins rejected Halsted’s request because the government needed white labour to keep the economy running. Halsted insisted that he wanted to volunteer because all his friends and relatives were doing their share. He pointed to Huggins that ‘I will do anything you like, on one condition…’ to which Huggins fumed, ‘you do not lay down conditions to me, and otherwise I will put you in the army!’ Halsted replied, ‘this is exactly what I am trying to do!’ Later, Huggins appointed Halsted as the Controller of Supply for Southern Rhodesia, and worked free throughout the war responsible for all the civil requirements, mining, food supplies and other necessities. Soon after the war, the government dissolved the department.

---
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As more white men offered to enlist for army service, Rhodesian authorities wanted to maintain an equilibrium between the war effort and the country’s economy. This forced the government to introduce measures to reduce large numbers white leaving employment in order to keep the economy running. In January 1940, it introduced the National Service (Armed Forces) Act to regulate the massive turn up of whites volunteering enlistment for service. This legislation controlled the overwhelming numbers of whites volunteering for the Empire’s war effort. It required that all male persons of European descent and British subjects to register for the service. It excluded full-time serving members of His Majesty’s armed forces and persons in or only entering the colony for tourist, education or other temporarily reasons. However, the government did not allow any person to undergo training until it notified such individuals.

This National Service Act was not even popular amongst some white Rhodesians. At the Bulawayo training camp, Hunt remembers that, since the state hastily passed this legislation, people protested out of the ranks when the government sent them back to the streets because of this regulation. In addition, the Act also compromised prospects of employment in the country. Companies and firms were uncertain when the government would call up some of its employees for service. One Captain Wellington commented in the Parliament that ‘what would be the use of that firm taking on such a man, when there is a possibility that after they have trained him for two or three months, he may be called up.’ Inasmuch as white patriotism and loyalty was present, parliamentarians wanted the government to have a clear recruitment mechanism and policy without endangering the economy and welfare of ordinary people. In order to draft more Europeans in the overseas missions, the government resolved to train Africans as drivers, orderlies and cooks to conserve the European work force. But, it was difficult to attract Africans, who often deserted conscription. Despite desertions, the colony’s African units, the Rhodesian African Rifles and the Rhodesian Air Askari Corps, succeeded in keeping their ranks at full strength and maintaining a high degree of efficiency throughout the war. As noted earlier, Rhodesia’s greatest contribution to the war effort, which demonstrated notions of kith and kin, loyalty and patriotism to the Empire, was undoubtedly in its air power.

26 *New Rhodesia*, 10 January 1940.
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The British Empire/Commonwealth Air Training Scheme (BEATS)

Before war broke out, the British Air Ministry (BAM) considered the British Empire Air Training Scheme (BEATS) or the British Commonwealth Air Training Scheme (BCATS) in an effort to establish air-training centres away from England. There is no definite term to describe this expansive scheme, as the name of the plan differed from one country to another. The scheme came after the British government realised that it had limited resources to expand the Royal Air Force (RAF) on the eve of WW2. The British Air Ministry preferred areas with reliable weather which could be constantly favourable for air training activities. Britain, therefore, outsourced pilots and aircrew, as well as coordinating the special training schools in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and Southern Rhodesia. Altogether, the scheme produced nearly 170,000 personnel. The scheme unified the training of Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand pilots and it was one of the most remarkable and significant ways which expresses the loyalty which the Commonwealth and Empire had toward Britain. More than anything else, the BEATS illustrated the closeness between Britain and the Empire during the war. The historian Ian Johnstone describes this scheme as a centrepiece of imperial air training.

For the British Air Ministry, Canada was the first choice for this scheme because it was close to the United States, which Britain saw as a potential source of aircraft of all kinds. In addition, Canada was far away from enemy activity and had close ties with Britain. On that basis, the BAM considered it an ideal place to train pilots, navigators, observers and air gunners for the Allied war cause. The BEATS was one of Canada’s greatest contributions to the Second World War. Richard Mayne describes the scheme in colourful terms. As one historian notes, ‘it was a massive undertaking that required new and upgraded airfields, tens of thousands of instructors and support workers, the acquisition of thousands of aircraft and the mobilising of many national resources.’

In view of the fact that the scheme came a few years after Canada gained control over its own foreign policy from Britain in 1931, the BEATS was a perfect test of the Canadian sense of nationalism and loyalty and its direction as an independent state. Being a cornerstone in the English-speaking world, the choice of Canada also had sentimental familial attachments to Britain and the Commonwealth. Moreover, the scheme was instrumental in propelling Canadian identities
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different from the notions of Britishness especially among those who participated in it.\textsuperscript{35} Ultimately, however, Canadian domestic politics meant the programme took a long time to start. Additionally, in the negotiations with the BAM, Canadians expressed a keen desire to have their own separate squadrons bearing their own name. Canadians did not want to lose their own identity by allowing the RAF to take full charge of all the operations during the course of the scheme.

During the interwar period, the Australian government wanted to strengthen its air force rather than only relying on its navy. This desire coincided with British initiatives to train pilots away from Britain. As a result, Australia became the first British Dominion to establish a separate air force.\textsuperscript{36} Before the war, the Australian Air Force was in a deplorable state. It was through the BEATS that Australia’s airpower markedly improved, with RAF personnel dominating the command structure. The Royal Australia Air Force (RAAF) confined its operations in the Malaya Peninsula and Pacific theatre of the war. Unlike Canada and Australia, New Zealand did not have much bargaining power during the negotiations and their air force were weak. When Australian authorities failed to strike a deal that favoured their own country, this attracted criticism from contemporaries and scholars.\textsuperscript{37} Despite national identity politics, Australia eventually participated in the scheme.

Similarly, the South African Air Force (SAAF) was ill equipped and most of the aircraft had become obsolete. Therefore, when the BEATS started in 1940, SAAF faced acute shortages of resources and pilots. By August 1940, training started with the establishment of the Joint Air Training Scheme. Because of the scheme, SAAF rendered valuable service to the Allied war effort in Cape Town, Durban, Port Elizabeth and Walvis Bay bases protecting Allied cargo among other contributions in other sectors of operations. However, South Africa’s support for the Allied Powers during the war angered many Afrikaner sections of the white population who saw Prime Minister Jan Smuts as a traitor.\textsuperscript{38} Against the wishes of many Afrikaners, Smuts declared war on Germany after taking over the premiership from James Hetzog, the leader of the Afrikaner opposition.\textsuperscript{39} His decision to commit South Africa to the war on the British side angered many
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sections of the Nationalists and contemporary writers criticised him.40 Many Afrikaner sections wanted South Africa to remain neutral; however, Smuts joined the war without calling an election. Kenneth W. Grundy states that Afrikaners hated with passion the General Service Oath, particularly its first operative clause that Smuts seemingly calculated to anger Afrikaners.41 Giving provisions for service members to fight anywhere in Africa, it read that in part: ‘I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to His Majesty King George VI and his heir and successors according to law.’42 Swearing allegiance to the British King George VI was, for hardliner nationalist sections of the South African white population, an enough offense to anger them. Despite Smuts’ efforts to bring South Africa into war with Germany, the opposition he received goes to show the limits to which South Africa’s loyalty towards the war effort could stretch. Interestingly, Southern Rhodesia presented a completely different picture concerning this scheme. More than anything, Rhodesia’s contribution to the allied war effort lay in the territory’s serving as a principal host for the BEATS.43

**The Rhodesia Air Training Group (RATG) and other Military Contributions**

Southern Rhodesians embraced the BEATS with the rhetoric of imperial patriotism and loyalty – quite a different response from that of the Dominions. One of the most striking features about Southern Rhodesia at this time was the absence of a regular army when war broke out in 1939. The British South Africa Police (BSAP) provided the first line of defence. Before the outbreak of the war, air training facilities in Southern Rhodesia were not adequate for large-scale training of pilots.44 This explains why the BAM did not involve Southern Rhodesia in the initial negotiations to establish BEATS. In June 1939, Charles Meredith, at that time Rhodesian Staff Officer for Air and Director of Civil Aviation, conducted a survey based on population statistics to examine the overall air work force situation in Southern Rhodesia. The survey estimated that the colony was able to operate three RAF Squadrons.45 Meredith presented his findings to the Minister of Defence, Robert C. Tredgold.

Later in October 1939, the Southern Rhodesian government offered Britain to train pilots and maintain personnel for three operational squadrons, subject to the supply of training and operational aircraft and equipment by the BAM. Subsequent discussions led to the establishment

of the Rhodesian Air Training Group (RATG). In January 1940, the government separated the Rhodesian Air Force from the Ministry of Defence. Colonel Ernest Lucas Guest, the South African and First World War veteran, assumed the position of the Minister of Air on 28 March 1940, and Meredith became Secretary for Air and Officer Commanding the RATG. The choice of the Rhodesia was mainly due to its reliability, good weather and distance from the theatres of war.46

The British government funded the scheme but was not in a position to do so quickly. To ameliorate the situation, Southern Rhodesian was more than eager to finance the scheme. BAM gave Meredith the permission to obtain whatever he wanted from Southern Rhodesia’s government and would settle the expenses later.47 The Southern Rhodesian government acted as the BAM’s agent for orders, contracts, material, and the acquisition of land to build airfields and erect air stations. Besides water supplies and sewage facilities, one of the considerations when choosing sites for aerodromes sites was malaria-free areas in the colony.48 The health and medical fitness of aviators was of the upmost importance, as authorities feared that pilots under training would suffer from malarial recurrent attacks while back in the cooler English climate.49 The RATG selected Salisbury, Gwelo and Bulawayo, above the 4000 feet contour, as the best sites free from malaria.

The RATG trained South African Air Force personnel, Yugoslavs and Greeks for service with the RAF. At the end of 1944, the total aircrew outputs from Southern Rhodesia were nearly 9,000.50 The RATG had important economic implications on Rhodesia, which reflects on how the colony helped the Allied war cause. The total local annual amount spent on the scheme greatly exceeded the annual Southern Rhodesia budget at the time and there were 150 separate non-public accounts (messes and canteens), with an annual turnover of £350,000.51 Southern Rhodesia’s responsibility concerning the scheme enabled the country’s building industry to blossom. The country had to deal with accommodation and other facilities that pilots and RAF personnel needed in Bulawayo, Gwelo and Salisbury. The country’s expenditure on the war Revenue Funds during the financial year 1943-44 was just under five and half million pounds – more than double what it had been in
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1940-41.\textsuperscript{52} This was a marked milestone considering that by 1941, the Rhodesian white population stood at only 68,954 to contribute to the Empire war effort.\textsuperscript{53}

The first school opened on 24 May 1940, making the RATG to be the first to produce trailed imperial pilots under this scheme. The fact that the RATG opened its first school after less than five months was a notable achievement. It was also illustrious in that the opening preceded by some weeks the opening of the first of the schools in the Canadian scheme, which had been planned well before the war started.\textsuperscript{54} This was because of the enthusiasm and support generated in Rhodesia than it was in Canada.\textsuperscript{55} As the programme developed, authorities decided to increase its size. Initially, the scheme provided for the establishment of the three elementary flying, service flying and one-observer schools.\textsuperscript{56} However, by 1943, there were several training schools, maintenance and repair depots in Southern Rhodesia.\textsuperscript{57} A further notable achievement was the coming into operation of the Air Station at Guinea Fowl, Gwelo, from bare veld. It took the government twelve weeks to install sewer and water facilities and a rail to connect with South Africa.\textsuperscript{58} Additionally, RAF personnel’s relations with the local population in Southern Rhodesia were generally cordial but not in accordance with the white population’s racial boundaries and policies. As Blake argues, ‘dyed-in-the-wool Rhodesians were shocked by the absence of any sexual colour bar among the youthful RAF personnel who took their pleasure when and where they could get it.’\textsuperscript{59} RAF personnel were independent of the colonial racial prejudices that preoccupied Southern Rhodesia settlers.

The RATG Headquarters (HQ) in Salisbury formed the crux of the scheme. It had several branches such as Air Staff, equipment, technical, personnel, medical, accounts and works departments.\textsuperscript{60} In the early days before the war, RAF personnel were in the command helped by few Rhodesian civilians.\textsuperscript{61} It was not until June 1940 that the first RAF personnel arrived at the HQ. Eleven clerks were drafted specially from Britain to introduce the RAF system of administration to the HQ in the training command.\textsuperscript{62} The HQ coordinated both the Southern
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Rhodesia Air Force (SRAF) and RAF, established and cemented a firm and solid kinship foundation. This combination stands as a testimony to the ability and harmonious kinship ties that these two forces shared throughout the war. Unlike in Canada where Canadians wanted the Canadianisation of the scheme, this did not create tension among Rhodesian whites opposing the heavy presence of RAF personnel. Southern Rhodesia contributed to the cost of HQ establishment, capital for work services with a few minor exceptions and maintenance. It offered certain emblems of staff employed in the school and an annual contribution of £800,000 in cash. Further, in 1945, it offered a loan of £3,000,000 free of interest utilised to meet expenditure in connection with the training scheme in the country. This financial contribution towards the scheme was very substantial in relation to the country’s resources at the time.

As in Britain and the Empire, in Southern Rhodesia, a number of auxiliary organisations including women emerged to support the war. For example, there was the Women’s Auxiliary Air Service in Southern Rhodesia (WAAS) commanded by Squadron Officer Roxburgh-Smith. It was the equivalent force to the English Women's Auxiliary Air Force (WAAF), another case to demonstrate the colony’s loyalty to Britain. A noticeable feature of the members of this service was the number of middle-aged women in it. WAAS enrolled more than a thousand women to work on the air stations throughout the colony. Besides, a number of Polish girls and women refugees became members of this force in spite of the language difficulties. Some of the contributions were made through the Women’s National Service League, the Navy League, the Red Cross, St John’s and other organised bodies, as well as individually.

The BAM officials heralded the Southern Rhodesia Scheme as one of the best in the entire Dominions as it was characterised by completely hearted enthusiasm. The RATG authorities implemented some changes in the syllabus cheerfully and put all instructions into operation without delay. Southern Rhodesia was supportive throughout the scheme and assisted whenever there were challenges; officials were ready to improvise whenever equipment was in short supply and made maximum use of the resources they had at their disposal. The BAM officials stated:

If an opportunity occurs, there need be no hesitation in congratulating those responsible in conveying the hearty thanks of the RAF for the assistance we received. [The RATG] has been
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as simple from our point of view as if it had been a detached RAF group subject to orders from the Air Ministry. Our training problems in Southern Rhodesia have never at any time made more difficult by political considerations.\(^{71}\)

The fact that the BAM officials praised the RATG reveals the closeness the two countries enjoyed during this time. Glowingly, Sir James Ross of the BAM said ‘I am not writing to pay compliments [but] to tell you the place of your work in the fulfilment of the destiny of the RAF.’\(^{72}\)

After the war ended, Britain and Southern Rhodesia were eager to continue working together to further the air training scheme. The BEATS Committee proposed that the BAM should maintain a small pilot training organisation in Southern Rhodesia as part of peacetime plans.\(^{73}\) Minutes from the BAM suggest that there were very strong reasons in favour of this secret plan. It wanted to retain the use of the ‘first-class’ installations erected in Southern Rhodesia’s airfields during the war. However, BAM officials debated the possibility of maintaining a relatively small peacetime force stationed near the Middle East and not in Southern Rhodesia.\(^{74}\) They planned to have only four Heavy Bomber Squadrons in the Middle East to preserve stability and thought that it was reasonable to locate it closer to the theatre of operation. They considered that if there was any need for such a secondary line of bases, it was supposed to be no further south than Kenya.

The BAM anticipated facing difficulties with the Treasury, which was likely to object to the spending of money on training outside Britain.\(^{75}\) However, there were strong post-war military and defence arguments in support for this proposal other than financial limitations.\(^{76}\) If the Treasury agreed, the BAM wanted to make a formal approach to the Southern Rhodesian government. Informally, the BAM officials knew that the Southern Rhodesian government would welcome such an agreement. Meredith had been taking part informally in the BAM’s discussions and it had confidence in him.\(^{77}\) The BAM was eager to accept this plan and to send a mission to Southern Rhodesia to negotiate terms and conditions of the proposals. It wanted to ascertain whether the Southern Rhodesian government would be willing to contribute to the joint scheme to an extent not exceeding the cost if the British government was to train at home.\(^{78}\)

Fortunately, the Secretary of State, the Treasury and the Southern Rhodesian government agreed to this plan. On 11 September 1946, Britain signed a memorandum of agreement with Southern
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Rhodesia recognising the air training scheme established as an integral part of the training organisation of the RAF. Southern Rhodesia offered to place certain facilities at the disposal of Britain for future training as a contribution to post-war imperial defence. This depended if Britain desired to take advantage of facilities in training RAF pilots in Southern Rhodesia. The government of Southern Rhodesia endorsed the desire of Britain to secure arrangements to the mutual advantage of the two countries without involving British funds in excess of the net cost of training RAF pilots. The two governments continued to run the air training scheme but not as a large scale as it was during to war. The scheme represented a valuable contribution to the defence of the British Commonwealth, so certain organisational and financial adjustments became necessary. Britain continued to maintain an organisation for training pilots and navigators in Southern Rhodesia within such maximum numbers agreed between the two governments from time to time. The air-training organisation would be under RAF officer appointed by the BAM responsible for all matters connected with the organisation, receiving policy direction through the Southern Rhodesia Ministry of Defence. This was only in aspects, which concerned Southern Rhodesia financially or politically, but in matters of local discipline and administration, the officer would conform to the requirements of the competent local authority. The air-training organisation would be within the inspection responsibility of the Inspector General of the RAF.

Besides the RATG, Southern Rhodesia’s contribution to the war effort extended to the battlefront. More than any other authoritative voice, Huggins trumpeted the role the colony played in the Imperial war effort. In 1945, he chronicled some of the Southern Rhodesian exploits during the war on the battlefront, such as:

The raid on Sirte by Rhodesian patrol of the Long Range Desert Group in North Africa in 1941. The low-level raid on Augsburg by Lancaster of Rhodesian Bomber Squadron in 1942. The splendid work of our 237 Squadron in the Abyssinia and Eritrean campaigns, and the work of our 266 Squadron, which pioneered the Typhoon. The fine reputation our men have won in almost every theatre of war serving in United Kingdom of South African units, not forgetting that our small population for its size has contributed a relatively large number of men to be found with all three forces.
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Huggins embellished his remarks with comments about heroism, determination and resilience, qualities that reflected imperial ideals. One of those Rhodesians involved in the combat was Ian Smith, who served in North Africa and Southern Europe flying Hawker Hurricanes. Smith would later rebel against Britain in 1965 despite having fought on the side of Britain during the war.

Southern Rhodesia contributed towards the war effort with limited resources. Huggins pointed out that the ‘fact that 8,000 Rhodesians are or have been on active service means that 12.5 per cent of our total population and 42 per cent of our available work force have been in uniform.’ To prevent high losses and carnage, British and South African forces absorbed Rhodesian officers and soldiers in small groups throughout the war. Southern Rhodesian whites instructed and commanded in the first place African soldiers from West Africa, Central and East Africa, and later the Rhodesian African Rifles. Rhodesian service members in operational areas were mostly white officers used to supervise Africans on farms and mines. Made up of black troops and white officers, the Rhodesian African Rifles was the main exception and it fought in Burma from late 1944 as well as in South-East Asia Command combating the Japanese. By contrast, with British Dominions that far outnumbered Rhodesia’s white population, the self-governing colonies’ war efforts was far above the norm, giving Rhodesians every reason to be proud of their imperial war services and effort on the battlefront. Southern Rhodesia also contributed on the economic and humanitarian fronts towards the imperial war effort.

**Southern Rhodesia’s Economic and Humanitarian Contribution to the Imperial War effort**

During the WW2, Europe both interacted with and exploited African economies. British African territories contributed towards the Allied war effort with solders and raw materials including Southern Rhodesia, which offered support with natural resources. Before the war, Southern Rhodesia enjoyed stable trade relations with Britain. The war disrupted trade ties between Rhodesia and Britain leading to what Phimister describes as the mixed fortunes of war. However, the network of goods between Britain and Rhodesia during this period continued under difficult conditions, a development that altered in the post-war years. Phimister notes that ‘the devaluation
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of sterling on the outbreak of war in September 1939 caused the price of gold to rise by roughly twenty shillings per ounce. However, gold remained the most important source of income among other important minerals such as chromite, asbestos, coal, silver, and iron that were in critical demand by the belligerent countries. Wankie collieries, which controlled deposits estimated at 700,000,000 tons, supplied the coal needs of the Belgian Congo, Northern and Southern Rhodesia, Mozambique and Bechuanaland during WW2, when their sales rose to over £700,000 per year. Worthwhile to mention was the role railways played in transporting minerals to the coast for shipment to the British and American factories. Rail transported most of the Rhodesian gold to Cape Town for passage to England wherefrom the British government shipped some in the form of bars to the United States.

Other sectors of the Southern Rhodesian economy such as farming also significantly contributed to the imperial war effort. Farmers produced extra food for the thousands of pilots trained in the colony, in addition to internees, refugees, and the civilian population. Tobacco was one of the most important crops grown in the colony, earning an average of £2,000,000 and £3,000,000 annually during the war. The colony’s average annual production of £40,000,000 over the war years were a boon to the soldiers as well as a source of profit to the country. However, this also brought its own fair share of problems in terms of food production. The government set up a Food Production Committee to oversee the situation in the colony. The Committee encouraged an increase in food production to be able to feed the increased population. The colony had to encourage farmers not to only concentrate on cash crops. As a result, the production of maize, the country’s staple food, rose from 1,160,000 bags in 1942 to 1,607,000 bags in 1943 and to 1,673,000 in 1944, an increase of 40 per cent. These statics does not include other crops such as groundnuts which increased from 44,000 bags to 64,000 in 1943 and 74,000 in 1944. As the country increased agricultural produce, this also benefited and strengthened its economy too.

The war also stimulated the development and growth of secondary industries in the colony. Before the war, the colony was mainly producing raw materials for South African and British
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companies. The war necessitated the growth of local industries with some form of state assistance. Despite this significant development of manufacturing industries in the colony, the role government played to stimulate manufacturing enterprises is debatable. For example, Victor Gwande suggests that the industrialisation of Southern Rhodesia owes much to the tireless efforts of the industrialists and manufacturers, a development the state later had to recognise and support. Some industrialists slammed the state and the British authorities for doing nothing to stimulate industries and businesses. Moreover, some Southern Rhodesian business owners could not agree entirely with the introduction of the excess profit tax by the government. When the government introduced excess profit tax, the Minister of Justice, Jacob Hendrik Smit, and all the business community were not happy about it. Huggins and other cabinet ministers regarded it as a matter of principle. Huggins raised concerns that the rise in the price of gold was due to the war and that the mining industry was making a profit out of the war. The government forced miners into that uncomfortable position by raising the basic price of gold 2s. per ounce. Phimister states that ‘by far the greater part of the increase was taxed by the Southern Rhodesian state in order to finance the colony’s war effort.’ The government considered it morally wrong for companies and firms to make profit during or out of the war, while other people were suffering and making enormous sacrifices. On the contrary, Hugh Beadle argued that the business community could not really see the logic of it – they needed to make profits for the country to keep going. They regarded their profits as something good for the country. Because of these controversies and misunderstandings, Smit resigned.

Due to the imposition of gold tax, there was much opposition in the country especially from the mining industry, which was in two categories. The first group denied the proposition that the government had a right to tax the gold mining industry separately. The second disagreed with the particular form of taxation and imposed by the government to rest upon reliable factors. Some

101 New Rhodesia, 1 March 1940.
102 Ibid, 22 March 1940.
104 NAZ Oral/BE2, H. Beadle, interviewed by D. Hatridge at Bulawayo, 23 June 1972. Beadle was a member of the parliament for Bulawayo North having been a member of that part since its foundation. At the outbreak of the war, he became Temporary Captain in the Southern Rhodesia Defence Force and in October moved to the Gold Coast Regiment.
parliamentarians, such as Patrick Fletcher believed in the Empire and wanted the mining industry to help the government in times of need. He charged that, 'I submit that the people have every right, when the permanent development is threatened, to call upon the gold mining industry for additional help and that is what we are doing today.' Southern Rhodesian politicians were in touch with British developments on taxation and were eager to implement the same policies towards the war effort. Fletcher informed the parliament that he read the English daily papers in order to ascertain what the British taxpayer knew of the imperial government’s war effort. Fletcher’s comments are revealing of his admiration of Britain:

The British taxpayer is entirely ignorant of details; so much, so that the imperial government has seen fit to prohibit the publication of rank and regiment and lists of Old Boys in school magazines. Winston Churchill introduced the Naval Estimates for 1940 and asked for £100. People must not forget that by our own will we are dancing in complete accord with the tune played by the imperial government. Dominion Status grants more latitude and they get out of step. However, we, as has been said, are junior partners in the scheme of secrecy and are bound to accept the policy of secrecy adopted by Imperial government.

Fletcher’s comments reveals how Southern Rhodesia was trying to impress Britain as a junior player in the politics of self-determination precisely because it was not a Dominion. This explains why Rhodesian settlers showed an ambiguous sense of loyalty and patriotism to Britain more than the Dominions during the war.

Another parliamentarian, Captain Eastwood, blamed gold miners for being too lazy to read and appreciate international politics. He considered gold miners so ignorant of the country’s war effort. He lamented that:

It is very unfortunate that in this country such a very small minority of people seem to have read and studied international politics for the last four or five years. One feels that if they had done so, they would have had a much better grip and understanding of the strength of the organisation with which [the colony is facing]. It is because they do not bother to study these things or read them, they are ignorant of this important problem, and they will very seldom listen to people who have made deep study of these things. Because I feel certain that if the gold mining industry really understood, what we are up against they would never have fuss and bother they have done.
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His comments lacked appreciation of the feelings of the gold miners whose sense of loyalty to Britain had reached full limits. They exposes the differences between politicians who wanted to use the war as an opportunity to make a political statement of imperial patriotism and loyalty to Britain. Gold miners were more concerned with their business and not entirely preoccupied with loyalty and identity politics. They were not prepared to support the government when it heavily taxed them.

The mining industry saw this tax hike as a continuation of the way the Huggins government dealt with the fraternity ever since it assumed power in 1933. Sir H. Williams representing the mining industry objected the views that the mining industry was threatening to cease production because miners refused to pay their share towards the war effort. In 1940, at a meeting at Gatooma, Williams stated that ‘he alone [Huggins] of all the Prime Ministers in the British Empire, took advantage of the war scares last year to enrich himself and his government.’ Therefore, they did not see the new taxes as genuine. According to Williams, as producers of the commodity, miners felt that the government was supposed to inform them about weekly and monthly gold prices. ‘All we know at present is that in October our gold was said to have been brought in London at £8. 8s per ounce. Since then we have heard rumours only about the price of gold. We are not even told the monthly rake-off the government gets from each individual.’ Southern Rhodesia’s gold output reached peak levels between 1941 and 1942. It subsided due to the reduced world price for gold, the decline of new investment in plant and equipment, and the diversion of work force and machinery to more urgent wartime production areas. Despite the introduction of excess profit taxes, gold miners continued to exhibit ideas of imperial loyalty but only to a certain extent. ‘We are all loyal subjects of the British Empire,’ Williams reminded the government, ‘and we are prepared to pay just as much (and more if necessary) to meet Rhodesia’s war effort, but all taxation must be on profits only, and where there is no profit no taxation.’ Their loyalty to the Empire was rhetoric; they could only go as far as it was comfortable with their financial commitment.

Besides economic contribution to the war efforts and its contradictions, Southern Rhodesia hosted internees and refugees. As the war progressed, vilification of supposedly enemy sympathisers and fifth column activities gripped the Rhodesian state. Martin Rupiah has shown in detail how Southern Rhodesia hosted over 12, 000 German, Austrian and Italian internees as well as Polish
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refugees as part of its war effort.\textsuperscript{112} What is important here is to note that these internees and refugees could not fully fit in Southern Rhodesia settler community. Some sections of white Southern Rhodesia showed ethnic prejudices against them. Mlambo notes that British and English-speaking whites considered some settlers – such as Afrikaners, Greeks, Indians, Coloureds, and Jews – not white enough by virtue of not being British.\textsuperscript{113} Settlers of British origin residing in the Marandellas did not politely welcome the presence of 687 Polish refugees evacuated from Iran and Iraq.\textsuperscript{114} The authorities decided to settle them at Rusapi and Marandellas towns. Polish war refugees arrived in Rhodesia by two main routes through Cyprus and Persia. Because most of these Polish refugees were peasants, British settlers in the area considered them to be of low class.\textsuperscript{115} Voluntary associations in the district loathed the presence of these menacing Poles on account of their non-Britishness class identity. Hodder-Williams posits that ‘the pillars of the voluntary associations, drawn almost exclusively from the high-status British farmers and professionals, were always conscious of class. Polish peasants were therefore a genuine cause of concern for them.’\textsuperscript{116} Deliberations were made after the war to accept Italians internees who made applications to stay in the country provided they had employment and were ‘of good character’ in order to be assimilated into the settler community.\textsuperscript{117} Immigration officials placed emphasis on their moral conduct to ascertain their desirability if it was compatible with established settler standards. After the war, the government repatriated most of these whites because they could not fit in the Rhodesian settler community because of their alleged poor class and status.\textsuperscript{118}

There were also cases of alleged Nazism in internment camps, with some internees claiming to be members of the Gestapo. One Kurt Hans Kipprich claimed to be the anointed Fuehrer for Southern Africa.\textsuperscript{119} Before his internment, Kipprich had worked for various companies in Southern Rhodesia as a consultant geologist between 1935 and 1939. In 1946, at the Norton internment camp, about ten internees, young ex-Baviaanspoort (one of the internment camps in South Africa), made an attempt to commemorate Hitler’s birthday. They dressed up in their Sunday-suits and asked internees, busy building their huts, to stop work. The whole attempt failed because nobody
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One anonymous columnist in the *Rhodesian Herald* strongly supported the ruthless eradication of such alleged fascist and Nazi elements in the internment camps. ‘It is high time,’ wrote the columnist, ‘that the local anti-Nazis and anti-Fascists as ruthlessly eradicated these pockets of Fascism in the internment camps as has been done in Germany and Italy by the Allied Occupation Forces who wholeheartedly assisted in their task.’ The columnist advocated for the removal of all Nazi and Fascist flags, pictures and emblems in the camps. However, the Minister of Justice, Captain H. Bertin, denied the display of Nazi emblems or pictures in the camps.

Another anonymous columnist in the *New Rhodesia*, a magazine committed to the economic developments in the country and critical of the government, was blunt about the Southern Rhodesian governments’ lenient treatment of internees. The columnist asked, ‘what is the reason for this silk glove treatment of ex-members of the filthiest gang of political thugs that has ever disgraced human history?’ The columnist blamed the Britishness of the Southern Rhodesian government and its people. Bluntly, the columnist stated that ‘it has always been the seamier side of the feebler specimens of home grown Britons, to placate their enemies at the expense of their friends, but surely, this is carrying matters too far.’

Despite the fact that some internees were far from being fascists or Nazis, these sentiments capture how some Rhodesians were prejudiced against other whites because of their presumed political inclinations.

There were especially ill feelings towards the anti-British Afrikaans section in Southern Rhodesia who supported General Hertzog and D. F. Malan in South Africa. Afrikaans-speaking settlers were concentrated in the Enkeldoorn and Melsetter rural and farming Districts of the colony. The dismissal of one Afrikaner woman, Norma de Jager, from the Education Department because of her anti-British sentiments clearly points to the tensions within the white settler community. White Rhodesians wanted to project an image of a unified settler community committed to supporting Britain in its endeavours against the Central powers. On 5 September 1939, the Acting Chief Education Officer, H. D Sutherns, reported to the Secretary of the Public Services Board (PSB) about the behaviour of de Jager on account of her alleged anti-British sentiments and activities.

When the record of staff came to the office, Sutherns reported, he found that the photograph of General Smuts on page seven of *Rhodesia Herald* had the word “traitor” written in pencil. Upon
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inquiry, de Jager did not deny the allegations against her. As a result, Sutherns informed her that he was not prepared to have amongst his staff anyone with such views as hers and he had no option but to report the matter immediately to the PSB. Sutherns was glad if the Board could remove de Jager immediately from office and would appreciate any further action taken against her.

De Jager defended her case, stating that the reason for her action had serious familial roots against Smuts. The imperial troops, she explained, ordered by Smuts, had shot dead two of her brothers in the 1913 Johannesburg strike, although they were unconnected with it. Later, when the PSB called de Jager to explain her conduct, she did not deny the allegations laid against her. The PSB also discovered that in conversation with other members of the staff of the Education Department, de Jager was sympathetic to the German Nazis. Authorities feared that her behaviour would cause dissension amongst other staff members and the entire civil service in the country and lead to anti-British feelings. Because of her conduct, the Board deemed it imperative to dismiss her from the Education Department office. Subsequently, she relocated to the Union of South Africa and looked for permanent employment there.

Following her dismissal, de Jager wrote a strongly worded letter to one Major Walker at Cranborne Air Training Station expressing her unhappiness because of the way the PSB handled her case. She alleged that she suffered nervous breakdown for working under uncongenial conditions. She narrated her family history in an effort to show that it was always pro-British. De Jager and her family had arrived in Rhodesia from South Africa when she was only four years old. At the end of the South African War in 1902, her father relocated to Rhodesia after receiving a medal as a loyal British subject during the war. De Jager pointed out that she was not aware what discrimination meant until she joined the Department of Education in Rhodesia. She further alleged that during her maternity at the Salisbury hospital, English-speaking nurses derogatively referred to her as the ‘Dutch Brawl’. She defined the uncongenial surroundings as the ethnic hatred she received from other white colleagues in the work place. She noted that ‘whatever my feelings are today regarding [white ethnicity] is what this country has made me. The action, which caused my dismissal, was directed to my own countryman, nationality and not a Britisher.’ De Jager’s letter to Walker is
suggestive of the tensions within the white settler community in Rhodesia on the grounds of loyalty and ethnic hatred.

Similarly, the case of the Voortrekkers (Afrikaner Scouts) during this period is revealing of the tensions and the rhetoric of loyalism towards Britain within the Rhodesian settler community. The Afrikaner Scouts had a provincial council constituted of elective members from Bulawayo, Gwelo, Enkeldoorn, Fort Victoria, Melsetter, Umtali and Salisbury. They convened a congress on 10 July 1939. After the meeting, Reverend Hennie Botha, the Provincial leader of the Voortrekkers in Salisbury, asked the Governor and the Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia to act as patrons for the Voortrekkers in Rhodesia on behalf of the Congress. The Governor General, Prime Minister, and other Ministers of the crown were patrons of the Voortrekkers.

The Governor reminded Huggins that the Voortrekkers were a movement with roots in the Union of South Africa and it was a purely Afrikaans-speaking Boy Scout movement. Therefore, the Governor saw no reason for its establishment in the Union apart from party politics and apartheid and there was less justification for it in Rhodesia. The translation of the Voortrekkers promise reading “on my honour I promise that I will do my best to do my duty to God and the King” raised serious misgivings to the Governor. To him, ‘this part transmuted by the Voortrekkers into the “vow”, “to execute my duty faithfully to God, my country and nation” – omitting to mention the King.’ He had already reached his decision but wanted Huggins to be careful with his response to Botha. He concluded his letter with some confidential remarks to Huggins. ‘For your confidential information I may tell you that Lord Clarendon, during whose Governorship General this Voortrekker movement started, was not at all keen on encouraging it, but finally accepted the office of patron under Ministerial advice.’ While appreciating the courtesy of the invitation, the Governor regretted that he could not accept the offer. He did not see the logic and necessity of duplicating European Scouts in the colony into separate organisations on purely linguistic divergences. He did not appreciate divisions between English and Afrikaans-speaking whites and the language spoken in their homes to affect their common duty of loyalty to His Majesty the King. The scout movement in Rhodesia was open to all European children irrespective of the language spoken in their homes.
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After convening another meeting, the Voortrekkers continued to persuade the Governor to be its patron. They denied any connection between the Rhodesian and the South African Voortrekkers movements. The Voortrekkers intended to affiliate with the International Bureau or the Boy Scouts and Girl Guides of Southern Rhodesia. In a condescending manner, Botha reminded the Governor of the history of the Voortrekkers in South Africa. ‘Knowing that you appreciate what the Voortrekkers of a hundred years ago did for the development of [South Africa], of whom we Afrikaans speaking people are descendants. I feel sure that you will sympathetically consider this honorary position of patron of Voortrekkers in Southern Rhodesia.’

Despite these serious efforts, the Governor turned down the offer completely citing the same reasons. This also shows that the Governor had some prejudices against Afrikaans-speaking whites in Rhodesia and did not trust their motives.

The government suspected some Rhodesian companies of harbouring whites with sympathies towards Germany or Italy. For example, in 1940, the government carried out air raids precautionary awareness in the country. The exercise included the Eiffel Flats under the Cam and Motor Mine Company, located about seven kilometres east of Gatooma specialising in gold mining and run by the Rio Tinto Group before it closed in 1969. It had an estimated number of 700 white workers and close to 5,000 Africans staying at the flats and a local school of 120 children. There were some thirty non-British white workers staying at the flats naturalised in Rhodesia. The government also wanted to assess any possible fifth column activities, especially among the white workers residing at the flats. In the case of invasion, the government feared that these whites would swing their support, offer intelligence to the enemy and betray the country. The state expected the mine management to take a lead in educating its workers on how to behave in case of air raids. It also expected the local mine leadership to control the surrounding areas. Outside of the mine, there were some commercial activities in addition to the mining equipment and vehicles of about 300 in number.

The Department of Justice appointed one of the residents at the flats, one I. J. Poley, to the Air Raid Precautions Committee. In his private correspondence with Davies, the secretary to the Department of Justice, Poley offered a thrilling and sensationalised report underlined with fear and uneasiness towards non-British whites. Poley wrote that:
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It is no use bluffing ourselves, there must be Italian sympathies, and it is only natural. Most of them are very full of themselves, and in addition are in contact with our [Africans] continually, their conversations are not loyal by any means.\textsuperscript{140}

More informing of the political prejudices in the country were his last words to Davies in the letter. ‘I am sorry to add the sentiments of the local manager of the mine – there is a very large percentage of Dutch element on the mine and the fifth column element is very pronounced.’\textsuperscript{141} The Chief Superintendent, Criminal Investigation Department (CID) of the BSAP, H. W. Clehct, with a great deal of somewhat suspicion scrutinised Poley’s last remarks on Afrikaners. Apparently, there were eleven male and eight female Italians; and one German registered in the Eiffel Flats area.\textsuperscript{142} Reports circulated that only nine Afrikaners in the Gatooma area were anti-British but none in the flats area.\textsuperscript{143} Clehct submitted that ‘there is nothing officially known to confirm the sweeping allegations made by Poley, who has not, considered them of sufficient importance to warrant his giving any information concerning them to Criminal Investigation Department or Police.’\textsuperscript{144} Further to that, the District Superintendent Pritchard, Gatooma, informed Clehct that the flats area was particularly free from anti-British talk and that Poley had not mentioned the subject to him either.\textsuperscript{145} However, even if Poley’s remarks seem to be conspiratorial or sensationalised, they broadly point to the tensions going on at the flats. As a resident, he most likely had inside information that authorities could have missed. While their whiteness was not questioned, their class and conceived political ideas rendered them undesirable characters in the eyes of the Rhodesian settler community.

White Rhodesians settler’s prejudices towards other non-British whites reflected even in immigration during the war period. In February 1943, O. C. Rawson, manager of Darwendale Estate near Salisbury, met South African Captain of Staff P. E. du Toit in Cape Town. They agreed that his two sons aged twenty-three and seventeen could be employed in Rhodesia at Darwendale. The Rhodesian immigration authorities declined to issue du Toit’s two sons permits arguing that there were enough people in Southern Rhodesia to do that job.\textsuperscript{146} Du Toit wrote a strongly worded letter to Huggins expressing his frustration. Without restraint or diplomacy, du Toit candidly told Huggins that:

we, the elite in the Union of South Africa, like Smuts, Hofmeyr and their followers (like myself)\textsuperscript{140} always did and do to this very day extend our hand of friendship and cooperation to all
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Rhodians… to our mines on the Rand, our schools, military colleges… in the Union. We neither directly nor indirectly insult any Rhodesian by telling them ‘fairy tales’ in trying to state that ‘we have got enough people in the Union to do the work’. We are trying to establish a real democracy and collaboration of the Smuts, Hofmeyr, Churchill, Roosevelt type without any ‘democratic hypocrisy’ whatsoever. We are not in the habit either to exploit or try to discriminate anybody from Rhodesia because for not belonging to the ‘Caledonian Society’ or the ‘Sons of England’… About 80 per cent of us, followers of Smuts, Churchill and Roosevelt are ‘Sons of a 100 per cent democracy’ and we cut out all racialism entirely or anything of the like nature.\footnote{Ibid.}

Du Toit was eager to bring this matter personally to the attention of Smuts and Jan Hendrik Hofmeyr just to expose the discrimination he had received at the hands of fellow white Rhodesian officials. Until his death in 1948, Hofmeyr was instrumental in fostering good relations between Afrikaans and English-speaking white in the Union of South Africa.\footnote{J. Winch, ‘J.H. Hofmeyr and the Afrikaner Bond: A challenge to William Milton’s “Englishness” and the advance of the “coloured” cricketer’, \textit{Historia}, 59, 1 (2014), 23.} This explains why du Toit was calling Southern Rhodesian immigration bureaucrats to go beyond petty ethnic chauvinism and embrace Afrikaners. He enclosed his decorated military record to Huggins and that of his two sons. His eldest son, Victor, had joined the South African army for about nine months and because of a tremor in his hands, the doctor ordered him to leave the army. His second boy, Leo, was a Lieutenant in the Air Force while his third son only seventeen years old, was underage to get permission to join the Union Tank Corps. He was waiting to turn eighteen in order to be able to join the army. With this military record, du Toit fumed to Huggins, ‘where is the military record of the damned responsible authorities of Rhodesia who turned my boys down for work, which they can obtain?\footnote{NAZ S468/39 Applications to enter and reside in Southern Rhodesia, 22 March 1944.}’\footnote{I. Mhike, ‘Deviance and Colonial Power: A History of Juvenile Delinquency in Colonial Zimbabwe, 1890-c.1960’ (PhD, University of the Free State, 2016), 203. For more information on the Ossewa-Brandwag see C. Blignaut, ‘Doing gender is unavoidable: Women’s participation in the core activities of the Ossewa-Brandwag, 1938-1943’, \textit{Historia}, 58, 2 (2013), 1-18.} Du Toit’s sentiments conjured notions of loyalty to the Empire by some South African service personnel. He distanced himself from the Ossewabrandwag, a pro-German and anti-British South African organisation formed during the WW2 who sometimes harassed uniformed forces for supporting Allied forces.\footnote{Ibid.} Unfortunately, du Toit was not aware of the functionalities of Southern Rhodesian immigration regulations.

The government policy on immigration could not permit immigrants to enter the colony as employees without obtaining the permission of the Minister of Internal Affairs. The prospective employer had to satisfy the Minister that there was no out-of-work Rhodesians available to fill the post. In pursuance of this policy, the Chief Industrial Inspector examined the list of unemployed...
persons registered with the government Employment Bureau, and notified Rawson that he had about a dozen suitable applicants available in the colony, some of whom had Afrikaans names. The Employment Bureau gave equal opportunities to all whites rendering unattainable du Toit’s claims that Rhodesian officials turned down his boys because they were Afrikaners. Moreover, the government wanted to preserve jobs for demobilised soldiers after the war. This development was against the closer relationship that had developed between Southern Rhodesia and South Africa because of the war.

Displaced Jews and other personnel seeking to settle in Southern Rhodesia likewise had their applications turned down by the Internal Affairs and immigration authorities. These developments capture the anti-Semitic nature of Rhodesia during the war. One such case involved N. Stiefel, who wrote the Governor of Southern Rhodesia applying for his German Jewish parents to settle in the country. Stiefel and his brother were Jewish refugees from Germany serving in the Rhodesian Internment Camp Corps, Gatooma. They wanted their parents, Aron and Hilda Stiefel (both over sixty years old), to be near them, rather than being lonely in Lourenco Marques where they stayed since April 1940 and the climate had a bad effect on their health. At the time, their parents were in possession of Portuguese stateless papers. Stiefel stated that ‘I cannot understand why this wish of two old people who escaped Nazi tyranny cannot be fulfilled and I apply to your power and kindness, to introduce our parents into this colony’. Stiefel had written to the Minister of Internal Affairs requesting his parents to stay in Rhodesia with no success. ‘We tried already since the outbreak of war to join the forces of this colony, but the only opportunity we had so far was to join the Southern Rhodesia Internment Camp Corps.’ Stiefel had made the application in 1941 but the authorities turned it down after full consideration of the facts of the case. In October 1942, the Stiefel brothers again renewed their application, which authorities turned down.

**Conclusion**

To sum up this discussion, this chapter has demonstrated that Southern Rhodesian whites expressed imperial patriotism towards Britain during the war. It has shown that the war fostered cultural and military connections between Rhodesian settlers and Britain in the fight against Nazism and Fascism. The war was instrumental in the development of kith and kin feelings among many white Rhodesians. It demonstrated that among other contributions, the BEATS was the most significant way the colony rendered on behalf of the Empire. The hosting of refugees and
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internees invoked ideas of whiteness and undesirability. Rhodesian settlers were afraid that these whites would dilute their self-image often constructed against the so-called desirable whites. This also set tone for the stronger anglophile characteristics of the immediate post-war Southern Rhodesia discussed in the next chapter.
Chapter Three

The Most British of all Colonies: Britishness, Whiteness and Loyalty to Britain in Southern Rhodesia, 1946 – 52

Introduction

When the war ended, the white settlers of Southern Rhodesia emerged with good prospects for their future. Post-war industrial and agricultural boom placed the colony in a good position and boosted their confidence and self-image at a time when Britain faced economic challenges. This chapter focuses on the competing ideas of Britishness, whiteness and loyalty to Britain in Southern Rhodesia between 1946 and 1952. It explore the contradictions of the post-war immigration campaigns, which Rhodesian authorities dedicated to mainly attracting British settlers for social, economic and political reasons. This chapter will argue that the influx of post-war immigrants had considerable influence to shape white identities in Southern Rhodesia. It shows tensions within the Southern Rhodesian settler community based on prejudices, anxieties and the rhetoric of imperial loyalty and Britishness. The chapter argues that, the culture of settlers in Rhodesia continued to demonstrate a contested sense of Britishness, loyalty and kinship to Britain in the immediate post-war years, which also extended to popular politics and business networks.

Settlers of the Right Type: Post-war Immigration Campaigns in Southern Rhodesia

In the early twentieth century, migration from Britain to its many imperial outposts not only shaped the lives of sailors, soldiers, merchants, administrators, and settlers, but also the millions who remained in the British Isles and had kith and kin living overseas.1 Many descendants of the British migrants never returned or only made short visits to the land of their forebears, but they still habitually referred to Britain as the ‘mother country’ or the ‘homeland’.2 The 1940s emigration from Britain into New Zealand, Australia, and Canada became more selective than previously. The Dominions wanted immigrants with skills and capital, characteristics which industry, commerce and the professions needed.3 The idea was that this class of immigrants would lead to economic development and help maintain the Britishness of these countries.

In a similar fashion, in the post-war years, Southern Rhodesian settlers wanted to attract British immigrants for economic, political and cultural reasons. The wartime partnership with Britain
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strengthened settler and imperial ties and most Rhodesian whites instinctively imagined that their political relationship with Britain would last forever. Therefore, the attempts to attract more British settlers was supposed to further bolster kith and kin ties between Southern Rhodesia and Britain. Yet not all post-war immigrants were directly from Britain, others were white South Africans who had become dissatisfied with the growing Afrikaner Nationalist influence in the Union; others still were refugees from war-tone Europe. Although the Southern Rhodesian white population was somewhat transient, immigration played a crucial role in the growth of Rhodesia’s white population. In 1946, the colony’s white population stood at 82,000 and by 1951, it had creased to 135,000 – mostly through immigration and not by natural birth. Such figures conceal the rate of emigration during this period. Between 1946 and 1956, 125,000 Europeans immigrated into Southern Rhodesia against 53,000 who emigrated. In 1947, white immigration stood at 13,595 of which 6,924 were born in Britain, whilst 5,104 had been born in South Africa. The majority of these new immigrants were males between sixteen and forty-five years old.

During the war, the government was cautious to commit itself to large-scale immigration in order to reserve employment for the demobilised service personnel. In 1943, it set up a committee to look into the prospects of post-war settlement of ex-service men and women. It preferred British settlers with farming background and in possession of not less than £50 of capital who had friends in Rhodesia or served in the country with the RAF during the war. Kenneth Vickery notes that the migration of British people into Southern Rhodesia was part of the ‘second colonial’ occupation – Britain’s post-war economic development and reconstruction plan. This means that Britain wanted to reassert its influence by clinging to African colonies in the post-war years for economic benefits. However, this coincided with the Southern Rhodesian settler community’s interest in increasing its white population with mainly British immigrants. Before the war ended, Britain and Southern Rhodesia had entered arrangements by which the UK would provide free passages for a limited number of suitable British ex-servicemen, women and their dependents. The Southern Rhodesian government took over the transport costs of the selected immigrants into their various destinations in the colony. As a result, in January 1948, immigration authorities
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recorded that 1,289 immigrants entered the country and granted fourteen of them permanent residence after they stayed in the colony temporarily.\textsuperscript{12} This figure included some RAF personnel and their dependents. Initially, the government envisaged a post-war immigration scheme limited to one hundred men, of which not more than forty percent would be married, and under thirty-five years old of age.\textsuperscript{15}

The government set up a committee to examine and select settlers as well as controlling the immigration scheme. The Minister of Agriculture and Lands suggested that the committee should consult the National Farmers’ Union of Great Britain to make the final selection of prospective settlers.\textsuperscript{14} In addition, the 1820 Memorial Settlers Association screened suitable immigrants in England, helping Southern Rhodesia to get required whites for particular occupations in the colony.\textsuperscript{15} The Rhodesian government placed new settlers under the internship of experienced farmers for a period of two years to enable them to acquire the local knowledge of farming. During the internship period, the government granted £5 to the single men, and £10 to married men.\textsuperscript{16} After the Land Settlement Board was satisfied with the adequate training, the government allocated a crown land farm, or allowed new farmers to select a private farm if they possessed sufficient capital. In 1946, immigrants declared capital of £6,068,900 compared with £2,258,100 in 1945.\textsuperscript{17}

The absorption of new settlers depended on availability of facilities in the country. Old settlers feared that the country was not able to provide sufficient schools, hospitals and houses while others stressed that ex-servicemen should get priority in all fairness.\textsuperscript{18} The influx of immigrants was greater than the colony could possibly absorb.\textsuperscript{19} As a result, the government introduced immigration restrictions to manageable proportions. For example, it compelled employers to give guarantees for the repatriation expenses of immigrants they brought in the country and a flat rate of immigration guarantees regardless of the immigrant’s origin.\textsuperscript{20} Unfortunately, this regulation encouraged employers to bring immigrants from other territories in Southern Africa rather from Britain. For example, in 1948, immigrants born in Britain were 8,574 and by 1949 the figure stood at 5,908, while those born in South Africa were 4,410 in 1948 and it increased to 5,173 in 1949.\textsuperscript{21}
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This had the potential of further diluting what was already ambiguous notion of Southern Rhodesia’s Britishness.

In 1947, the flood of immigrants created serious housing challenges.\textsuperscript{22} Despite the high turnover of whites, immigrants were arriving and staying more permanently in unprecedented numbers. With metropolitan arrivals outnumbering those from the Union for the first time, the building industry could not catch up with the demand for European housing.\textsuperscript{23} To address these shortages, the government brought new artisans and building material into the country and introduced rammed earth houses (pire-de-terre).\textsuperscript{24} James McNeille, who arrived in Southern Rhodesia in 1919, tells an interesting anecdote about the introduction of these pire-de-terre houses. According to him, a fellow named Posselt asked Huggins to come and have a look at a house that he built out of mud, in Salisbury – pire-de-terre. When Higgins saw the mud house, with much euphoria and relief remarked “that is the answer!”\textsuperscript{25} Soon mud houses flourished in Bulawayo and Salisbury because they were cheap. The government also tried to slow down on immigration as another way to mitigate housing problems. However, this did not mean a complete stoppage of immigration.

By 1950, the government had relaxed the immigration regulations into the colony. It reimbursed employers who paid guarantees for all British immigrants after two years. However, employers were still interested in paying small premiums to insurance companies to indemnify themselves against repatriation expenses. Under the new system, employers paid £100 for single and £150 for the married British and South Africa immigrants they brought to the colony.\textsuperscript{26} Previously, employers provided £200 in cash or in bank-secured deposits for British immigrants or £300 if the immigrant was married.\textsuperscript{27} The government altered the clause which provided that if immigrants changed their jobs, the original employer remained responsible for their guarantees as long as they remained in the country and became citizens.\textsuperscript{28} Because immigrants frequently moved, this meant that many firms had considerable sums of money they paid on behalf of employees who would have long left their jobs.

However, the new scheme was not popular among other industrialists in the country. For example, the Manager of Porter’s Ltd. reflected that the new system of guarantees did not meet the
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objections raised by employers while the proposed insurance scheme did not suit everybody. The Managing Director of Rhodesia Plastics Ltd. Salisbury wholeheartedly supported the idea that in the event of the immigrants leaving their company, the new employer would pay the guarantees or to the employees themselves. However, in 1949, Southern Rhodesia provided a new Citizenship Act which allowed British subjects to register as citizens after spending two years in the country. Once they become citizens, the government could not deport them and would no longer require financial guarantees. It required a guarantee of £100 for South Africans and £200 for Britons, plus fifty percent if the settler was married. The 1949 Citizenship Act was the first of its own to give whites a legal definition of being Southern Rhodesians. Prior to that, Europeans referred to themselves with their ethnic origins such as Irishman, Scotsman, Welshman, Englishman, British or Afrikaner and so forth. Therefore, before 1949, it was easy for Southern Rhodesian settlers to have many identities. Whilst the state was eager to increase the country’s white population, some local and metropolitan individuals took it upon themselves to bring more settlers in Southern Rhodesia.

**British Satellite Towns and Advertising Southern Rhodesia**

Some enthusiastic individuals in Southern Rhodesia and in Britain made significant efforts to attract settlers through advertisement and attempted to establish British satellite towns in the colony. In 1947, *The London Advertiser* covered a story involving E. L. Leeming, surveyor to the Urmston (Lancashire) City Council who identified 8,000 acres in the Umvukwes farming area to build the new Urmston, first of Southern Rhodesia’s satellite towns. *The London Advertiser* claimed that planned mass immigration was of far greater benefit to Southern Rhodesia compared to the slow pace of immigration and would require proper planning in order to accommodate immigrants not satisfied with the post-war life in Britain. As early as 1944, the government was aware of Leeming’s idea of establishing British satellite towns in Southern Rhodesia. Then, a great deal of publicity was given to Leeming’s idea to move white communities from overcrowded Lancashire to satellite towns Southern Rhodesia. The proposal was to increase the colony’s white population by 500,000, who would be distributed in ten satellite towns of 25,000 people each and smaller towns with 10,000 inhabitants.
The so-called Lancashire proposals already created interest in the British press. For instance, one Peterson of Hull, UK, read in one of the local paper about Southern Rhodesia’s post-war settlement scheme and desired to emigrate.\textsuperscript{36} He was a qualified builder by profession and was prepared to work as a journeyman. The Chief Immigration Officer informed Peterson that skilled whites like him were more than welcome in Southern Rhodesia.\textsuperscript{37} The land which Leeming wanted to use to build the satellite towns belonged to Arthur Chatwin, a local farmer in Umvukwes who was willing to sell his land for the purpose of town development using his personal influence and property to attract more British settlers. Chatwin’s land was on flat open country with the Umsengesi River and various tributaries running through. In an undated, four-page length document, Chatwin described Southern Rhodesia’s need for British immigrants, brains, and capital in passionate terms:

Southern Rhodesia is a sun kissed land, overflowing, so the novelist says, with milk and honey. Its present population of about 85,000 white people is predominantly British and its most crying need is for British capital, brains and brawn to further its development. To introduce these piecemeal to the country in very considerable numbers in its present stage of development, however, will undoubtedly tax the capacity of the colony to absorb them, but the opportunity to interest settlers of the right type must be seized at once before immigrant schemes of other colonies get way.\textsuperscript{38}

Evidently, Chatwin had a romantic picture of Southern Rhodesia’s climate and landscape. He firmly believed in the rhetoric of keeping the country ‘British’ by attracting only desirable immigrants from Britain. He was tapping in the national settler post-war discourse of making Southern Rhodesia a purely British territory. At the same time, he passionately desired to see British capital flourishing in Southern Rhodesia.

As an Anglophile, Chatwin proposed what he considered one of the ways to ameliorate Southern Rhodesia’s critical need for more British immigrants. He hoped that the scheme would attract industrialists into the colony to set up their manufacturing and processing plants, thereby, creating employment and stimulating industrialisation, urbanisation, and development.\textsuperscript{39} But, Southern Rhodesian authorities did not really see the feasibility of Chatwin and Leeming’s utopian scheme. The Director of Public Relations expressed disbelief over the practicalities of such a grandiose scheme to uproot thousands of immigrants into the colony:
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Outside of all official planning, here is a proposal to import half a million new immigrants; planned development is impossible if private individuals are to try to organise schemes of this magnitude. The reliability of the information Chatwin and his colleagues supplied to potential industrialists, was open to question, and produced entirely erroneous impressions; without official control, a scheme such as this was fraught with the most dangerous consequences, both for the immigrants and for this colony. It seems he did not think of what it meant to uproot thousands of people and move them to unfamiliar surroundings; taking them from the rain of Lancashire to the blazing heat of Rhodesian October; or even from English pubs, football and the ‘dogs’ to a country that has none of these essential pastimes? In addition, the Chief Immigration Officer questioned where the food would come from to feed extra town-dwellers when the country could not grow enough for its existing population.40

The Director of Public Works completely differed with Chatwin’s romantic description of Southern Rhodesia’s climate and landscape. As a government bureaucrat, he did not appreciate unplanned settlement and was aware of the differences between Southern Rhodesia and Britain. In place of the unpractical town proposals, authorities suggested for the establishment of satellite factories in the colony. Mushrooming townships already existed in the colony, such as Umtali, Que Que, Rusapi, Hartley, and Bindura, than to establish new ones. They wanted industrialists to transfer their processing plants to Southern Rhodesia close to raw-materials and import staff and machinery from Britain.41 Smaller towns in the country would then provide industrialists with immediate facilities such as roads, light, water, and sanitary services, which could not be readily available in a new town like Umvukwes Urmston. Consequently, the plan did not see the light of the day as it lacked official support.

Besides Leeming and Chatwin’s grand ideas, some Southern Rhodesian white publicists also campaigned to attract British settlers in their personal capacity. One such case involves Norman Yule, a Salisbury-based publicity expert, self-proclaimed imperialist and supporter of the Empire. In 1944, Yule clearly articulated his ideas addressing the third annual conference of the Municipal Association of Southern Rhodesia on post-war mass immigration publicity campaign. As a confirmed and proud imperialist, Yule wanted whites of British origin to settle in Southern Rhodesia to counterbalance the Afrikaner-dominated South Africa in the subcontinent.42 He was aware that Southern Rhodesia desired to increase its white population, particularly by settlers of British ancestry, in order to perpetuate the Britishness of the colony. ‘The colony has already
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envisaged mass Immigration from the congested areas of Britain to the under-populated centre of Rhodesia…it is hardly necessary for me to stress our dire need for European population, particularly British. He believed that the presence of large numbers of British immigrants would automatically increase buying power and allow economic development. According to him, the economic factor would automatically adjust itself, with increased consumer demand leading to the opening of new markets for local products and export the excess. The thinking at the time was that because of housing challenges, there was a need for more bricklayers, artisans and other tradesmen that would eventually stimulate economic and infrastructural development of Rhodesia. Central to Yule’s presentation was massive advertisement of Southern Rhodesia to induce prospective British industrialists and settlers. He believed in the greatness of the Empire despite the post-war Britain’s economic challenges. His submissions are quite revealing of this fact:

Britain has more than vast empty areas at its disposal … the Empire is really an extension of Britain itself. The British people can show the world that [the] Empire is something more than a source of raw materials … it controlled market for [its] manufactured products. It can validate its commitments under the Atlantic Charter by proving that the Empire is not an acquired possession but a living branch of the tree – an integral, indivisible, part of the whole.

These sentiments capture strong beliefs in the Empire and Anglophile tendencies in Southern Rhodesia. Implicitly, white settlers thought of themselves as an appendage of Britain through migration and economic networks. This helped to bolster the rhetoric of kith and kin feelings between them and Britain.

As part of the advertisement, Yule proposed for an All Rhodesian Exhibition, portraying the advantages of settling in Southern Rhodesia from every angle. The expo would comprehensively show the cross section of Southern Rhodesian life in addition to a central theme to serve as the magnet to arouse the interest of the intend British audience. The exhibition would be in sections to be easily demountable, transportable, and toured industrial centres where concerned industries would find the necessary information. Supporting the exhibition, Yule proposed to use the press, wireless, cinema, and lectures to get the project across to the British people:

Another section of the exhibition, which would no doubt create special interest to the overcrowded workers in Britain, would be the ideal home, which is possible in this country. It would be available with its half-acre or so of ground for there is no need in this country of
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open spaces to pile up humanity into flats, which was eventually become tenements and slums. The focal point of the exhibition would be a vast diorama depicting a Rhodesian City of the Future in dramatic form. The theme of the city will be “this is our dream city of the future, come and help us build it”. A coloured sixteen mm film depicting life in the colony and emphasising our active open air existence facilities for sport and education should be taken as soon as is practicable. Other countries with large exchequers will shortly be clamouring for British immigrants, and in my opinion, it will be the first in the field that will receive the active cooperation, sympathy and support of both press and radio.46

By the Second World War, cinema found its way into Africa but the colonial state controlled African spectatorship giving preference to whites.47 The colonial mission regarded cinema as a symbol of civilisation and modernity, early camera crews scrambled for images in Africa for export to the metropoles giving publicity about life in the colonies.48 Thus, Yule wanted to fast track the pace of British immigration using cinema to entice prospective British settlers.

At the conference, Councillor Holmes of Bulawayo took the opportunity of protesting against the government action of withdrawing its support from the Publicity Association. He felt that the future of the Empire depended on Britain distributing its excess population.49 He wanted Britain’s access population to immigrate to Southern Rhodesia not only to increase the colony’s white population but also to demonstrate its Britishness. Despite the fears and anxieties against non-British whites, the country did in fact receive mixed classes of immigrants.

‘Undesirable’ Immigrants and Whiteness

With almost complete autonomy, the Selection Immigration Board was responsible for choosing white immigrants it considered suitable and desirable. Selected government civil servants made up the Board. While it worked closely with other departments for consultation in unclear circumstances, the Board had the final decision.50 Additionally, an Appeal Board made up its mind on personal opinion, though not necessarily based on the requirements of law when dealing with desirability and undesirability of immigrants. Thus, there was a possibility for the Selection Board to refuse individual applications made on identical grounds. For instance, the Board either could decide to admit unqualified whites on compassionate grounds, or refuse.51 Even if repeatedly
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overruled by the Appeal Board the Selection Board would still adhere to its view and continue to reject applications of this type. This exposed the contradictions within the immigration policies of the country. The overtly British Southern Rhodesian settlers stereotyped non-British immigrants as ‘white aliens’ and ‘undesirable’ regardless of their fair skins. They conflated class and ethnicity to include or exclude whites whom they considered to be of lower class or poor.\textsuperscript{52} The definition of undesirability depended on political, economic and social factors prevailing at each particular time. In the early colonial years, as Bonello notes, Rhodesians fashioned their self-image in relation to Africans, the imperial homeland of Britain and white South Africans.\textsuperscript{53} Just like their fellow British South Africans, Southern Rhodesians constructed their identities in relation to those with which they came into contact, particularly Afrikaners and Africans.\textsuperscript{54} However, in the post-war years, they also imagined their self-image in relation to the so-called desirable whites.

In the post-war years, Southern Rhodesian old settlers and officials remained suspicious of other classes of whites. As Gann and Gelfand stated, ‘old settlers tenaciously proclaimed over their beer mugs that the post-war immigrants were much inferior to the fine types who used to come out in the earlier years …’\textsuperscript{55} In 1946, news circulated that there was influx of unwanted white aliens in the colony – mainly Afrikaners. The Bulawayo Chronicle, one of the Argus Company of South Africa newspapers, which supported the state, dispelled as unfounded such stories and fears directed against the so-called white aliens. It stated that from 1915 to 1944, inclusive 87.35 percent of all immigrants were British, leaving 12.65 percent for all other national origins. Of the total immigrants during this period, 2.24 percent were from Asia, mostly British Indian.\textsuperscript{56} Although these were official statistics, they helped to allay fears that white aliens were flooding the country. To English-speaking settlers and government officials, the alleged influx of Afrikaners would contaminate their imagined British space and make assimilation difficult. In the absence of threats from African nationalism, Rhodesian settlers agreed that they should not allow white aliens to overrun the country.\textsuperscript{57}

In January 1949, Rhodesian authorities checked immigration records to consider the validity of the suggestion that Afrikaners were flooding the colony. The document at the National Archives of Zimbabwe dealing with this subject is marked ‘secret’ with capital letters, meaning it was not for public consumption. The file does not indicate its author and date except for the year. As detailed
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in the secret document, results show that approximately one-third of the British immigrants from the Union of South Africa were through the Plumtree boarder post, where many Afrikaners entered Southern Rhodesia. The authorities carried a similar examination in respect of Beit Bridge boarder post through which the greater part of rural Afrikaner immigration took place. The results showed that, in July 1949, ninety-six English immigrant families entered Southern Rhodesia against thirty-one Afrikaner families.

As mentioned elsewhere above, the fear of Afrikaners was political even though they were so insignificant in their numbers. The government feared that Afrikaners in rural areas could produce a greater effect on the colony’s parliamentary balance than they could if they were coming to the urban areas where they could become absorbed into the larger and more representative constituencies. Since Afrikaners usually fell into two definite political categories, it was by no means certain that those entering Southern Rhodesia were all Nationalists. Some who came into the colony could have been liberals and, therefore, pro-Smuts, like many of their English-speaking fellow-immigrants, hostile to the South African Nationalist government. The Southern Rhodesian officials noted that:

> Whatever views there may be on this point they are beyond proof and purely conjectural, for it is extremely difficult to get a true picture of the position of having regard to this fact that Afrikaners who are disposed are very slow to voice anti-British sentiments in circles where their remarks will be noted.

It was impossible for government authorities to inquire from the South African officials as to the political inclinations of any Afrikaners seeking admission to the colony. There was no evidence to suggest that South Africa was sending disaffected Afrikaners to infiltrate into the Southern Rhodesia Afrikaner population. Most of these Afrikaners chose to settle in the Umtali, one of the good tobacco districts, where there was a significant proportion of the Afrikaner population alongside other districts such as Charter. The domiciled Afrikaner farmers sponsored the entry of these persons and gave them jobs as assistants as a way of introducing them into the tobacco industry. It was a convention that the government would not give an Afrikaner preference, in a matter of acquiring land, over an available English-speaking candidate.
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As far as the existing Afrikaner population of the colony was concerned, the principal known establishment was *Die Genootskap van Afrikaners in Suid Rhodesie* (Society of Afrikaners in Southern Rhodesia) with twenty-four branches in the colony. This came into being under the title “Afrikaans Vereeniging of Southern Rhodesia” in about 1944/45 thereabout with its own constitution. The Society wanted to foster friendly relations with the Union of South Africa, eliminate ethnic prejudices and safeguard the Afrikaners’ church, language, culture and tradition and lastly apartheid. In 1946, a company known as Unitas Press limited came into being registered with a capital of £75,000 and when it came to the government notice, local Afrikaners subordinated £25,000. The objects of the company were to carry on business as printers and publishers, negotiate loans, and conduct various types of business normally attended to by brokers. Some sections of the white community speculated that one of the unofficial interests of the company was to introduce Afrikaner settlers. Unitas Press limited was responsible for publishing Afrikaans-medium newspaper *Die Volkagenoot* which described itself as ‘the mouthpiece of Afrikaners north of the Limpopo.’

The fear of Afrikaner immigration continued to worry some sections of Rhodesia settler community. For example, the Sons of England of Patriotic and Benevolent Society vehemently opposed their entrance into the colony. The association originated in Toronto in 1874 before it spread into South Africa in 1881 and later into Southern Rhodesia. Its membership was restricted to males of British birth or descent who pledged to maintain imperial interests in the subcontinent. The society wanted the government to be strict and vet all Afrikaners entering the colony and to ascertain their political inclinations before admission into Rhodesia. It suspected Afrikaners of Nationalist sympathies and was not prepared to see Afrikaners flourish in Rhodesia. From an administrative viewpoint, however, it was impossible to screen the politics of all immigrants – even if authorities thought this to be desirable. Officials noted that in July 1950, 23,390 persons entered the colony – nearly 800 per day – this including tourists and returning residents, but it did indicate the impracticability of making detailed enquiries at the border. The Secretary of Internal Affairs noted that, even if such enquiries were likely to produce reliable information, it was quite impossible to arrange screening at the applicant’s station of departure in
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the Union or elsewhere.\textsuperscript{69} Authorities were careful about the extreme undesirability of confining enquiries to any one section of the community, since all sections could have undesirable elements differing one from another.

To some extent, oral sources point to the tensions and differences within the Rhodesian white settler community between English and Afrikaner-speaking settlers. The case below points to differences at local and even government levels. In 1977, one white Rhodesian woman, Susan Hunt, recalled the attitude and stereotypes English-speaking settlers had towards Afrikaners and white South Africans. This reflected more especially when Rhodesians crossed the Beit Bridge boarder into South Africa. Hunt recalled:

> We were terribly rude to South Africans. I may have been rude myself. In sort of horrible way, really. You know this business the moment you crossed the bridge over the Limpopo, “Thank God we are out of that country!” They are funny people I know, but they still behave in a disagreeable way sometimes. I mean the bureaucracy, the bureaucratic people; I am not talking about the ordinary common people. I think we could have them as better friends possibly if we ordinary white Rhodesians behaved better over the years towards them. Our system brought up us to despise Afrikaners, mainly, I think, supposedly because they lacked brains. It takes many years with our type of education, if you are not a university graduate or a world traveller, to learn that brains are not the prerogative of any one nation.\textsuperscript{70}

These comments shows that some Rhodesian settlers considered themselves superior to Afrikaners and white South Africans in general. Some of the indifferences towards Afrikaners were partly a response to the rise of the Nationalist Party in South Africa. This solidified anti-Afrikaner feelings in Rhodesia and the strategic tendencies to further the sense of Britishness. Despite these differences, some Rhodesians still felt it was a bit unfair to have such views towards Afrikaners. Hunt gave a reflective opinion expressing this idea, especially regarding those Afrikaners who received farms in the 1950s. Rhodesians considered Afrikaners less patriotic towards Rhodesia because of their closer links with South Africa.

> I think that here again, (on Afrikaners who got farms in the 1950s in Rhodesia) we are being unkind to the Afrikaners. We believe that they are all feathered their nests in South Africa so that if things do go wrong here they can go home and that is that, and live comfortably in South Africa. However, I think if South Africans were purely British, we would not have done the same. It is human nature.\textsuperscript{71}

\textsuperscript{69} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{71} Ibid.
Some high-ranking government officials embodied the sentimental idea of Britishness and articulated it to some prospective immigrants. For instance, the Minister of Internal Affairs, Lucas Ernest Guest, responded to one O’Keeffe after he inquired about the prospects of his fellow Polish compatriot who wanted to immigrate into Rhodesia. Guest reminded O’Keeffe, ‘as you know, it is the policy of the government to ensure that the population of the colony shall be predominantly British.’

Clements tells us that the ‘British’ element in Rhodesia included a group who were numerically at least strong as the “home British” who were the more influential. British by birth or descent they crossed the Limpopo into Rhodesia after many years in South Africa. Therefore, Rhodesian authorities considered whites such as O’Keeffe and others as white aliens whose immigration needed official monitoring in order to maintain the rhetoric of the Britishness of Rhodesia.

Afrikaans newspapers in South Africa such as *Die Burger* expressed unhappiness about the bad publicity of Afrikaner immigration into Southern Rhodesia. By comparison, English newspapers in South Africa, particularly the *Cape Times* and *Rand Daily Mail*, peddled this bad publicity. According to *Die Burger*, English newspapers supported the United Party of Rhodesia, so that new arrivals from Britain obtained only one-sided and often distorted opinions about the Nationalists, without being in a position to consult an opposition papers to balance the one mindedness. *Die Burger* considered stories against Afrikaners in Rhodesia that South African English newspapers carried as unpleasant, put-stories, and showing journalistic disrespectability to a striking degree. It alleged that South African English newspapers were keen to accept and publish uncritical ‘news’ and build up on attacks of their own against Afrikaners in Rhodesia. It framed Rhodesian Afrikaners as defenseless against their English fellow-citizens, which labelled them as traitors. It questioned why English newspapers did such acts, which not only strained relations between English and Afrikaans-speaking whites in Rhodesia, but also threatened to trigger tensions between Rhodesia and South Africa. ‘The only possible explanation is that they think that in this way they can do harm to the National government of the Union.’

Another anecdotal story reveals the ethnic divisions in Southern Rhodesia settler community involved a rugby match in Inyazura tobacco District that framed Afrikaners as ruthless. In September 1950, a heated debate emerged surrounding the treatment a white employee received from an Afrikaner farmer of Inyazura. This employee was referee in a critical rugby match between
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Inyazura and Umtali. The referee awarded the Umtali team a penalty kick. When he returned to
the farm, the owner told him his sympathies were apparently on the wrong side. Furthermore,
conspiracies circulated in Inyazura depicting Afrikaners as unworthy people of the poorest type
who came penniless. ‘Some of them come here on “holiday” or visiting relatives who give them
work quickly in the district. Others arrive here virtually without a penny and in the most miserable
clothes and nationally inclined tobacco farmers appoint them as ‘supervisors’’. However, it is
difficult to deny that there were cases where some English-speaking whites who arrived in
Rhodesia had no money. Stories circulated that Afrikaner farmers bought land belonging to their
British counterparts at very high prices who were unlucky with their harvests to squeeze them out
of the district. Moreover, ‘Afrikaner farmers not only employed Afrikaners in their services, but
also insisted on their foremen to have nothing to do with the Britishers in the neighbourhood.‘
Die Burger considered such stories as baseless, which could lead to hostile feelings towards all
Afrikaners in Rhodesia.

To protect the so-called Britishness of Rhodesia, white Rhodesians made sure that English
remained the official language of the colony. Among the English speaking whites of South Africa,
English language also defined their British identity. Similarly, it defined British identity in
Southern Rhodesia, where English was also the official language, meaning English-speaking
settlers enjoyed its unchallenged monopoly. Benedict Anderson calls this practice the ‘standardised
language-of-state’. One of the crucial functions of language is that it acts as a medium of power.
Ever since the 1920s, Afrikaners had been always determined to see their language taught in
schools. They wanted Rhodesian officials to appreciate their language in white schools. In 1947,
the scope of the Society of Afrikaners in Southern Rhodesia widened to include the provision of
better facilities for teaching Afrikaans to Afrikaner pupils in schools and Sunday observance. It
championed for the introduction of Afrikaans programmes in the broadcasting services,
restoration of civic rights to those deprived under the Civil Disabilities Act during the war and
curtailment of native franchise.
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At the same time, the Presbytery of Bulawayo of the Dutch Reformed Church (DRC) convened for a meeting and agreed to a number of resolutions, which they wanted the Minister of Education to take into consideration. In part, the Church wanted the Minister of Education to consider the appointment of Afrikaans-speaking members on the different school boards and to allow the introduction of Afrikaans as a subject from standard IV.86 The proportion of religious denominations in Rhodesian schools in 1945 shows that the higher percentage Church of England with 41.5 percent, DRC 17.2 percent, Roman Catholic 10 percent, other Christians 26.7 percent, Jews 4.2 percent and others four percent.87 Therefore, the DRC was the second largest religious denomination. The delegation presented a petition with 3,642 signatures, surprisingly 300 of the signatories were English-speaking people.88 According to the delegation, Afrikaner children in Rhodesia were not able to read the Bible in Afrikaans and found it difficult to follow sermons and services at Sunday school.89 The delegation was deeply concerned about the fact that children acquired only a poor knowledge of Afrikaans in Southern Rhodesian schools. Educational opportunities for Afrikaans-speaking children were also another concern of the deputation. With a view to the further education of Rhodesian children in high, technical, and agricultural schools as well as universities in the Union, a better knowledge of Afrikaans was necessary.90 Their efforts were limited to secure a better future of their children at church level and for future opportunities. In the process, the teaching of their language would help also to preserve and protect their identity as a distinct people.

The Rhodesian Chief Education Officer consulted with the Natal Director of Education concerning South Africa’s language policy. The English-speaking whites of Natal considered themselves as the last outpost of the British Empire in South Africa.91 It was logical for the Director of Education to consult with their compatriots, who shared similar patriotic feelings towards their country. The Director of Education of Natal responded that there was a regulation by which the government did not give teachers salary increase if they failed to make themselves bilingual within five years of their appointment. Moreover, the Natal system of education allowed the provision of lectures in Afrikaans and the remainder in English in order to assist teachers.92 Despite their acclaimed Britishness, white Rhodesians adopted their educational system and
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curriculum from South African practice, including at the tertiary level. However, the Minister of Education could not accede to the Afrikaners’ petition to introduce Afrikaans language in white Rhodesian schools. His perusal of inspection reports gave him the opinion that the general standard of English was not good. He found the state of affairs disturbing and so did not feel inclined to allow the introduction of instruction in another language, which would thereby reduce the present amount of school time available for the official language of the colony. The government was reluctant to change the country’s language policy as prescribed in Section 20 of the Education Act. The appropriate part stated, ‘in districts where pupils enter school without an adequate knowledge of English, teachers shall be permitted the use of the pupil’s vernacular language in order to clarify ideas and facilitate the pupils’ knowledge and ability in the use of English.’ As a result, the Department of Education could do nothing, which would have interfered with the free mixing of English and Afrikaans-speaking whites thereby compromising their unity.

The Bulawayo Chronicle condemned attempts by Afrikaners to introduce Afrikaans language in white Rhodesian schools arguing that this had the potential to escalate tension within the settler community. It called attempts by Afrikaners as insidious propaganda and emphasised that English was the language of the country, unchallenged and unchallengeable. The New Rhodesia, a monthly publication which was always critical of the government opposed the movement to introduce Afrikaans in white schools. The article carried an interesting title: “Citizen John – speaks his mind on what is the official language of Southern Rhodesia?” Citizen John had no kind words directed against Afrikaners and Rhodesian education authorities whom he considered lenient towards the language movement. He told his audience that English was the official language of the country and Afrikaans was just as much a foreign language as French, German, Spanish or Italian. Calling Afrikaans a foreign language is revealing of the differences within the Rhodesian settler community during this period.

The Sons of England of Patriotic and Benevolent Society also wanted English to remain the sole official language of the country. The ruling United Party promised during its 1949 Congress to oversee the entrenchment of English as the only official language as provided by the constitution. When the Sons of England later convened in 1952, the Deputy Mayor of Bulawayo opened the
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event and supported the idea of maintaining the English way of life in Rhodesia. He appreciated the efforts of the Sons of England for their invincible determination to protect and perpetuate the English way of life and thought in Rhodesia.  

While Rhodesian Afrikaners advocated the teaching of their language, some liberal English South African newspapers reported on alleged Nationalist feelings in Rhodesia. For example, in 1950, the Cape Time translated an Afrikaans story from the Volksgenoot about Afrikaner nationhood in Rhodesia. The story claimed that Afrikaners in Southern Rhodesia would never give up their Afrikaner nationhood in any circumstances. The Volksgenoot attempted to reply to allegations of Nationalist penetration, describing them as baseless fabrications designed to disrupt white relations in the colony. Afrikaners asked the meaning of ‘assimilation’ on which the white Rhodesians placed so much emphasis. After all, Afrikaners were proud to belong to a distinct group with its own-shared culture:

We are a people (volk) with our own distinctive traditions, language, church, and culture, and with them, we bear a distinctive stamp and character. We cannot and do not wish to be anything else. We are proud of our Afrikanerskap and believe that we can be good Rhodesians without laying aside our nationhood and trying to be something we can never become. The Volksgenoot denies that there is any Afrikaner political organisation in Southern Rhodesia. The allegations that poorly clad Afrikaners of poor type are coming into the country is as an insult to our young farmers.

Clearly, Rhodesian Afrikaners especially those in farms were not willing to shed off their identity. They were not prepared to dilute their cultural beliefs and customs in order to become like other Rhodesian settlers. The Southern Rhodesian authorities found that the ‘proper’ mixing of Afrikaners, white Rhodesian settlers and new immigrants, rested on assimilation. However, new settlers presented the government with another different challenge.

**Contestations between Old and New Settlers**

The government expected older settlers to orient these new comers into imperial ideas, which included Rhodesian myths and racial attitudes. They wanted new settlers to quickly learn and adjust to these ideas. It was upon assimilation and the proper mixing of the old ideas and habits with the new, that the success of any immigration scheme depended. The novelist Doris Lessing, who came to Southern Rhodesia from Britain in 1949, wrote that new settlers from Britain were

---

100 Ibid.
101 Cape Times, 2 September 1950.
102 Ibid.
usually ex-public school, very English, but extremely adaptable. As Alison Shutt notes, new immigrants flocking into the country after the war were to be educated in the nature of white Rhodesian culture and manners by older settlers. Considering the racial nature of Rhodesia, it was difficult for the old settlers to integrate new volumes of immigrants free from colonial race prejudices. There were also immigrants from South Africa who were adventurous and perturbed by the expansion of apartheid, which was taking place in the context of the growing racialism in the Union political circles.

In the opinion of some well-placed Rhodesian officials such as Alan Lloyd, confirm that a greater proportion of the post-war immigrants were of ‘poor type’ and ‘lower classes. Lloyd joined the Education Department in 1933, and then transferred to the Department of Justice (District courts) where he worked for eleven years before he started his private practice in 1946. He stated that ‘subsequent to the war, white immigration seemed to change. It seemed to be of “poor type” of British immigrant who was endeavouring to get away from the post-war austere conditions in Britain.’ Post-war immigrants lacked the more idealistic outlook of the pre-war immigrants. The decline in the standard of paternalistic attitude of the pre-war European became very noticeable after the war when the ‘poor type’ of white immigrants allegedly did great damage to the European prestige in the country. Lloyd recalled a good incident that sheds light on how other non-Rhodesian whites expressed similar disgust at the new wave of immigrants:

I remember well going down for an appeal by air to Bloemfontein in the Union of South Africa, as it was then when the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of South Africa heard our appeals from the High Court. I was sitting next to a man who told me he was a Director of the Hong Kong and Shanghai Bank and lived many years in Ceylon, who, knowing I was a Rhodesian, said to me that he was surprised at the amount of the poor white trash that he saw in Bulawayo while he was there.

Notably, from this quotation, Lloyd was eager to express his status and position because he could fly to South Africa and meet top officials. The idea of calling new immigrants trash is quite revealing of how class and poverty were important in defining white undesirability. It also shows
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that British immigrants, despite belonging to the officially accepted cultural extraction, who did not possess enough wealth, could be considered undesirable.

Some new British immigrants also freely mixed with Africans, thus transcending racial boundaries. Ralph Drew Palmer, who came in Rhodesia in the 1920s, alleged that the nature of post-war immigrants changed the political landscape of the colony. He stated that:

They used to go and have tea in the kitchen, and speak to them, as they would do to another European, and eventually the African would let them down – he would pinch all the sugar or go away and not come back on the time he said he would. Moreover, all these sort of things would upset these chaps and they immediately went over to the rightwing. It is one of the reasons for a sudden political change and feeling in the country; it was a result of the new immigrants.\textsuperscript{109}

This kind of class indifference angered the older settlers who considered themselves as the heirs to the so-called Rhodesian way of life and guardians of the pioneering and imperial tradition. Most interestingly, in Palmer’s remarks, old Rhodesians cynically directed their intolerance to new immigrants as scapegoat for political and economic pressures.

Those post-war British immigrants who held liberal ideas and views were not readily acceptable by the old settlers. Another white Rhodesian, Washington Stumbles, relates an anecdotal story circulating in Salisbury where one white English immigrant attacked Rhodesian women for their alleged laziness. Although Stumbles related this story as his wife told him, it demonstrates that even new immigrants had their prejudices towards Rhodesian whites. In 1948, Stumbles’ wife was driving up from town to where they lived in Allan Wilson Avenue. She gave a lift to a white woman walking along the street who happened to be a rather ‘uneducated’ English immigrant. The passenger proceeded to attack white Rhodesian women for the alleged lazy life they led and that they never exercised because Africans servants did everything for them. Stumbles’ wife turned the car round and drove back to where she had picked her up. As Stumbles narrates the story, his wife fumed to the passenger that “if you feel that we are too lazy here and we do not exert ourselves enough, perhaps you would like to go on walking”\textsuperscript{110}. Definitely, this woman was unfamiliar with having African domestic servants and had different racial attitudes.

The District of the Sons of England and Benevolent Society of Rhodesia was deeply concerned with the emergence of divisions within the white Rhodesian settler community and the dilution of the Britishness of the colony supposedly caused by new immigrants. In the past, it complained,
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'Rhodesians always judged their fellow men in the light of what they were, rather than by the amount of money they possessed or the position they might occupy.' Allegedly, the Lodge blamed new immigrants for bringing about class differences in white Rhodesia. The Lodge complained that non-British immigrants such as Italians were diluting the British way of life in the country. The Rhodesian settler community was more egalitarian and not entirely reflective of the class based British life. The Minister of Internal Affairs, Hugh Beadle, told to the Sons of England about the British foundations of white settler Rhodesia. He alluded that the preservation of the essentially British character of Rhodesia and the reasonable standard of living of whites were two foundations of the country. While these ideals seemed axiomatic, but there was pressure on the government to introduce measures that might encroach on them. Rhodesian legislators designed the Aliens Act of 1946 as a way of preserving the colony’s British background. Since 1946, Beadle assured the Lodge, the immigration of aliens had been limited annually to eight percent of the number of British immigrants who entered the colony. Periodic movements for admitting larger numbers of central and southern European peasants and from Italy of the peasant type for the colony’s economic progress were not justifiable enough to dilute Rhodesian white values. Officials reasoned that the influx of non-British immigrants had the potential to lower the standards of living in the colony. However, this was an exaggeration; officials conveniently excluded other white immigrants because of their cultural heritage regardless of their socio-economic status.

To avoid the problem of unemployed whites, Rhodesian officials were not willing to accept immigrants looking for jobs. The country needed white immigrants able to start their own private business. The *Rhodesian Recorder*, a monthly industrial journal, alluded to this fantasy in an exaggerated manner: ‘Rhodesia is outstandingly a place where you can get on your own, in preference to getting into a job. People taking risks quite the opposite to the socialistic doctrine of so-called ‘security’ built up the British Empire.’ This comment captures differences between Rhodesia and the post-war British welfare state. The industrial community further advocated for more thrift and entrepreneurial settlers to immigrate into the colony. ‘We do not want too many cotton-wool people in Rhodesia … We need all talented folk who are thinking of settling here … Rhodesia is one of the last bastions of private enterprise…’ The idea of attracting only talented whites and framing Rhodesia as the last bastion of private enterprise reveals settler pride. Certainly,

111 *Bulawayo Chronicle*, 22 January 1951.
112 TNA FO 371/80195 Italian immigration into Southern Rhodesia and employment of Italians in Somaliland Protectorate, 27 January 1950.
113 Ibid.
114 Ibid.
115 *Rhodesian Recorder*, April 1951.
116 Ibid.
this was an overstatement cushioned in settler nationalism and quite opposite of the economic realities in the country. Rhodesian whites became prejudiced against job-seeking immigrants as soft-handed and lazy because it was against the settler projection of a hardworking community. Desirable white immigrants were supposed to bring skills and money to invest in the country or establish branches in Rhodesia from overcrowded British industries\(^\text{117}\). The idea was that this type of white immigrants would lead to the economic development of the country. In contrast, the Rhodesian settler community considered immigrants who could not take care of themselves as undesirable, as they had the potential to offset established white standards. Besides issues of undesirability of new immigrants, white Rhodesians expressed were concerned about loyalty to Britain.

**Effects of Immigration, Loyalism and Racial Identity on Popular and White Nationalist Politics**

Loyalties and identities are negotiable, contested and subject to compromises depending on the circumstances. Common threats, real or imagined fears, and other interests united British people across the Dominions and colonies of settlement to rally behind their shared British heritage. As Linda Colley, the historian of nationalist politics in the Britain Empire revealed, `whatever their own differences, Britons could feel united in dominion over, and in distinction from, the millions of colonial subjects beyond their own boundaries.`\(^\text{118}\) This equally applied to white Rhodesians, whose overtly rhetoric expressed an imperial rhetoric towards Britain and the Crown. In the immediate post-war years, kinship and patriotic feelings towards Britain were so strong among many white Rhodesians.

In 1946, Britain invited Southern Rhodesia to participate at the Victory Parade after the war in London. The event meant so much to white Rhodesians because it strengthened kith and kin connections with Britain. The Southern Rhodesian government invited applications from serving and ex-service members of the Rhodesian forces to participate in the event. Rhodesia was prepared to send a group of hundred people representing all ranks, drawn from the serving and ex-service personnel of the sea, land, and air force.\(^\text{119}\) It also included personnel from the women’s services, as well as the Coloured and African units. The interesting part was the arbitrary term “Southern Rhodesia forces” that covered Rhodesians who serviced in the Royal Air Force as they enlisted in the Southern Rhodesia Air Force.\(^\text{120}\) By participating in the victory parade, Rhodesians felt part of
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Britain and this enabled them to identify themselves as British citizens although they were conscious of their Rhodesian identity.

The flying of the Union Jack in Rhodesia was a gesture of loyalty to Britain. It was mostly visible at government buildings and notable functions, such as the Buy Rhodesia campaign gatherings. In South Africa, the Union Jack was dear to the great majority of white Natalians, so much so that they wanted the government to include it in the national flag. Similarly, the Rhodesian business community expressed its loyalty to the Union Jack regardless of the Buy Rhodesian Campaigns aimed at promoting local industries in the 1950s. Arrangements for the Buy Rhodesian campaign brought to light the topic of the official flag of Rhodesia amongst industrialists. Industrialists considered Rhodesian goods cheaper at the expense of imported commodities. Most Rhodesian goods were obviously cheaper than imported and commodities. Above all, by supporting local industries Rhodesians would be keeping the money in the country. Leaving the economic side of the campaign, the question of the Union Jack also emerged. As the Rhodesian Recorder revealed:

Outside the colony the Blue Ensign, with the addition of the Rhodesian crest, is used; but within our own borders, we fly simply the Union Jack. In an effort that centres round our own local products – even to the temporary neglect of goods from Great Britain – the Union Jack seems scarcely to fill the bill.

Their concerns could also cascade into other sections of the white community eager to keep both their Rhodesian flag and the Union Jack side by side. This reveals that white Rhodesians, at this point, did not have problems in having multiple loyalties. Colley argues that ‘in practice, men, and women often have double, triple, or even quadruple loyalties, mentally locating themselves, according to the circumstances, in village, in a particular landscape, in a region, and in one or even two countries.’ Southern Rhodesia’s white settlers wanted to have a Rhodesian flag and the Union Jack in order to show their loyalty to Britain and maintain their Rhodesian identity. Industrialists and politicians were interested to see what sort of flags or ensigns the Buy Rhodesia campaigns were going to employ to herald the land whose products they extolled. Ironically, the Buy Rhodesia campaigns sought to promote local industries against foreign ones, including British.
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Regardless, Rhodesians still wanted to fly the Union Jack side by side with the Rhodesian flag as a gesture of loyalty to Britain and keep their double loyalties intertwined.

The Sons of England of Patriotic and Benevolent Society kept reminding the government of the need to keep Rhodesia British and loyal to Britain. In 1950, they passed some resolutions for submission to the Chief Immigration officer of the Rhodesian government to consider. Among other important resolutions, they wanted the government to take steps to ensure that every immigrant took the Oath of Allegiance to the British King. In 1952, they requested for the High Commissioner in London to take steps to correct any false impressions created about Rhodesian whites as soon as such reports appeared in the British press. However, the position of Rhodesia in the British press at this time was more impressive than the Society imagined. Evidently, white Rhodesians communicated with their kith and kin in Britain through letters. Relations between Britain and Rhodesia at this time were still friendly; therefore, it follows that the British media represented Rhodesia in good and positive ways.

In the post-war years, Southern Rhodesia’s settlers expressed the rhetoric of loyalty towards the British Monarch. Since the 1890s, Rhodesians had regarded with high esteem the position of the monarch in their social, economic, and political life. The most notable way of expressing their political loyalty was through the office of the Governor in the country that acted on behalf of the Crown. The 1947 royal visit strengthened Rhodesian loyalty to the monarch at least during this period. They considered the visit of the British royal family in their country to affirm that they were loyal to the Crown. The British government and the monarch considered these visits as an opportunity to express the continued importance imperial links and to thank the Empire and Commonwealth for its support during the war and their economic support towards Britain in the post-war years.

In 1952, Rhodesians received the news about the death of King George VI with much sorrow. The Rhodesian Recorder described King George VI not only as a King but also as a man with outstanding qualities. ‘His courage and ability to surmount personal problems set a standard for all to follow and his example as a husband and a father proved an inspiration to
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millions. He stressed the importance of family life constantly, and his own family formed the core of his sovereignty.\textsuperscript{131}

The business fraternity also confirmed how much they respected the Royal Family and the mutual respect that existed between them and promised to keep working for the Empire.

Although formed carefully trained and well equipped for the trust and responsibility now fallen upon her, our young Queen’s present sorrow calls first for our deepest sympathy and this we extend, also, to all members of the Royal family…. In recent times, our Kings and Queens have shown a sincere interest in the development of trade and industry. No exhibition has been too small for them to visit and, as Princess, our new Queen showed her determination to follow the examples of the past. Every student of history knows that some of the greatest of Britain’s eras of development have coincided with the rule of our queens; Elizabeth I and Victoria are two names, which spring instantly to mind. Time will show whether the reign of Queen Elizabeth II will be similarly marked. We can assure Her Majesty; however, that Rhodesia is more than determined to play its part in the continued expansion of the strength of the British Commonwealth of Nations….\textsuperscript{132}

This reveals the degree to which the Rhodesian business and industrial community identified with the Monarch. These same comments can be extended to a number of white Rhodesians who felt connected to the British monarch. The British Pathe described George VI as ‘a family man that [all British people] shall best remember.’\textsuperscript{133} But, Rhodesians were by no means exceptional in expressing their political loyalty to the monarch upon the death of King George VI. Australian newspapers also covered the news of the death of the King. Winston Churchill gave a moving speech after receiving news of the passing away of the King part of which expressed and the Empire loved the monarch. “The King was greatly loved by all his peoples. He was respected as a man and a Prince far beyond the many realms over which he reigned.”\textsuperscript{134}

In support of Britain’s post-war food shortages, the Rhodesian government embarked on a Food for Britain Fund campaign. It urged Rhodesians to send food parcels to their kith and kin and friends in Britain. The government announced a special effort throughout Rhodesia to collect a further sum of money for the Food for Britain Fund. Initially, it was difficult to send food parcels to Britain because of the high costs. However, the government considered waving its proportion of the postage charges on gift parcels to Britain. The Minister of Defense and Air, Sir Ernest Lucas
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Guest, argued that if the Rhodesian terminal charge were withdrawn the rate would be 1s a lb. instead of 1s 4d.\textsuperscript{135} Prior to this announcement, there was a great deal of dissatisfaction among the public concerning not only the cost of transmission of food and other parcels to their kith and kin in Britain. They were also not happy because of the restrictions in size and number of parcels individuals could send as well as the formalities attending their dispatch.

To their relief, the government announced the new changes of sending food parcels to Britain without a permit with no restriction on the contents or the number of parcels. The only limitation was that the parcel should not weigh more than 11lb.\textsuperscript{136} From 6 January 1947; Rhodesians could send food parcels to Britain by a new and cheaper method. By using small packet service 2lb food parcels could be sent for a charge of 1s 4d instead of 2s 8d.\textsuperscript{137} There was no limit to the number of packets that one could sent to any person, and export permits were no longer relevant. Rhodesians felt duty bound to help the British people whom they shared with a sense of attachment and still considered Britain as home during this period. As the \textit{Bulawayo Chronicle} expressed ‘we have not been able to do a great deal to relief the food shortages, though that is rather more our misfortune than our fault.’\textsuperscript{138}

However, this rhetoric of loyalty to Britain and the idea of Britishness was not straightforward. In his private correspondence with Lennox Allan-Boyd, in 1980, Roy Welensky reflected on the contradictions of white Rhodesia. After 1945, he believed, the white Rhodesian life-style had frozen in time, unlike in Britain, where the middle classes had not changed their whole way of life. Welensky observed that many of the images of white Rhodesia life were of a Britain that seems to be disappearing:

Sunday Matins at the Anglican Cathedral in Salisbury, the men and women in their Sunday best with the special glow of the insider which typifies the Church of England at its worst and hardly a black face to be seen, is one example. Boys in blazers and straw hats, their hair short; girls in uniforms, round hatted, gawky but demure, walking through the streets of Salisbury is another. No dropouts, teenage rebels, drug problems, the straight forward drinking of the rugby team or of the farmers in for a binge from the country. There were of course exceptions to all these images, but largely Rhodesia had not yet approached the very real problems which loss of Empire, comparative affluence and mass communication has brought to Britain.\textsuperscript{139}
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To Welesnky’s opinion, white Rhodesian’s life-style mimicked that of a long gone British society. By embracing what they imagined as the British way of life, white Rhodesians developed a sense of pride and superiority.

At the political level, Southern Rhodesia remained British concerning Parliament and the civil service. As Woodhouse notes, the Speaker of Parliament ranked immediately after the Prime Minister. White Rhodesians still tolerated and admired the old-fashion pioneering myths, virtues and vices strengthened by their isolation. This isolation allowed white Rhodesians to fantasise about the economic and social achievements in the country since the early colonial years. To them, accusations that they had only achieved all this by oppressing the blacks were absurd. Largely, they lacked the cross-fertilisation with developments in Britain, which, inevitably, would have diluted their obsession with a Britain, which had passed into history. Unfortunately, their values remained constant in a changing world.

The deep-seated reluctance to change felt by the vast majority of whites in Rhodesia was fuelled by what they heard and on their occasional visits to Britain, where they saw of the impact of change. In the post-war years, London became shabby, British youths had long hair but were short in morale, the English disease was apparently, now endemic and the debilitating welfare state all pervading. To Welensky, the British loss of self-confidence and apparent lack of personal endeavour was a function, not of a complex amalgam of historical causes, but of a conscious change in attitude, which they were determined to resist. These complexities contributed to the development of an inward looking among many white Rhodesians. Therefore, their sense of the British way of life was dominated by vision of the metropole that was actually undergoing rapid social transformation. Rhodesians were slower than Britons to adjust to Britain’s changed international status since 1945. Many white Rhodesians could not believe the changes, which took place in Britain since the post-war years, they remained trapped in the past in outlook and opinions while the world forward.

**Buy British: Trade Connections and Ties between Rhodesia and Britain**

Rhodesian white settlers were eager to strengthen economic and commercial ties with Britain. The 1947 London Tobacco Agreement highlights the point at which the commercial and trade ties
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strengthened between Britain and Southern Rhodesia. This was part of Britain’s post-war imperial design to bolster economic ties between Southern Rhodesia and Britain. What is important to note is that this also coincided with post-war British economic challenges. Therefore, white Rhodesians wanted to use this opportunity not only to show that they connected with Britain culturally, but also wanted to extend this association to accommodate economic aspects. The post-war years presented so many business opportunities and saw the intensification of trade and business networks between Southern Rhodesia and Britain as portrayed in the business mouthpiece of Southern Rhodesia, the *Rhodesian Recorder*. This relationship, however, was not in the form of an unofficial imperialism wielded by the City of London directed towards the colonies creating economic dependence. It was more of an exchange of business ideas, goods, capital, and trade networks between the two countries.

The Rhodesian business community was anxious to buy British products and urged Britain to supply them with such wares. Failure to do so would mean that Britain was risking the loss of valuable markets in both South Africa and Southern Rhodesia. As the Bulawayo Chronicle observed, ‘South Africa and Southern Rhodesia [were] anxious to ‘buy British’ and it [was] vital that Great Britain [would] supply them [good] if [it was] to grasp and hold them.’ This was the conclusion reached by Lady Wakefield, wife of Wavell Wakefield, Member of Parliament, who returned to England from a trade mission. She attended the meeting on behalf of the Guild of British Creative Designers, to the Union, the Northern and Southern Rhodesia and Egypt. The reactions to her visit to Salisbury and Bulawayo in part also allowed British manufacturers to learn Rhodesians’ special needs. ‘Tailored washing frocks, printed dresses, lightweight suits, and moderately priced eveningwear are in great demand in Rhodesia. The climate is an important consideration – sunshine favours bright colours.’ Therefore, the need for an intimate knowledge of the demands of these markets whether – in suits, informal dresses or sport wear – was of the utmost importance. The graphs below shows Southern Rhodesia imports and exports with from
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selected countries in the post-war years which shows that imports and exports from Britain were at the top between 1945 and 1949.

**Figure 1. Southern Rhodesia Imports, 1945 to 1949**

An important and striking feature of the white Rhodesian economic boom was the position of women. Although there are no official figures to show the number of women who entered into business in Rhodesia during this period, the case of Dorothea Haas partly demonstrates this point. Earlier, white women, such as Ethel Tawse Jollie, had worked earlier for the Responsible Government cause defying patriarchal notions of white womanhood. In 1948, Dorothea Haas of Bulawayo founded a woman-clothing firm, Glennie Frocks Ltd. This firm turned out a range of forty to fifty styles a season, which it sold in Nairobi and Cape Town. The company manufactured both afternoon and evening frocks branded with British fabrics and novelty evening materials from Lyon in France. The British fabrics were floral prints, Wemco fabrics, and Tee Bros fabrics. Plain materials come from William Rogerson, Lancashire Loomcraft, Jersella, and other famous houses. There were also tastes of London designer dresses in Rhodesia such as Michael Sherad’s red faceloth topcoat with large patch pockets, which diminished the hip line by flaring out far enough seen from the back. Rhodesian women were able to enjoy beauty preparation
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made especially for them by Betty Day, formerly of Harrod’s London. Attached to a well-known store in Salisbury for three years, Day studied the effects of a warm, dry, semi-tropical climate on the skins of white Rhodesian women. She was convinced that their main need was a skin food with special emollient qualities.\(^{156}\) Day and her qualified analytical chemist partner experimented in their Salisbury laboratory in Cameron Street and produced a cream essentially suitable for use in the Rhodesian climate. Betty Day skin food was the first of many beauty preparations perfected with the sole object of serving white Rhodesian women by giving them creams and lotions to meet their own special problems and enable them to retain the youthful, glowing and supple skins usually associated with more temperate climates.\(^{157}\) Before coming to Rhodesia, Day publicised beauty preparations in London for twenty years. She joined Ann Seymour – editor of *Women and Beauty* – in “Women’s Fair” at Olympia, to advise women of all types on the correct use of creams and lotions.\(^{158}\) With her new skin food, Day was confident that she found a solution to the problems of Rhodesian women of discrimination.

Trade and business networks were not only limited to fashion and clothing. It also included food making and machinery exchanges. For example, in April 1946, the Rhodesian business community was expecting the mission to reach Bulawayo, before it left for Salisbury and Johannesburg. E. H. Gilpin, Director of the largest manufacturers of baking biscuits and confectionery machinery in Britain and chairperson of the Executive Committee of the Liberal Party in Britain led the mission.\(^ {159}\) The other was Norman Nevil, the Director of the Food Machinery Export Group and the British Chemical Plant Manufacturers’ Association. An electrical engineer with experience in Australia and Russia, Nevil was associated with the British engineering company of Siberia. It was one of the earliest companies formed for the sale through one organisation of the products of a group of non-competitive engineering firms.\(^ {160}\) These visits cemented commercial and trade ties between Rhodesia and Britain.

British hardware manufacturers such as the oil king heater made by Vaporheat Ltd. of London found their way into the Rhodesian markets. The *Rhodesian Recorder* noted the low fuel consumption of the vaporheat due to a specially designed burner, which operated on the vaporising principle.\(^ {161}\) It was therefore ideal for Rhodesian customers who imported fuel. Screw ring miner for kitchen hardware produced by Spong and Company Ltd, London. Lightweight holds, a light alloy

\(^{156}\) *Ibid.*  
\(^{157}\) *Rhodesian Recorder*, February 1951.  
\(^{158}\) *Ibid.*  
\(^{159}\) *Bulawayo Chronicle*, 23 November 1946.  
\(^{160}\) *Ibid.*  
\(^{161}\) *Ibid.*
bricklayers and plasterers’ holds, produced by the Wouldham manufacturers Company Ltd, Rochester, Kent.\textsuperscript{162} Generators manufactured by Dale Electric (Yorkshire) Ltd. found their markets in Rhodesia.\textsuperscript{163} These generators were suitable for industrial plants, hotels, farms, country houses and a lot more in Rhodesia. Most of these companies had agents and offices in Rhodesia especially in Salisbury and Bulawayo where most industries operated. The new Series 3 heavy duty wheeled, diesel tractors, a product of Marshall Sons and Company Ltd. of Gainsborough, England found its way into Rhodesia. By the beginning of 1951, Kimptons (Salisbury) Ltd. hoped to be able to supply the ‘series 3’ from stock.\textsuperscript{164} Rhodesia was also a viable market for some British model cars, especially the famous Austin touted as powerful and economical.\textsuperscript{165} These products are just a sample of the many British items that found markets in Rhodesia in the post-war years.

Rhodesian manufacturers and industrialists visited Britain to learn some business ideas. For instance, in March 1950, E. P Whyte and Company Ltd manufacturers’ representatives of Bulawayo left for Britain to spend approximately three months visiting principals and obtaining new agencies.\textsuperscript{166} He intended to visit Haslams Ltd. of Manchester, Ferguson Brothers Ltd. of Carlisle, Stott, and Smith Ltd. of Manchester, H. T. H. Peck Ltd of London and George William Price Ltd of Nottingham.\textsuperscript{167} In conformity with the company’s policy of sending its buyers to study the market at first hand, B. Purkis, fashion buyer at Stuttaford’s London office, visited South and Southern Rhodesia. Purkis, who was making her first visit to Southern Africa, told the \textit{Rhodesian Recorder} that ‘the idea was for the London buyers not only to have personal contacts in the Union and Rhodesia, but also to know local conditions because of climatic differences.’\textsuperscript{168} While on a holiday visit to Britain, F. J. Dryden, Assistant in the Credit Control Department of Haddon and Sly Ltd. of Bulawayo, studded the latest accounting and credit control methods in use among prominent British firms.\textsuperscript{169}

In July 1950, the exhibition of British footwear and general leather goods toured Rhodesia to market British products. John Creek, the Assistant Manager of the cooperation, believed that probably in six months’ time, some of the shops would present displays of British leather goods to prepare the way for another exhibition in about a year.\textsuperscript{170} After the first stage of the display in Salisbury, Creek paid a short visit to Bulawayo and then returned to London to prepare a market
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survey on Rhodesia for the corporation. British industrialists and manufacturers, who praised the colony’s industry for making meaningful strides, frequently visited Rhodesia to explore business opportunities in the colony. ‘Since the war ended, I have visited many different countries all over the world, but nowhere have I been more impressed than in Rhodesia,’ said D. M. King, Managing Director of George W. King Ltd, manufacturers of mechanical handling equipment. In May 1951, for the first time, a Rhodesian pavilion was present at the British Industries Fair. Industry cooperated with government to present a worthy display after a lapse of two years. The Rhodesia House was responsible for the most of the arrangements prior to the Fair in liaison with Rhodesia government and the Federation of Rhodesian Industries. At the exhibition, Rhodesia stressed on tobacco, secondary industry and other products the colony produced. Some Rhodesian companies were exporting their products to Britain as early as the 1930s. The Rhodesian Industrial Company Ltd. established in 1935, whose products distributed under the name of Olivine, earned a reputation for its purity and flavour. It exported its products to Australia, New Zealand, Cyprus, and Mauritius, South Africa and many other countries including England during the war when it sent gift parcels.

The subject of Imperial Preference remained topical in the business ties between Britain and Rhodesia during this period. It assumed a special importance in view of the United States and its strong efforts to force Britain to abolish preferences within the Empire. A. C. Soffe, the president of the Association of Chambers of Commerce of Southern (ACC), supported imperial preference when he addressed the conference held in 1946. The conference found that Great Britain was not only an essentially important market for every constituent part of the Empire, but for some parts, represented almost the sole market. The ability of Britain to take these imports, which meant the ability to pay for imports with exports, was a matter of fundamental concern to the entire Empire. ‘It is time we discuss a defensive attitude and assume America to compensate the Empire for throwing open its markets by reducing tariffs.’ Rhodesian business people felt duty bound to support the mother country at a time when Britain needed the support from the Empire. Soffe saw the need by the Empire to appreciate that there was a danger of the elimination of the preference system because of the terrific pressure on Britain at a time when its burdens were almost unbearable. The ACC supported and adopted the appointment of a Rhodesian trade
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representative and staff in London to inform British manufacturers of the great potentialities of the South and Central African territories.\textsuperscript{178} By establishing industries in the colony, the ACC hoped that British manufacturers would not suffer.

However, post-war international political developments also affected trade relations between Britain and Rhodesia. The rise of the United States and Russia triggered a series of defense procedures in America and Britain that affected business. For example, in 1951, the \textit{Rhodesian Recorder} informed Rhodesian importers and retailers that they would see less British hardware for some few months, particularly lines made wholly or chiefly of non-ferrous metals.\textsuperscript{179} This applied also to certain finishes, including chromium and nickel-plating, as well as to galvanised ware. The shortage of non-ferrous metals was worldwide and a result of defence programs and the American policy of stockpiling of strategic materials.\textsuperscript{180} From 1 February 1951, under the Prohibition of Management Order that included all fancy brassware, the British government prohibited the use of zinc, copper, and copper alloys in the manufacture of hardware and hollowware generally.\textsuperscript{181} Other items that came within the scope of the ban were all types of architectural and decorative metal work; a wide range of household appliances and domestic utensils; electric appliances, accessories and fittings; garden and agricultural requisites (except for essential uses); and much domestic and agricultural galvanized ware.\textsuperscript{182}

The Rhodesian business community felt that their country could become the Empire’s arsenal. To achieve this, Britain needed to provide capital and skilled labour, and give priority to the export of the necessary plant for setting up armament factories and munition works in Southern Rhodesia. ‘The colony can make a big contribution to Britain’s armament programme and become one of the finest arsenals in the Empire’, said the Managing Director of Porter’s Cement industries (Rhodesia) Ltd.\textsuperscript{183} His thinking was that the government could turn engineering workshops set up for armaments in Rhodesia into mining and agricultural manufacturing plants after their need passed. He concluded by saying that ‘the colony should stockpile essential raw materials against world crises. Where industrialists could not afford to do this, the government should help.’\textsuperscript{184}

British business personnel read the \textit{Rhodesian Recorder} to explore investment and market opportunities in Rhodesia. For example, the Chair and Managing Director of Kaufman Sons and
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Co. Ltd narrated a revealing anecdote. While he was in Britain, he said, he found the *Rhodesian Recorder* on the desks of many businesspersons he visited. In some cases, he alleged, ‘it was open, and I could see that the advertisements and editorial columns well penciled. In thus bringing the potentialities of Rhodesia and the other territories it serves to people overseas, your journal is providing an invaluable service.’

Therefore, the *Rhodesian Recorder* was instrumental in marketing Rhodesian goods and market potentials in Britain bringing the two communities together.

**Conclusion**

This chapter demonstrated that in the post-war years, the relations between white Rhodesia’s settlers and British immigrants were warm. However, the former were anxious over an influx of white South Africans and Afrikaners in the Colony. Certainly, old Rhodesian settlers feared the impact Afrikaner nationalism would have on their Colony. Subsequently, the Rhodesian settler community strongly supported Britain and the Crown. Even so, they also showed an ambivalent sense of Britishness, which was exclusionary, fluid and contested. The need to attract more British immigrants in the post-war years brought unintended class tensions and differences in racial attitudes within the Rhodesian settler community. These tensions reveals that the Rhodesian settler community was not homogeneous mainly along class lines. Ideas of racial differences and class were more pronounced during the Federation years, which the next chapter will explore in detail.
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Chapter Four

Racial Partnership, Liberalism and the Development of White Conservatism, 1953 – 62

Introduction

This chapter discusses the failed political project of racial partnership in Southern Rhodesia during the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. It demonstrates that changes in the British colonial policy in Africa strengthened rightwing white attitudes among many settlers. It further explores the slow emergence of anti-British feelings among many white Rhodesian settlers including those who previously looked towards Britain with affection, especially in the late 1950s. This came after Britain refused to grant white Rhodesians minority independence on the same pattern as with Zambia and Malawi at the end of the Central African Federation (CAF) in 1963. This marked the beginning of complicated relations between Rhodesian settlers and Britain which increasingly shifted from love to hate relationship. This chapter demonstrates that post-war economic boom coupled with social and political developments within and outside Southern Rhodesia were instrumental in reshaping white social and political attitudes between 1953 and 1962.

Economic Boom, Prosperity and Race Relations in Southern Rhodesia

By the early 1950s, post-war economic developments and large-scale white immigration had transformed the Rhodesian economy. Ian Hancock shows that developments in Rhodesia owed much to the wartime shortages and allied demands for raw materials, increasing local demand stimulated by the arrival of aircrews for training and, later, of post-war immigrants.\(^1\) Consequently, the advance in annual foreign investment rose from £13.7 million in 1945 to £50.7 million by 1953.\(^2\) A post-war jump in tobacco sales to a dollar-conscious sterling area and booming metal prices during the Korean War all contributed to the rapid expansion and diversification of the economy.\(^3\) Food processing, clothing, tobacco manufacturing, the building industry, and iron and steel production flourished, with secondary industry also expanding greatly.\(^4\) The post-war economic boom gave rise to industrialisation, urbanisation and prosperity. By 1953, Salisbury and Bulawayo emerged as attractive and smart cities. Contemporary commentators noted that Salisbury expanded into a skyscraping city almost literally before the eyes of its people, like an incredibly
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expansive transformation scene in pantomime. Southern Rhodesia came to resemble a modern state with extensive road and rail systems, with big developments in Salisbury absorbing the large influx of European (largely British) immigrants. During the first ten months of 1953, 8, 532 immigrants entered Southern Rhodesia as compared to 12, 576 in the same period of 1952. When classified by country of last permanent residence, 3, 782 came from Britain and 3, 422 from South Africa. By country of origin, 4, 505 were from Britain and 2, 809 from South Africa. In 1957, about fifty percent of the immigrants who entered the Federation had come from Great Britain.

Traditionally, Britain and South Africa were the principal source of immigrants. Yet, authorities desired to attract more immigrants from Britain in order to ensure the continuation of the British way of life in the Federation and to build up the white population of Southern Africa as a whole. However, questions about the desirability and class of new immigrants continued to worry officials. They did not prefer immigrants they considered lazy or poor, and those who depended on social welfare. They did not want immigrants in ‘swaddling clothes and preferred people with character and spirit to continue the tradition of the pioneers.’ This scenario would lead to the poor-white problem, which authorities did not expect from settlers whom they wanted to live above Africans. The Federal Prime Minister, Lord Malvern, reinforced this belief in 1955 while attending a meeting of the Inter-governmental Committee on European Migration (ICEM). He had no objection to the admission of non-British immigrants to the Federation, if the country remained a British sphere of influence. Thus, the Federation’s white politicians wanted to maintain strong cultural and economic ties with Britain.

By 1951, the figure for urban dwellers was under seventy percent and many were getting employment in Salisbury. In Salisbury, economic boom allowed for the emergence of urban beautification in the form of the trim villas of the bungalows, well-watered green lawns, swimming pools, jacaranda, bougainvillea, and poinsettias. White Rhodesians could now afford luxurious lifestyles. According to Blake, “Salisbury was a glorified version of an English “garden city”… more attractive and spacious.” Some of the 1950s immigrants such as journalist John Parker, recalled
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that Rhodesia remained in many ways the most British of all the colonies.\textsuperscript{16} In many respects, the Rhodesian civil service embodied from the start many of its best qualities of dedication, selflessness, and hard work – qualities that resembled the British civil service.\textsuperscript{17} The influence of the civil servants and the jingoism of Cecil John Rhodes, the founder of Rhodesia, were fundamental to the development of the white society’s ultra-British flare and the cultural kinship connection. ‘More English than the English, we used to say,’ Parker noted, ‘and it was far [truer] of the early years. These were the days when to serve the Empire was every young person’s dream and duty, and Rhodesia was the ideal place to come.’\textsuperscript{18}

With increased prosperity also came improved living standards among Rhodesian whites. Blake notes that the average family income according to a sample survey made in 1950-51 was £925 per annum.\textsuperscript{19} Almost every European household had an African servant at a time when such luxuries were fast diminishing in Britain. In the post-war years, ‘Southern Rhodesia was a prosperous thriving country with one of the highest living standards in the world.’\textsuperscript{20} The prosperity of Rhodesia continued independent of the influence of, to use Antonio Gramsci’s term, ‘organic intellectuals’.\textsuperscript{21} The boom was a product of the efforts of industrialists, manufacturers, farmers, and those in commerce; all this hinged on the exploitation of African labour. Rhodesian settler intransigence, as Kenneth Good reveals, related to the cohesive and integrated socio-economic character of the white society and to the extremity of its economic exploitation over Africans.\textsuperscript{22} The post-war boom ensued that the white Rhodesian settler society could continue to associate whiteness with colonial privileges.

Economic prosperity boosted settler confidence and nationalism coupled with regional developments such as the ascendance of D. F. Malan to power in South Africa in 1948, which saw the rise of Afrikaner nationalism and apartheid in that country. This further allowed many white Rhodesian settlers to embrace the sense of Britishness distancing themselves from the apartheid policies of South Africa. In 1953, Southern Rhodesia hosted the Central Africa Rhodes Centenary exhibition in the city of Bulawayo. The exhibition aimed at commemorating the centenary of Rhodes’ birth, the founder of Rhodesia. Coincidentally, it also marked the birth centenary of two
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of his staunchest colleagues, Leander Starr Jameson and Alfred Beit.\textsuperscript{23} The celebrations also demonstrated the scope and character of the achievements for which Rhodes laid the foundations.\textsuperscript{24} The celebrations helped familiarise new immigrants with the central founding myth of the colony and cemented Rhodesia as a loyal British territory.\textsuperscript{25} The event was an opportunity for both Britain and Rhodesia’s white settlers to express their political connection. By inviting the British government to the exhibition, Rhodesian whites also wanted to show their kinship ties and emotional attachment to Britain and the monarch. The High Commissioner for Southern Rhodesia noted that the exhibition was an opportunity not only to stress the commercial but also the cultural ties uniting Britain and Rhodesia.\textsuperscript{26} The absence of Britain at the exhibition would be an offence to Southern Rhodesia at a time when it was trying to promote the Federation. It would provoke odious comparison with the readiness of South Africa and Britain to participate at the Van Riebeeck exhibition at Cape Town only a year previous, in 1952.\textsuperscript{27} Some British politicians reasoned that the fact that Britain participated in the Van Riebeeck exhibition was itself an argument for taking part in the Rhodes expo.\textsuperscript{28}

The Commonwealth Relations Office, the Colonial Office and the Board of Trade were firmly convinced that, notwithstanding Britain’s post-war financial difficulties, Britain should not make a political blunder by failing to participate in the exhibition. Most importantly, they were fully aware of white Rhodesia settlers’ connection and loyalty with Britain. Therefore, they needed to convince the Chancellor of Exchequer and the Overseas Development Department of the cultural, economic and political significance of the exhibition to Britain:

Southern Rhodesians are thoroughly loyal and devoted to the British connection, and we cannot let pass this opportunity to display our interest in their affairs and our appreciation of their loyalty. In the parliament, we have emphasised the need to strengthen the British connection and ensure the continuance of British traditions and principles in Central Africa. Our sincerity might be in question if we decline to spend a relatively modest sum on the representation at Bulawayo of British traditions and achievements in the fields of culture, social progress, science, manufacture and the like. We simply cannot afford to stay out when the Union [of South Africa] are participating, knowing as we do the ambitions of Nationalist Afrikaners to extend the political and economic influence of their country over its northern
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neighbours. The importance of maintaining and extending UK trade with the Rhodesians is itself a sufficiently cogent reason for seeing that British prestige fostered by an adequate British exhibit. We are seriously concerned with about the future of our exports to Central Africa, particularly to Southern Rhodesia.\(^\text{29}\)

Therefore, it was essential for cultural, economic and political reasons for Britain to participate at the Rhodes centenary exhibition. Its presence was necessary to demonstrate the kith and kin ties between Britain and white Rhodesia’s settlers during this time. Britain wanted to project its manufacturing and industrial resources it could offer towards the material development of the Federation, give a picture of some British life on the social, artistic and scientific side, and illustrate the historical connection with Central African whites.\(^\text{30}\) The Queen Mother passionately submitted that the absence of a British pavilion at the exhibition would put her in a very embarrassing position.\(^\text{31}\) Subsequently, as the ‘mother country’ of Northern and Southern Rhodesia, British dignitaries attended and the Queen Mother opened the exhibition.

The exhibition received British press coverage. For instance, Don Taylor, the deputy editor of *New Commonwealth*, a leading journal on Empire affairs and correspondent of the *London Sunday Express*, toured the CAF to reporting on the progress of the exhibition. When he visited Rhodesia, he described the site as astonishing and most handsome – bigger than Britain’s South Bank Exhibition and the various halls strikingly designed.\(^\text{32}\) In Britain, the daily newspapers, weekly reviews, radio, and television substituted the Rhodes centenary exhibition as the main topic of the day. The *Radio Times*, which was the biggest circulation of any publication in Britain, devoted several pages to Rhodes and the celebration.\(^\text{33}\) An even surer sign of Britain’s interest in the colony was the weekly radio palour game ‘Twenty Questions’, one of the most popular programmes since the war.\(^\text{34}\) During the event, the crowds who followed the Queen Mother waved small Union Jacks at each appearance of the visiting British royals.\(^\text{35}\) This was a symbol of the country’s loyalty and closer ties with the British government and the monarch. The exhibition therefore sentimentally brought Southern Rhodesia closer to Britain.

Africans participated in the exhibition, albeit with quite a different attitude towards these centenary celebrations. Southern Rhodesian colonial bureaucrats tried to explain to Africans that they should look upon the exhibition as an expression of the combined efforts of both whites and blacks in
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When the British royal party visited an African village, black women dancers leaped in an ecstatic, vibrant dance, singing words of welcome and praise to the Queen Mother and Princess Margaret. Whether these women really knew the true meaning of the event or they danced under the command and persuasion of African chiefs and colonial officials to impress the Queen remains contested. Many were not actually from Southern Rhodesia, but from as far afield as Lesotho and other African countries. A case in point was the grass hat gifted by a Basuto girl to Princess Margaret. Rhodesian whites saw African participation as a political gesture directed towards Britain to show racial partnership and inclusivity in the Federation.

The Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Racial Partnership and Class Struggle

The idea of Federation or amalgamation of the two Rhodesias and Nyasaland started since the days of the British South Africa Company. However, the two British commissions of 1929 and 1938 all rejected amalgamation because they were opposed to Southern Rhodesia settlers’ racist policies. Additionally, both Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland rejected it citing differences in the racial policies with Southern Rhodesia. When the idea of a Federation was revised in the late 1940s, both Britain and Rhodesia’s white settlers projected racial partnership as the binding principle in the Federation. Proponents of the Federation strongly believed that multi-racial partnership ‘would provide a reliable British imperial buffer between an increasingly segregationist and republican Union and growing African nationalist militancy in the north.’ Thus, the experiment of racial partnership and multiracialism between blacks and whites in the three territories was supposed to hold the Federation together. This was very important if they were to acquire self-government from London and achieve a Dominion status. British authorities hoped that Federation would promote multiracial partnership in the three territories. Despite African resistance, Britain established the Federation on 1 September 1953.
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During the WW2, the support African territories’ offered Britain allowed imperial officials in London to realise the need to maintain Africa after the war for economic planning. After 1945, Britain wanted to recover its economic status by holding onto its African territories in a process what scholars called the ‘second colonial occupation’. The need to reform colonial policy in Africa in the post-war years came also from the United States. This forced officials in the metropolis to persuade their governments to reform their policies on the African continent towards colonial development. Britain wanted to maintain economic ties with its African colonies which had a dollar-earning potential and the need to renovate imperialism and recast it in a more acceptable way for its own reasons, colonial subjects and American critics. After the war, Britain and France made economic development plans for their African territories in order to reassert their great power status. Partly, Britain established the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland in 1953 for its economic reasons and that Rhodesian loyalty to the Crown was proverbial. The establishment of the Federation also converged with settler economic prospects and political considerations. Southern Rhodesian whites wished to benefit from this partnership in terms of economic gain from the rich copper fields of Northern Rhodesia and cheap labour from Nyasaland for its growing manufacturing and construction sectors. Southern Rhodesian whites reaped most of the economic benefits associated with huge growth, secondary industry and commerce. They used revenues from Northern Rhodesia’s copper mines to finance the economic and infrastructural developments in Southern Rhodesia. This was also because Southern Rhodesia had the most diversified economy compared to Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland.

When Britain established the Federation, it reduced its constitutional obligations over Southern Rhodesia as whites retained their own territorial government, Prime Minister and complete control over internal affairs. The latter was crucial: in the event that Federation failed, it gave whites exclusive rights over Africans from Britain. Through this arrangement, Britain passed on its constitutional responsibility over Africans to white settlers. In the reverse, this also exposed how the Conservatives in Britain trusted Rhodesia’s white settlers to preside over blacks. According to
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Clements, Britain and Southern Rhodesia believed that Africans were still unfit for political control; whites had a responsibility to guide, educate and train those blacks considered to be worthy of authority, which was regrettably unforeseeable.\textsuperscript{50} Leading white Rhodesian politicians and the Conservatives in Britain were under the same impression that African participation in government should be limited to those who had attained European standards.\textsuperscript{51} This observation means that the idea of kith and kin was running on both sides of white Rhodesia settlers and Britain. European standards was a vague political language to exclude Africans into the assumed colonial white privileges premised on property rights.

As noted earlier, racial partnership was supposed to be the binding principle in the CAF. However, partnership was a cynical political term. Butler argues that ‘based on a restricted franchise, the Federation would, in theory, allow for gradually increasing African political participation, while preserving effective white hegemony for the foreseeable future.’\textsuperscript{52} Racial partnership ensured white supremacy and hegemony over the social, economic and political aspects of the Federation. The historian John Darwin argues that the acceptance of partnership laid in its ambiguity; to Britain, it meant the steady evolution of blacks towards social and political equality rejecting African nationalism and white supremacy as well as segregation.\textsuperscript{53} The preamble of the constitution ambiguously stated that the particular object of the Federation was to foster partnership and cooperation between their inhabitants.\textsuperscript{54} In the House of Commons, the Minister of State for the Colonies stated that it was only by a policy of practical partnership that the British government hoped to settle race relations in the Federation.\textsuperscript{55}

Frederick Cooper warned scholars not to surrender to words without critically interrogating their meaning, usage and analytical limitations.\textsuperscript{56} The same caution applies to the term partnership which had several meanings during the 1950s. Race, class, privilege and prejudice underpinned these meanings. Ideally, the term suggest a situation where two or more parties would work together on equal contractual basis, mutually benefiting. However, white politicians used partnership as a campaign slogan to achieve Dominion status and preserve their power and privileges.\textsuperscript{57} The British government could not bother much about white settlers’ intentions. The continuance of the Native Department to separately deal with African affairs showed that white paternalist attitudes were far
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from drifting towards multi-culturalism and racial inclusivity. Racial partnership was a political language subject to varied interpretations by both blacks and whites.

Because the term related to two different races, it assumed different meanings to each group. From the outset, Cohen reveals, the majority of white settlers were not able to treat Africans as equals. Huggins, the first Federal Prime Minister suggested that the idea of partnership was subject to ones’ own interpretation as to what it meant. He framed it in paternalist terms by representing Africans as juniors in the partnership with whites. He argued that Africans were supposed to work their way up the ladder if they were to be on equal terms with whites. In explicit terms, he viewed the term as being a ‘partnership between the horse and its rider.’ When stretched far, the term had social boundaries and limitations. Some whites argued that ‘partnership does not mean opening Miekles to the “munts” overnight.’ Mickels was one of the elite hotels in Salisbury giving only access to whites; therefore, in a day it opened up for Africans, it would be as good as a national monument. Whites placed race before class if ever Africans wanted to be on equal terms with them.

On a political level, white Rhodesians had another definition of partnership: to preserve minority rule, settler supremacy and privilege. Huggins and his cabinet viewed partnership as an attempt to gradually give Africans a little more interest in the politics of the country in order to help the government have a better sense of the African population’s views. One of the critics of the colonial state, the novelist Doris Lessing, saw partnership as ‘a last-ditch attempt to stave off an explosion of African bitterness and as a policy of intelligent self-interest by white supremacists.’ It was therefore a way of giving a few privileges and raising the standards of a minority of Africans above their fellows, without altering the basic structure of segregation. To many wishful Africans, and especially the small educated community, partnership suggested the end of the Land Apportionment Act, the pass system and the colour bar. Dunn records that the African nationalists defined partnership as a political system existing in a multiracial society where the blacks permanently remained subservient to the whites. In that society, whites would persuade
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blacks that this was not the case. Although sarcastically put, the term captures what whites really meant, especially towards African advancement in the industry.

However, some white liberals, who did not believe in settler supremacy, worked very hard to bring about interracial associations. On 25 July 1953, Chief Justice of Southern Rhodesia Sir Robert Tredgold formally inaugurated the Interracial Association. The association acted as a pressure group aimed at establishing a meeting place for like-minded individuals, regardless of racial origin, to share the values of western civilisation.\(^{69}\) Liberal white members who did not attach material and political meanings to liberalism and partnership invited their African friends, Indians and Coloureds to their homes.\(^{70}\) Other rightwing – inclined whites called members of the association such as Hardwicke Holderness ‘idealist’ for believing in racial tolerance and not the ‘purity of the white race’.\(^{71}\) They resented this practice for fear that blacks would dilute their social white spaces. Ironically, they were comfortable with black house cleaners in their homes and gardens but not as equals, especially the educated Africans. Some expressed outright discrimination of Africans purely on the grounds of their skin tone. British officials noted that these were the ‘pin-pricks’ that had the potential to seriously undermine the survival of the Federation which critically needed some urgent reforms.\(^{72}\) A 1959 government survey showed that twenty-five percent of whites in the country would not object to staying in a multi-racial hotel, but about twenty-five percent would violently object to doing so.\(^{73}\) The remaining fifty percent would not like the idea but would not object. What remained of the interracial associations were personal networks and contacts between and among members who participated in them after they failed.\(^{74}\) These observations meant that, although the white electorate agreed to the idea of multiculturalism, partnership had its own racial, material, class and political limitations.

The Native Affairs Department (NAD) discouraged whites from visiting blacks in their locations. Lessing recalls an event when she wanted to visit her African friend residing in Harari after she applied for permission from the NAD officials. Snappily, officials reminded her that:

> We do not encourage visiting between white and black; besides, there is a lot of immorality going on, there ought not to be, but there is. If you want to meet “natives” socially why don’t you invite them to a white house and then there is no problem.\(^{75}\)

\(^{69}\) Hancock, *White Liberals Moderates and Radicals in Rhodesia*, 27.

\(^{70}\) Ibid.


\(^{72}\) TNA CO 1015/1877 Race Relations, Future Policy of the Federation, 18 February 1959.

\(^{73}\) *Rand Daily Mail*, 26 October 1959.

\(^{74}\) Hancock, *White Liberals Moderates and Radicals in Rhodesia*, 40.

\(^{75}\) Lessing, *Going Home*, 97.
When she kept on insisting about making the visit, the officials gave her only two hours; she treasured this time as a souvenir of partnership, but was nonetheless under state surveillance. ‘We always have our men at the meetings so that we know what is going on’, stated one official, ‘but social visits are discouraged, [as] they lead to all sorts of complications.’ A patriarchal Rhodesian white community and its civil service peddled fears of the black peril of the early colonial era.

By 1955, whites were beginning to be uncomfortable with the pace of black advancement. They formed Voice of the People, an association in Salisbury aimed at preserving white supremacy and advancement often constructed in relation to British civilisation. It argued that it was useless and dangerous to try to achieve in sixty or hundred years such a level of advancement, which took one thousand years for British people to reach. Some whites enjoyed voting rights on the purchase of their whiteness. Dunn recalls a young African National Congress (ANC) member who once worked on a building site with many white men in his own age group. ‘I tried to get them talking about politics, the young man narrated, ‘but they knew nothing about it! The affairs of their own country did not interest them … yet they all had the vote and I had not!’ To use David Roediger’s phrase, it is clear that these whites enjoyed the ‘wages of whiteness’ to excise franchise rights.

Some white Federal politicians shared ideas that even the educated Africans were not yet fully ‘civilised’. For example, one Winterton argued that African lawyers and educated people were not civilised enough. The African Federal Assembly member, Wellington Chirwa, defended black advancement arguing that ‘law is one of the most difficult courses to take, by the time one obtains Bachelor of Laws degree (LLB) that person must be civilised.’ Timothy Scarnecchia argues that the Federation presented African educated elites room to maneuver in ways that would never have seemed possible in the previous years.

Educated Africans presented a formidable challenge to European colonial privileges and upset the established vision of white colonialism. The position of educated Africans in Southern Rhodesia brought class and racial tension as they fought for inclusion in the settler privileges. This category
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included clerks, teachers, preachers, social workers, journalists, nurses, lawyers and doctors who demanded respect and a higher status than other blacks did. These Africans travelled in the first and second-class facilities on the railways and did not want to wait at the Post Office longer. Some educated Africans could travel in first or second class on the train, but could not enjoy the privileges associated with such facilities because of their skin colour. It was ethically and morally wrong that after this category of Africans paid for first class facilities, they were denied the chance exercise their rights. There were complaints about Africans of decent characters, respectable members of the community, denied the rights of entry into certain places because of their skin colour and race. Dunn recalls an incident involving one of his closest African friends, when ‘a man with a Honours degree, a home and a car of his own … was once ordered out of the lift in a Salisbury office block to which he had been invited by the president of the local Chamber of Industries.’ Apparently, the customary entry for blacks was an open fire escape clamped to the rear wall.

Some whites vehemently dismissed complaints about racial equality as insincere allegations. Ray Stockil, a rancher and businessman from Fort Victoria belonging to the Dominion Party, which believed in white supremacy, echoed these sentiments in 1959 amidst the political instability threatening the CAF. He pointed out how mischievous overseas politicians with preconceived ideas about Africa and violent methods made the Federation their ‘playground.’ Huggins was willing to accommodate the small class of educated Africans, but not the mass of illiterate Africans:

I have the greatest sympathy … [for] the emerged or emergent African. If these honourable men come here and suggest that, we can extend all these things to the illiterate mass who are a little better than they were when I came here forty-three years ago, except that they come into town with clothes instead of a bit of skin. They are quite wrong … you cannot expect the European to form up in a queue with dirty people, possibly an old umfazig (woman) with an infant on her back, mewling and puking and making a mess of everything. You cannot expect them to do it at this stage of advancement.

Despite all his passionate talk about partnership, these statements shows that, Huggins remained a white supremacist. To him, partnership and black advancements was just another political language and phrase of the day.
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In Southern Rhodesia, as in other territories, there were separate entrances for Africans, Europeans, Asiatics and Coloureds at the Federal Post Office facilities. To make matters worse, there was no door for African facilities save to use a small window.\(^{90}\) Bowman argues that the Federal government failed where it had contact with Africans especially in transport, postal services, higher education defence, and the public service.\(^{91}\) The undignified treatment of Africans by settlers was detrimental on both sides in that it bred a spirit of hatred between the two races. Hancock contends ‘that both Federal governments were complacent at a time when they should have been actively promoting African political advancement and endeavouring to incorporate advanced Africans into the system.’\(^{92}\) The government could not pay serious attention to the African protests in Salisbury and bus boycotts under the leadership of the City Youth League (CYL) in 1956 formed by James Chikerema. The CYL was against African members of the Interracial Association and the Capricorn Africa Society and the hypocrisy behind the idea of liberalism. Yet, as Lowry argues, the Capricorn Society also thrived to contain the spread of communism among Africans in Rhodesia.\(^{93}\)

Southern Rhodesian whites fashioned whiteness to exclude not only blacks especially when the country received other non-British immigrants in the 1950s. When it suited them, they would apply Britishness to exclude other whites of European descent whom they perceived to be of ‘poor’ heritage. Those whites who did not fit the Rhodesian settler standards, although they had fair skins, their moral conduct and political ideologies could make them ‘undesirable’. Their undesirability shifted depending with moral, economic and political factors. Other white liberals got angry when the government brought Italians to Southern Rhodesia during the construction of the Kariba dam between 1955 and 1959.\(^{94}\) The overtly British white Rhodesian perceived Italians as ‘poor’ whites. They called Italians and Greeks ‘wops and dagos’ and ‘scum of the earth….’\(^{95}\) One white liberal stated, ‘I do not mind being considered the equal of an educated African, but I object to any dregs from Europe being my equal simply because they have white skins.’\(^{96}\) Cases of undesirable Greeks, Italians and Portuguese immigrants attached mainly to the railways appeared in the 1950s. These cases revolved around indecent behaviours which were considered incompatible with Rhodesian white community. Their social contacts were Asiatics, Coloured and African prostitutes, *shebeens*
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(illicit bar or club) and generally, they lived in squalid conditions far less than those of Africans did. Allegedly, they deliberately broke every industrial law and were prepared to work under conditions, which local white artisans would not tolerate. The effect of non-British immigrants who were unable to speak English on the apprentices was a matter of concern by officials who considered Southern Rhodesia a British space.

Similarly, British immigrants who allegedly held extreme ideas were not welcome in Rhodesia. For example, the deportation of Charles Taylor by the Todd government conflated class, undesirability and different competing political ideologies. Taylor, a recent migrant from Britain, was a key figure in the 1954 Rhodesia railways strike over poor salaries. Rhodesian immigration officials deported Taylor for leading the strike and most importantly because of his Communist connection in Britain. Taylor’s wife claimed that her husband ceased to be a card carrying member of the Communist Party before he left for Rhodesia. Upon entering Rhodesia, his wife denied that her husband had any connection with the Communist Party in Britain. Todd alleged that his administration deported Taylor because his wife said that he had been a member of the Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB) but he lied to immigration authorities about his connections. The British Security Liaison Officer in Salisbury briefings revealed that Taylor had a Communist background and that he maintained his Communist connection in Britain until his departure for Rhodesia.

The membership of the CPGB was mostly miners and its members suffered victimisation from their employers who regarded them as troublemakers, especially in the years leading to the Second World War. As in western countries, the fear of communism was widespread; and in Africa, this affected white Rhodesians who connected the rise of African nationalism to the spread of communism. Rhodesian officials therefore disliked the presence of white communists for fear that they would bring trade unionism among white workers. There was another point to this fear. By the 1950s, African nationalism was rising; this made the government to panic and unwilling to accept whites with extreme political ideas like Taylor who had the potential to influence Africans
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to rise against the colonial establishment. Worse still, he alleged that whilst in Rhodesia he did the unmentionable thing by borrowed money from his house-boy to buy milk for his children. Whether Taylor exaggerated his experiences while in Rhodesia, he had transgressed the country’s racial boundaries. Moreover, his allegations reveals that not all whites maintained the settler imagined high living standards. It also demonstrates that other whites could mingle and interact with Africans regardless of their class and race. However, there were efforts to incorporate blacks into the social and political aspects of Rhodesian society which produced mixed results.

**Liberalism and the Development of White Conservatism**

Garfield Todd became the Prime Minister, the Minister of Labour and Native Education of Southern Rhodesia from 1953 to 1958. He was born and educated in New Zealand. In 1934, he migrated to Southern Rhodesia where he worked as a missionary at Dadaya mission (Church of Christ). As Hardwicke Holderness argues, the fact that Todd became the Prime Minister without being a minister before was to some extent a testament to a readiness for change in a liberal direction on the part of at least a significant section of the white electorate. Todd believed in the provision of better quality life for Africans. In fact, he considered that whites were supposed to treat African teachers, clergymen, business owners as equals, as well as all blacks who proved themselves responsible. His political philosophy deviated from the established settler supremacy and racial prejudices. Rhodes’ motto – equal rights for all civilised men – was central to Todd’s concept of racial partnership and liberalism. He defined it as ‘the establishment of equal rights for all civilised men and a fair share of responsibilities.’ Yet, Peter Baxter argues that this could mean anything; Todd’s objective was to make whites believe that he was there to protect their interests against blacks. Todd imagined a Rhodesia ‘under which the government [remained] in the hands of civilised and responsible persons … with emphasis on educational prowess, skill, economic success and acceptable character in place of race, religion and nationality.’ When reflecting on the past, Todd agreed that he was a paternalist and remained one. He supported African education, training and sought to address housing problems, especially in Salisbury and Bulawayo.
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Through education and training, Africans could compete with whites and promote equality. According to him, there was no knowledge without education for the Africans.\textsuperscript{112}

To elevate Africans, Todd’s administration introduced reforms aimed to exempt the black middle class from the restrictive colonial regulations, such as the Pass Laws, Land Apportionment and liquor licenses. What was most significant about Todd’s style was that ‘he cultivated the image of a white politician who wanted a direct and dialectical relationship with black opinion.’\textsuperscript{113} However, the Electoral Act of 1957 was the most significant piece of Todd’s legislation and reform – one that was central to settler entrenchment and racial supremacy. The rightwing elements believed that by embarking on franchise reform, Todd and his liberal faction were destroying white supremacy and more interested in appeasing Africans.\textsuperscript{114} The reform meant elevating a small elite group of Africans to vote with ability and merit. Reflecting on the electoral reform, Holderness states that it was a modest piece of legislation. ‘It was something of a triumph relative to the realities of white politics at the time but minimal to compared with “one man vote”’.\textsuperscript{115} This observation suggests that Todd tried his level best against the white supremacist ideologies. It was also against the Rhodesian electoral laws that never really allowed Africans to participate in the mainstream politics of the country, a discrimination made to preserve white privileges against blacks. The electoral reform caused more political anxiety and interest than any other reform Todd introduced which also signaled his downfall.\textsuperscript{116}

Todd was fully aware of the political influence the emerging African class which had the potential to instigate other ordinary blacks to upset the colonial white establishment. Some educated Africans, such as Nathan Shamuyarira, joined Todd’s ruling United Federal Party (UFP). They associated with the Todd administration, held high prospects of racial partnership, and enjoyed a degree of confidence among other Africans without the same opportunities.\textsuperscript{117} According to Todd, Central African whites were supposed to cooperate courageously and generously with the inevitable.\textsuperscript{118} In 1954, the government amended the Land Apportionment Act which was the pillar of white privilege to allow hotels, clubs and restaurants to become multi-racial if they wished. Even so, this did not extend to residential areas. Todd wanted to accommodate the African middle class in European-only bars and hotels such as the Ambassador, Meikles and Jameson, restaurants and
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train compartments, as well as to open up better residential areas for them.\textsuperscript{119} Besides addressing education and housing challenges, Todd tackled the issue of industrial relations. Africans were not qualified as ‘workers’ under the industrial laws of Southern Rhodesia. In 1957, the government revisited the Liquor Amendment Bill to allow Africans to drink European beer and wine, excluding spirits.\textsuperscript{120} Whites were under the perceived fears that if Africans would become violent and ungovernable if they drank spirits.

Todd provoked a serious backlash from the rightwing whites who felt that he was moving too fast towards partnership with his African advancement initiatives. Most whites saw Todd’s social and electoral reforms as dangerous because they promoted black advancement.\textsuperscript{121} Yet, Todd was fully aware that there was no future for whites unless they were prepared to share political power with Africans in Rhodesia.\textsuperscript{122} This was a reality that conservative and fast growing rightwing white elements could not see coming. By 1956, Todd’s image in the press angered the electorate, especially over black advancement rather than general development.\textsuperscript{123} The white electorate accused him of raising African expectations; supporting miscegenation directed against Todd upsetting perceived the purity of the white race in the country.\textsuperscript{124} He was more progressive with his colleagues in the House of Assembly, than white public opinion would allow.\textsuperscript{125} In this respect, assimilating the African middle class into the colonial milieu directly contravened settler colonialism, white supremacy and political hegemony. It also meant diluting the sectional interests of those whites who were preoccupied with maintaining their colonial privileges. Liberalism was therefore in direct contrast to racial cooperation and class. This is because Todd differed with his white colleagues in the belief that a considerable number of Africans had reached the standard required to exercise the franchise, something most whites were willing to concede.\textsuperscript{126} All the same, David Coltart argues that Todd was hardly a liberal in the western sense, unwilling because in key respects he was deeply conservative.\textsuperscript{127}

Some settlers thought that the noticeable feature about Todd was his attachment to the extreme leftwing whites or liberals. One of his cabinet ministers, Alan Lloyd recalls that Todd always seemed to have an attachment to those who were on the extreme left, not those in the centre or
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the conservatives of the party. The conservative Dominion Party (DP) was formed in February
1956 under Winston Field. It had a slightly larger numerical support throughout the country, and
opposed Todd. Some of its members, such as Raymond Stockil, singled out Todd as ‘the most
unscrupulous and ambitious politician Southern Rhodesia has ever known’ because of his pro-
African stance and attack on the white racial establishment. The DP was a grouping of
discontents and drew its membership from less prominent members of the Rhodesian settler
community. It drew its electoral support from frustrations rather than from ideas and enjoyed the
support of smaller towns such as Fort Victoria and Gwelo, which always resented the dominance
of Salisbury. Furthermore, the DP had a special appeal to the disadvantaged white minorities,
such as Greeks and other non-British settlers, who resented the exclusiveness and the favouritism
to its own kind displayed by the tight English-oriented establishment. Its appeal also extended
to old settlers, retired officers from India and those who felt that their special franchise was a
hindrance rather than an encouragement to African advancement. Therefore, the emergence of
the DP was symbolic of the political changes within the Rhodesian settler community towards race
relations.

Cabinet and civil servants accused Todd of showing dictatorial tendencies. Donald Macintyre,
Minister of Finance from December 1953 to December 1962, recalled that Ellman-Brown and
Patrick Fletcher were the two leading cabinet members who were critical of Todd’s leadership
style. Fletcher belonged to the old generation of Rhodesians too long to accept change. Macintyre rebuffed the theory that the Federal Party amalgamate with the United Rhodesia Party,
a combination that was a little less pro-Todd. What affected the decision with regard to getting
Todd out was his attitude to the cabinet and the discontent of two principle members – Ellman-
Brown and Fletcher. ‘If the two members of the cabinet had not come out into the open and said
they wanted to get rid of Todd, he would never have gone. He would have still been there,
irrespective of what his policies were.’

Moreover, Todd’s cabinet opposed him for meeting African leaders on a personal basis without
any notification so it looked like he was arranging something behind its back. Fletcher and other
parliamentary UFP members, such as Aitken-Cade and Humphrey Wightwick, were opposed to
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what they considered ultra-liberalism. Deliberately, they mounted a smear campaign which portrayed Todd as a ‘kaffir-loving missionary’ and convinced the fear-ridden whites that the name ‘Todd’ was synonymous with African nationalism. Subsequently, on 9 January 1958, his cabinet resigned because they lost confidence in his administration. Due to a political crisis rooted in racial politics, the UFP split into two factions – the pro and anti-Todd supporters. The party convened a congress to find a solution. It invited Edgar Whitehead, who was at the time a Federal representative in Washington D. C. to be the new Prime Minister. He came from an upper class English background, which later cost his premiership as he showed pro-British dispositions. Whitehead formed a new cabinet that included Todd, but he left in 1958 to revive the United Rhodesia Party that failed to gather enough electoral victory in that same year. This brought Todd’s political carrier to an end as well as racial partnership and liberalism. As Cohen notes, that Africans viewed Todd’s removal as further evidence that partnership was an empty term.

**White Uncertainties, One Nation and Nationalism, 1959-1962**

When he assumed power, Whitehead tried to unite all Southern Rhodesians, black and white, together into one nation. However, African nationalism was a beginning to constitute a serious threat to the white rule. In response, argues Bowman, the white regime used relentless harsh measures to curb African dissent. In February 1959, the government declared State of Emergency giving the state absolute power to arrest and detain without trial, control business and employees, and generally make regulations without interference.

Coltart states that the government arrested nearly 500 black nationalists banning a number of African political parties. The promulgation of Law and Order Maintenance Act (LOMA) and Emergency Powers Act of 1960 effectively worsened race relations in Southern Rhodesia.

However, Whitehead was determined to improve African education in order to develop the foundations for black enfranchisement. Still, the years between 1958 and 1962 were the most reforming period in Rhodesian history. Prior to that, there were no genuine opening in the public service for blacks with qualifications. However, others such as the first African barrister Hebert Chitepo – pushed their way through the white bureaucracy. Bowman reveals that the UFP government implemented some reforms in the hope that Britain would grant the country a
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Dominion status. In 1960, the government amended the Southern Rhodesian Public Service Act of 1931 to allow the admission of non-whites leaving school with qualifications. Until then, the government employed non-Europeans but these employees were not eligible for membership of the civil service and its privileges. The Public Service Board planned to remove all racial aspects from unestablished posts. The highest post the government gave to an African in the service, as of 1962, was that of Inspector of Schools. This post was in open competition with whites.

In July 1961, the government passed a Bill allowing for the insertion of a clause in the Land Apportionment Act, which enabled clubs to operate on a multi-racial basis, if approved by the legal authority concerned. The Ambassador Hotel opened its doors to non-whites, though it was not the first bar in Salisbury to become multi-racial when the government approved its licence on 30 June 1961. As one of the most exclusive and expensive hotels, it was run and owned by Savvas Pafitis, a leader of the Greek community in Salisbury and the honorary Consul General for Greece. Two years previously, the Jameson hotel catered for whites and non-whites visitors to Southern Rhodesia. Clements states that hotels, restaurants and clubs could admit guests of all races but subject to certain controls. Hotels which went multi-racial found themselves boycotted by customers who resented non-whites. When hotels reversed their decisions, those who approved of partnership in turn boycotted them. Some whites preferred segregated hotels for business purposes. One said, 'we are small and cannot afford to have three African customers order one beer and share it while they sit for hours. That is a quick way to go out of business.' Some complained that their African waiters resented black customers for not tipping. Some passed blunt racist remarks alleging that other African women were of the country type who could not properly use modern toilet facilities and that hordes of blacks made too much noise in white spaces.

It is clear that whites were not prepared to share facilities with blacks. For example, swimming baths revealed how white patience increasingly wore out when the National Democratic Party (NDP) organised Freedom Sitters. Rhodesian settlers considered these facilities as a privilege of only whites associated with aquatic lifestyles. In 1961, the Chief Justice Hugh Beadle passed a
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judgment stating that the municipal Act of Southern Rhodesia did not reserve swimming baths for the exclusive use of one race and prohibit another from using it. The ruling came after an application for an order declaring the city council’s restriction of the use of the municipal baths to ‘customary users’ to be illegal. However, it was not until August that a club in the more conventional sense of the word – the Civil Service Club, the largest in Salisbury – found itself dragged into the public arena. One of its white members introduced an African guest into the premises in Salisbury. Other white members asked the African visitor to leave. The white member who had invited his African friend brought the affair to the attention of the press, resulting in bad publicity. The club expelled the white member for ‘attempting to bring the club into the political sphere and to discredit the club in the eyes of the press and the public’, not by introducing the African. However, the Civil Service Club remained conservative refusing to open its doors to Africans.

In addition, efforts to attain racial partnership in the field of sport were a cause of concern for conservative Rhodesian whites. The formation of a professional soccer league in Rhodesia in the early 1960s was a new development in multi-racial sport. To some whites in the Federation, sport could provide a common ground for blacks and whites to learn to understand each other. Because of the small number of whites in Rhodesia, Africans participated in the league. This professional league came into being because South African teams were enticing an increasing number of promising white players to leave Southern Rhodesia and join them in the Union. The promoters of the league felt that the only hope was to make it multi-racial, so that it could draw on the large number of non-white players. While many sporting activities went multi-racial, the more traditionally white Rhodesian sports such as golf and tennis resisted change. However, racial segregation remained dominant. In the rural areas where Afrikaner influence was strong, old traditional habits of white supremacy remained powerful. As Clements writes, there were fewer pressures from the less sophisticated Africans and Asians in those areas for any change.

Whitehead’s reforms did little to impress Africans because they did not shift political power into their hands. Power remained in the hands of the white oligarchy and irritated the rightwing whites who regarded them as appeasement to black extremists. Whitehead hoped that these reforms
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would appeal to white moderates and ease racial confrontation. In the early 1960s, uncertainties grew regarding the idea of partnership and the future of the white people in the country. Partnership disgusted some whites who were not prepared to concede their colonial advantages, homes and property. ‘Whites wanted to protect farmhouses or a home in a new suburb of Salisbury’, wrote Philip Mason, ‘such as Alexandria Park, with its bright with bougainvillea, jacaranda and poinsettia, with smooth green lawns, white gate-posts and smart new cars.’ The possibility of losing national identity and that of their children in black Africa worried Rhodesian settlers. One white mechanic complained about making concessions to blacks. ‘We must always make some concession to the Africans’, he grumbled, and ‘here they want me to take my cook out for dinner.’ The mechanic’s complaints captured white anxieties about an uncertain future. The mechanic thought he should sell his house and go back to Durban. ‘But the trouble is you cannot sell a house here. No one wants it. They are all worried about the future. You watch, in another five years most of the whites will either be back in the Union or in the lands they came from.’ To safeguard their interests, whites in Southern Rhodesia realised the need to perpetuate their minority rule at all costs.

Whitehead’s rhetoric of creating ‘One Rhodesia’ did little to abate the many of Africans who were agitating for inclusion in the social and political spheres of their country. As early as 1959, Whitehead explained the idealism of racial cooperation in Southern Rhodesia regardless of colour and race up to a point when all the people of Southern Rhodesia called themselves Rhodesians. During a British television interview, he hoped that all people be called Rhodesians regardless of their race or colour. But he was quick to point out that African advancement did not mean a lowering of European standards. However, by 1961, it was clear to the UFP leadership that white supremacy was in its twilight era. Events on the African continent and elsewhere would not allow white supremacy and settler colonialism to cling on and preside over Africans anymore. Whitehead appealed to all races to ‘regard each other as Rhodesians and build up a greater prosperity. As the years go by, we shall come closer and closer to a sense of one nationalism.’ He continued, ‘the maintenance of straightforward white supremacy was “as dead as the dodo.”’ By alluding to a dodo – an extinct bird – Whitehead was reminding the settlers that white supremacy as archaic.
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Whitehead envisaged one Rhodesia for all Rhodesians sharing the same nationalism. More telling was the Rhodesian identity invoked by Whitehead other than Europeans. He emphasised and reinforced a Rhodesian identity different from Britishness. Since the 1961 constitution increased the African franchise, Whitehead went on a serious campaign to persuade qualified Africans to register as voters. The Pretorian News reported that this was of vital importance, not only to Southern Rhodesia but also to the whole future of race relations in Southern Africa. According to South African newspapers, Whitehead wanted to see a state where both whites and Africans called themselves Southern Rhodesians, saying ‘this is my country.’ By doing so, this would defuse African nationalism and pacify some British quarters calling for African advancement.

Whitehead believed that, within two generations, all people in Southern Rhodesia could enjoy a better standard of living. To achieve this dream, African nationalists would have to abandon the idea of seizing power quickly. Thus, Whitehead initiated the Build a Nation campaign, and utopian idea of creating a one Rhodesia for all Rhodesians. Addressing a Build a Nation campaign meeting, he discouraged nationalists from seizing and gaining power and authority in the short term, and for whites to make sacrifices in the following generations if they were to preserve their future. He recommended for Southern Rhodesian whites to stop calling African men “boys.” He was replying to an African member of a multi-racial audience at a Build a Nation campaign meeting to outlaw the use of the word “boy” in public places. He said he “always detested the term’ and urged other people to avoid using such words and to stop other people using them’. Whitehead was convinced that full cooperation depended on the evolution of whites’ attitude towards Africans – or the educated, elite class of Africans, at least.

While Whitehead was preoccupied with racial inclusivity through the Build a Nation campaign, African nationalists rejected it. The United Democratic Party (NDP) and the Zimbabwe African People’s Union (ZAPU), banned respectively in 1961 and 1962, could not accept the idea. Referring to the ban, Nkomo stated that Whitehead was digging the white peoples’ grave in Southern Rhodesia. He added, ‘Whitehead cannot build a nation by banning people. He must see that that all people here have equal rights.’ The Spear, a ZAPU newsletter, asked ‘how a man who belonged to the ruling minority race build a nation and remained head of a dictatorship?’ The government outlawed Africans political activities but spoke about one nation, thus exposing
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its contradictions. The fast emerging African educated class remained suspicious at the genuineness of the state to assimilate them into white privileges. Restrictive legislation acted against their advancement further fueled their disillusionment and unrest.

Intergenerational differences within the Rhodesian white community made it difficult for a non-racial nationalism to emerge. Older white settlers were not prepared to accept the supposedly youthful, forward-looking and progressively dangerous ideas for embracing Africans. Kenneth Milward, a journalist based in Salisbury, gives us some insights into the ideological differences between young and old conservative Rhodesians. In 1955, Milward came to the Federation, feeling that the establishment offered not only more economic opportunity but also realistic, progressive, multi-racial policies on the sound basis of equal opportunities for all, irrespective of race. Milward was an English-speaking Rhodesian of South African origins and he supported racial cooperation. According to him, some young Rhodesians were approaching a position of influence and responsibility in the country who were able to submerge colour prejudices. But their views were not compatible with the older and highly influential core of old white Rhodesians who could not change at their stage of life; it was the duty of the new society to allow them to live out their lives peacefully and pass undisturbed in the natural way.

To foster positive political, economic and social development, Milward supported Whitehead’s views about racial cooperation under one national identity. To him, no greatness would occur until all people thought and acted positively, united, constructively and purposefully – as Rhodesians, as ‘The Rhodesian Nation’, irrespective of skin-colour. He called for all Rhodesians, associations, hotels, cinemas, and those in any position of influence to do away with racial discrimination because this stood in the way of good race relations and economic prosperity. However, not all these efforts could thwart white fears and anxieties. The Congo crisis helped to galvanise white rightwing extremism. Immediately after Belgium granted the Congo independence in 1960, the new country plunged into civil war leaving many whites as refugees. The Congo crisis helped to rationalise in the minds of many outside Africa undue emotionalism and idealism attaching to the ‘liberation’ of the indigenous peoples in colonial territories in Southern and Central Africa.
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Coltart, whose family hosted Belgian refugees, heard ‘harrowing tales of what was happening in the Congo…the spectre of thousands of Belgian refugees in their country had a profound effect on the mind sets of white Southern Rhodesians.' Again in 1960, there were bloody riots in Southern Rhodesia as blacks protested against the colonial state’s racist policies. Because of these insecurities, white solidarities, conservatism and rightwing extremism surfaced in Southern Rhodesia.

**Shifts towards Anti-British attitudes in Rhodesia**

As soon as Whitehead took office, his most important tasks were to push for Dominion status from Britain, promote industrial development and attract large scale white immigrants. Besides the flow of capital and investment, Whitehead had no doubt that his government would enjoy the fullest confidence of the United Kingdom. He began negotiations with the British government for the revision of the Rhodesian constitution. His object, argues Kenneth Young, was to extirpate the extensive powers of the British government over certain classes of legislation. After a series of talks, the British government provided the 1961 constitution which Africans rejected for not protecting their rights. Whitehead and his UFP claimed that the new constitution meant independence for Rhodesia and campaigned for its acceptance by both whites and blacks. Ian Smith even resigned from the UFP and from his post as Welensky’s Chief Whip regarded the constitution as racist. Smith would later change to rightwing and declared illegal independence from Britain in 1965.

The right wing DP opposed the new constitution because it was too liberal, while the NDP attacked it for not providing majority rule. What is important to note here is white attitudes towards Britain. Already there were feelings that Britain was not serious about the situation of white Rhodesians, which invoked a sense of betrayal. White settlers were beginning to rethink the degree to which Britain was serious about protecting their interests and doubt the validity of their own sense of Britishness. At this point, white identities, which were based around a sense of whiteness and Rhodesianess, offered more of a solution than being British. White Rhodesians were determined to safeguard their economic and political privileges and keep the Southern Rhodesia
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as ‘a white [peoples’] country’. Like Smith, political and social events influenced many whites to shift from liberalism to rightwing and anti-British stance.

During this period, the United States’ anti-colonial stance also mounted significant pressure on Britain to abandon its colonial possessions. Cohen contends that the Democratic Party administration supported what Africans wanted – independence. In the context of cold war politics, the US was afraid that colonies could provide fertile seedbed for communist activities. At the same time, Britain needed to do away with its colonies in order to enter the European Union (EU) composed of the Federation. In addition, British public opinion and the Labour Party were against colonial obligations putting pressure on the pro-settler conservative Harold Macmillan government to hasten decolonisation. In the British Parliament, the Conservatives were vulnerable to Labour’s criticisms ‘of their complicity in the machinations of white minorities in Africa, and above all in the CAF’, writes Holland. Macmillan wanted to protect British image towards decolonisation as a liberal power but was afraid of African interests. He later notes that it was unthinkable in Southern Rhodesia to grant independence to Europeans as it had been in 1910 to the Afrikaners in South Africa. Rhodesian whites were not prepared to accept this British position that seemed to be a betrayal by their kith and kin. Ian McLeod, at the helm of the Colonial Office, put the British policy of majority rule into practice in Kenya and Nyasaland; he was working as fast as he could on Northern Rhodesia. The Federal Prime Minister Roy Welensky described McLeod as ‘a very difficult man to get on terms with and to understand…subtle and secretive as well as ruthless’ towards colonial policy. However, by 1961, the UFP was happy to work with Duncan Sundays whom they found ready to make concessions during the constitutional talks over Rhodesia’s future.

Issued in London, the ZAPU international organ and news bulletin, Spear, opposed the Tory government over the appointment of R. A. Butler as head of the Central Africa Office in London, which dealt with African matters. Macmillan wanted to centralise responsibility for the Federation under a single secretary of state and Welensky was happy to work with Butler. In all

---

188 Cohen, _The Politics and Economics of Decolonisation in Africa_, 149.
189 Butler, _Britain and Empire: Adjusting to a Post-Imperial World_, 63.
190 Holland, _European Decolonisation 1918-1981_, 225.
192 R. Welensky, _Welensky’s 4000 Days: The Life and Death of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland_ (London: St James’s Place, 1964), 187.
193 After the Whitehead administration banned the NDP in 1961, African nationalists formed ZAPU in 1962 under the leadership of Joshua Nkomo which split in 1963 giving rise to the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU).
194 Cohen, _The politics and Economics of Decolonisation in Africa_, 164.
controversies that beset the British government over the Federation and its component parts, Butler arraigned himself on the side of the settlers and against African self-rule. In ZAPU’s assessment of the potential African support in the Tory government, it classified him as a near-Lord Salisbury man. His appointment was a victory for Welensky and Africans were not happy.\footnote{Spear, ZAPU International Organ, 1, 2 (1962),} Further alleged that Duncan Sundays was ‘a settler’s darling and Butler [was] their darling [too]. The “kith and kin” cult in the British government does not impress us [ZAPU].’\footnote{Ibid.} In the eyes of the British government, alleged Spear, the Africans of Zimbabwe were of less value than British industries.\footnote{Ibid.} Africans wanted Britain to use its reserve powers in the constitution against white rule and Whitehead was not willing to sell Rhodesia down the river through majority rule.\footnote{Bowman, Politics in Rhodesia, 37.} Africans already felt that Britain was protecting its kith and kin against their own interests.

Political developments in Rhodesia after 1958 and the emotional break with Britain created animosity in white Rhodesians directed against Britain. They were breaking with their kith and kin at a time when they needed British emotional and political support against African nationalism. Many white Rhodesians could to believe that Britain had drastically changed since 1945. As Donal Lowry writes, ‘to many of these, any evident deterioration of British influence could only be proof of a wilful decadence, manifested not least in sexual permissiveness and deviance, pornography and drug-based youth musical culture, a failure of vigilance, and an apparent decay at the heart of Empire.’\footnote{Lowry, ‘The Impact of Anti-Communism in White Rhodesia’, 175.} Many white Rhodesians remained stuck in denial that the day of imperial glory had faded away with time. As such, they felt it was their responsibility to teach their cousins in Britain what it really meant to be British – that ‘Britishers could never be defeated or displaced like other people in history, no matter how desperate their situation might become.’\footnote{Ibid.} Clements commented that the insistence of being British preserved Rhodesia’s identity in cultural terms, economic matters and political tradition.\footnote{Clements, Rhodesia, 140.} Many white Rhodesians did not trust white politicians who seemed to be pro-British such as Edgar Whitehead and other British officials such as Duncan Sundays.

The apartheid policies of the Afrikaner-dominated South Africa were not believed to be compatible with the proclaimed tradition of British liberalism in Rhodesia. This reinforced the search for this sense of being British among Rhodesian whites. For all the squabbles and bickering, wrote Clements, typical Rhodesians never doubted that there was a fundamental and unbreakable
community of interest between them and Britain. This is because white Rhodesians increasingly regarded Britain with mixed feelings of attachment and betrayal. Significant numbers of Rhodesian whites resented changes in the British colonial policy which moved towards decolonisation. As early as 1957, Welensky expressed these feelings when he noted that ‘there is a real fear that the UK basically supports the African and would let the European down here’. Letting Europeans down meant throwing whites to the whims of half ‘civilised’ Africans under majority rule by their kith and kin in Britain. Welensky was not objecting to the position of Nyasaland on the way to majority rule with a white population standing at 8, 800 and 2, 750 000 blacks, unlike Southern Rhodesian with 215, 000 whites, 2, 630, 000 blacks and 15, 400 others. Added to British distrust was the Monckton report, published in October 1960. It called for an extension of franchise to Africans and reform to the colour bar in the Federation, which infuriated whites. It supported the independence of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland under majority rule, thus offering further confirmation that Britain was ready to support Africans at the expense of settler interests.

To many white Rhodesians, Britain’s colonial policy was unpalatable to white settlers especially the way in which it was carried out. Clements records that Britain’s policy appeared to them so ‘devious as to be treacherous and dishonest…and the men responsible for it were portrayed as cynical bullies or pusillanimous weaklings’. The Conservative Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, who succeeded Anthony Eden after the Suez crisis of 1956, signalled Britain’s hasty retreat from Africa. After 1945, the political and financial burden of supporting colonial rule was now considered too much on Britain. Peter Gibbs, a contemporary writer, pointed out that Macmillan’s wind of change in Africa encouraged the African nationalists to press for their own determination and whites resisted these efforts. In Rhodesia, it was not popular to quote Macmillan in support of one’s convictions and conclusions.

White resistance to African demands generated racial antagonisms. One Federation minister who spoke with the South African High Commissioner in Salisbury expressed discontent with Britain towards the manner it seemingly sought to appease blacks at the expense of whites. ‘I was born in [Britain] and I feel free to say what I like about it. I would never have believed the [British] way to appease extremists. What [Britain is] doing is unfair to the whites and equally unfair to the

---

202 Ibid, 140.
203 Ibid, 141.
204 Ibid, 141.
205 NASA, BTS 1/156/1 Vol 9, Southern Rhodesia: Political Situation and Development, 6 February 1961.
206 Clements, Rhodesia, 142.
blacks. It was common in Salisbury ‘to find highly placed officials accusing the British of being chicken livered and spineless…. Some Rhodesian politicians born in England, such as Winston Field of the Dominion Party, were critical of British journalists and press towards Rhodesia. He complained that the worst type of journalists coming to Rhodesia were from the “yellow press” of Fleet Street. He simply meant to say that British journalist were zealous to publish uncritical news on Rhodesia.

Independent African, Asian and eastern European communist countries also spoke against Britain’s way of handling the Southern Rhodesian political situation and for protecting white settlers. Russia was at the forefront of this campaign. In 1962, at the United Nations General Assembly, the Soviet representative Platoon Morozov demanded for the immediate dissolution of the Federation. At the same meeting, the Ghanaian delegate insisted that Britain was responsible for Southern Rhodesia and denounced ‘legalistic quibbling’ on the subject. These accusations came after Britain repeatedly denied responsibility for Southern Rhodesia, arguing that it was a self-governing colony. Edward Heath, the Deputy Foreign Secretary, told the UN Committee of Seventeen on colonialism that Britain had no right to intervene in Rhodesian matters. ‘We made it clear that we had no right to intervene in matters in which Southern Rhodesia had been autonomous for many years’. Joshua Nkomo expressed dismay when the British government refused to hand over Rhodesia to ‘inexperienced people’ – meaning Africans – because it was highly industrialised. British rightwing newspapers covered Rhodesian stories with a keen interest. For example, the Daily Mail, reported how William Harper, a leading opposition figure in Rhodesia urged the government to ‘bring out the rod of iron’ to deal with riots ‘or the people will take it into their own hands to do something.’ At the center of these accusations was the idea of kith and kin that – Britain was hiding behind constitutional technicalities to protect Rhodesian white settlers.

After a long resistance, Britain agreed to receive UN Committee led by India’s C. S. Jha for discussions on her policy in Southern Rhodesia, a development interpreted in New York as a sign of capitulation. Previously, Britain had opposed all attempts by the UN to conduct this inquiry and received considerable support for its attitude in the General Assembly. Because members of
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the General Assembly viewed the internal affairs of Southern Rhodesia as of no concern to them, Britain could easily continue to resist by refusing all facilities to the UN Committee.\textsuperscript{219} According to the \textit{Times}, members of the sub-committee accepted the legal fact that the British government had no right to interfere in the internal affairs of Southern Rhodesia, and were depending on British pressure on Southern Rhodesia to bring about a universal suffrage without ability or merit.\textsuperscript{220} Idealist liberalism led the \textit{Guardian} to say the government did the right thing in inviting the sub-committee to London to discuss the special committee’s work, and particularly to the UN debate on Southern Rhodesia.\textsuperscript{221} The chair of the sub-committee reportedly said that Rhodesia did not have self-government, but government by settlers.\textsuperscript{222} His remarks carried weight in changing the decision by the British government. It specifically referred to the unwise transfer of power to a minority government of settlers. Already Britain had clashed with Russia at the UN on this matter, and Tunisia was pressing likewise. Senior officials at the Central African Office were not prepared to hazard any public guess about further developments. They were also not sure of the possible wider effect, on Britain’s other colonies of the invitation to the committee of seventeen.

To the calls made by the Committee of Seventeen, Todd, by this time a former Rhodesian Prime Minister added his voice demanding for black majority rule in Southern Rhodesia at the UN. If Britain believed that Nyasaland was ready for an African majority government, he argued, it could have applied the same principle to Southern Rhodesia with much better educated and able to run a country.\textsuperscript{223} He told the UN General Assembly’s committee on colonialism that the Declaration of Rights contained in Southern Rhodesia’s 1961 constitution was a “worthless substitute for British protection”.\textsuperscript{224} He was afraid that if Britain left Rhodesia alone, there would be bloodshed and the eventual expelling of the white people.\textsuperscript{225} Todd was aware that Britain had a duty to perform on Southern Rhodesia. He submitted that ‘when I was Prime Minister, we were not independent of Britain. We were not regarded as a self-governing state … we were betwixt and between. After we became part of Federation we were not invited to take part in the Commonwealth Prime Ministers conferences.”\textsuperscript{226} His point was that the colony was largely not self-governing and Britain was supposed to take full responsibility and solve the Rhodesian political challenges.
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When Paul Mushonga of the Zimbabwe National Party (ZNP) also spoke against Britain at the UN Committee of Seventeen, he concurred with Todd. Mushonga accused Britain of intensifying the machinery of oppression in Rhodesia by refusing Africans self-rule while promoting settler interests. He reasoned that if the British had not prepared Africans for self-government over the past seventy years, there was no purpose to believe that they would do so anytime soon. If Britain continued not to act, Africans were prepared to pursue their independence objective – albeit with bloodshed and bad race relations. Ralph Palmer, leader of the Central Africa Party, questioned Britain’s seriousness when it came to protecting Africans. The powers retained by Britain on Southern Rhodesia did not prevent the white minority government to pass the Land Apportionment Act. As Palmer argued, these powers did not prevent settler administrations from passing discriminatory legislation and enshrining it on the country’s statute book. Therefore, Britain was protecting white settlers even against its constitutional obligations, which reserved powers to protect Africans.

By the early 1960s, white settlers believed that black majority rule was moving rapidly in the direction of a grim reality, no more a fallacy and a distant possibility. Whitehead himself seemed ready to go along with it faster than many white Rhodesians who were not prepared to go that far. Changes in British colonial policy greatly reconfigured white perceptions. From a South African perspective, Britain was ready to undermine the whites, to divide them, and reduce resistance to a small hard core who could eventually be called ‘extremists’, probably even ‘terrorists’. Changes in white political attitudes signaled that Whitehead and his UFP were on their way out power. These political developments had far-reaching effects in shifting Southern Rhodesian political and social landscape in the early 1960s.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, this chapter has engaged with political developments in Southern Rhodesia since 1953 to 1962. It traced the development of settler confidence, the politics of racial partnership and liberalism, as well as the development of white conservatism in Southern Rhodesia. Throughout this period, the idea of kith and kin and Britishness shifted as influenced by the social and political developments within and outside Southern Rhodesia. As Africans mounted pressure to offset perceived white colonial standards, Rhodesian whites rallied behind whiteness despite their political differences. Some liberal minded whites switched to the right camp in the late 1950s as
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they felt that black advancement was going too fast. The presence of the righting Dominion Party acted as a watchdog against the extremes of liberalism and evils of racial partnership. This chapter has also demonstrated how Britain’s colonial policy in Africa allowed for the development of anti-British feelings in Southern Rhodesia. As Britain supported majority rule in Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland, white Rhodesia settlers begun to feel a sense of betrayal by their kith and kin as the Monckton commission failed to guarantee them minority rule.
Chapter Five
Father and Son Quarreling? White Rhodesians and Britain, 1963 – 71

Introduction
On 11 November 1965, the Rhodesian Front (RF) government led by Prime Minister Ian Smith unilaterally declared independence from Britain in an act of rebellion. This came after Britain insisted on majority rule as a pre-condition for Rhodesian independence. The Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI) meant that Southern Rhodesia cut itself off from Commonwealth trade preferences and other benefits. The British government imposed economic sanctions in an attempt to bring the rebel government back to legality. This chapter argues that, besides political, military and economic considerations, feelings of kith and kin played an important role and influenced how Britain handled the Rhodesian crisis between 1963 and 1971. Contested notions of loyalties and kith and kin ties, as in actual familial ties between Britons and those of British descent living in Rhodesia, shaped the approach of successive British governments to the Rhodesian question. This chapter reveals that feelings of kith and kin ambiguously operated at political and familial levels between Rhodesia and Britain. It also shows that despite the political disagreements, there was an ongoing love and hate relationship between white Rhodesians and Britain. Moreover, Rhodesian settlers continued to hold conflicting loyalties towards the British Crown while continuing propagating that they were under attack from international communism. The Rhodesian regime rejected African demands not as genuine attempts to achieve independence and blamed Britain for betraying its kith and kin by supporting majority rule.

Rhodesia Independence Negotiations and UDI
Britain officially dissolved the Federation after ten years of existence by granting Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland African nationalists the right to form independent governments in 1963. White Rhodesians felt that Africans in Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesian were ill-prepared to run their countries. Their call for settler independence from Britain opened a new phase in the British decolonisation of Rhodesia. Philip Murphy shows that there were competing political and economic factors which influenced the pattern and nature of British decolonisation between 1951 and 1964. He further notes that during this period, some Conservatives in Britain believed that African settlers represented a brand of Englishness which was becoming extinct at home. This particularly applied to Rhodesian whites and this was “far more than a mere loyalty to “kith and kin” and their Tory admirers saw them as them more patriotic than the government of the mother
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country’. Even so, Britain did not believe that it could grant Southern Rhodesia settlers minority independence because of its unique situation. Unlike in West and East Africa, Britain faced stubborn settler nationalism as white Rhodesians were determined to stay in power and refuse imperial moves towards decolonisation. John Darwin notes that unbending reaction blindly resisting its inevitable destruction characterised settler nationalism in central Africa.

Britain’s ineffective role in the self-governing colony of Southern Rhodesia made it difficult to introduce measures that seemed to affect the nature of white rule in the 1960s. Since 1923, Rhodesia whites had enjoyed complete internal control, as Britain did not use its constitutional obligations when it comes to the protection of Africans. The Governor only served as a constitutional figurehead and settlers controlled defence and internal security. The majority of Rhodesian whites did not welcome Britain’s sudden interest (for the first time since 1923) in exercising reserved powers, mainly for supporting majority rule. This gave white Rhodesians a sense of entitlement to self-rule after the British government granted independence to Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland under black leadership. They felt that their survival was in danger because Britain could give Rhodesian Africans independence while sacrificing white interests. Whites in central Africa also looked to South Africa, a country which had enjoyed autonomy from Britain since 1910. Rhodesian whites wanted to remain in control over the legal and constitutional apparatus which governed social, economic and political aspects of the country upon which their survival depended for several years. They resented majority rule because they considered that Africans were not ready to assume leadership that would guarantee their security and ally their fears.

In 1961, the British government provided Rhodesia with a new constitution which many believed had a potential of paving way for majority rule. The new constitution provided franchise rights for Africans who qualified to vote after obtaining education and a certain amount of income. However, it offered a slow pace from one person one vote to majority rule. Initially after supporting the new constitution, the African nationalist Joshua Nkomo, the leader of the National Democratic Party, later renounced it because it fell short of the projected majority vote and rule. This versatility infuriated white Rhodesians and politicians who did not trust African nationalists and British motives as far as their future was concerned. Moreover, the new constitution shocked

---

3 Ibid, 10.
5 Ibid, 194.
6 Wood, So Far and no Further, 15.
many white Rhodesians, who disliked the fact that it increased the power of the Crown over their country. These mixed feelings and conflicting perceptions towards Britain and African nationalists forced white Rhodesians to intensify the need to have their own independence in order to safeguard their interests and future.

In December 1962, the newly formed right wing Rhodesian Front (RF) won the election under Winston Field. The RF was an alliance of rightwing elements formed in March 1962 by whites united by their common hatred of the UFP’s alleged appeasement policy. This also marked the shift from liberalism to conservatism as well a move from Anglophile to Anglophobia in Rhodesia. The RF did not believe in racial partnership or fast African advancement and opposed the 1961 constitution. The RF enjoyed support from the rural farmers, artisans and civil servants who had backed the largely middle-class Anglophile UFP. This category of white electorate was not happy with the elitism of the UFP and wanted the populist RF, which spoke to their needs and fears. The RF had a grassroots support throughout the country and its membership increased dramatically from 1,000 by the end of July to nearly 9,000 by December 1962. It was able to take advantage of the rural vote and all the white sections who felt threatened by African nationalism and the UFP’s approach to the independence issue and liberal ideas.

In March 1963, Field formally demanded independence from Britain. However, Britain wanted unimpeded progress towards majority rule, guarantee against retrogressive constitutional amendments, and instant improvement in the political status of Africans, an immediate move to end racial discrimination and an independence that was acceptable to all. The British government wanted some electoral reforms in Rhodesia as pre-conditions for independence which the RF was not prepared to concede. It warned Field about the dangers of seizing independence unilaterally. Murphy notes that if Rhodesia declared illegal independence, it was because British ministers betrayed their country and settler interests and lost sight of their true national identity. However, in London, some forty Conservative backbenchers led by Patrick Wall supported Field to take independence by force. Such a body of support in the metropole caused Field to flirt with the idea of some action. When he returned to Salisbury, the right wing elements in his cabinet,
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including William Harper and John Gaunt, supported by pushing acting Prime Minister Ian Smith to take action. As Evans notes, the Field’s cabinet was prepared to seize independence unilaterally and disliked the 1961 constitution.\footnote{Evans, ‘The Role of Ideology in Rhodesian Front Rule’, 35.} The Chief Justice, Hugh Beadle, made it clear through the cabinet that the judiciary was obliged to stand by the constitution and could not support such an action. Moreover, the army reminded Field that it took an oath of allegiance to the Queen and would remain loyal under the Governor, the crown’s representative.\footnote{Mss.Eng.c.6466 George Ivan Smith to U Thant, 14 February 1964.} This disarmed Field and shook is political base in the RF cabinet because the British outwitted him at a time when Anglophobia was on the rise.

The RF considered Field too polite with Britain and African nationalists alike, believing him to be out of touch with white aspirations and fears on the ground. He was not the kind of a leader the party and the electorate wanted to protect their interests and most importantly to seize independence from the reluctant British government. As early as September 1963, ideological themes including Anglophobia, conspiratorial beliefs and strict media control had gained their way in the RF.\footnote{Evans, ‘The Role of Ideology in Rhodesian Front Rule’, 39.} As far as the independence negotiations were concerned, these forces were powerful in determining the course of Anglo-Rhodesian relations at a political level. On 13 April 1964, Field resigned and Ian Smith accepted the cabinets’ nomination to take his place as a Prime Minister prepared to seize independence unilaterally. Field was unable to check the emotional drift from the British connection, which, so long as it existed, had profoundly influenced Rhodesian white society.\footnote{Clements, Rhodesia, 191.} The real reason why Field (who was Britain’s last hope in Rhodesia) had to go, as subsequent events showed, was to clear the way for UDI.\footnote{Flower, Serving Secretly, 4.} In 1972, William Cary, a former RF cabinet Minister, narrated how the caucus ousted Field and generally dealt with ‘enemies’. ‘Whenever there was any element of risk, we clamped down on it … We just had to be ruthless and eliminate them … We started eliminating the Prime Minister himself because he was a potential danger. He was not for independence.’\footnote{NAZ Oral/CA 4, W. J Cary, interviewed by Hatridge at Gwelo, 8 February 1972. See also Flower, Serving Secretly, 18.} The RF leadership was not prepared to accommodate any liberal approach when it comes to secure the future of whites in Rhodesia.

Smith took advantage of white fears to unify them behind the RF political project by using propaganda. Ian Hancock reveals that the new administration was determined to cement European control over Rhodesia and entrench RF leadership in all areas.\footnote{Hancock, White Liberals Moderate and Radicals in Rhodesia, 105.} Clements states that loyalty to the
party and to Rhodesia became inseparable concepts not only in the minds of RF enthusiasts but in the mass of the public. Smith appointed PK Van de Bly as the Minister of Information who, in turn, hired the controversial anti-communist Ivor Benson to act formally as his adviser as a way of consolidating power through information dissemination and propaganda. Benson belonged to the eccentric flank of right wing theorists which flourished in such bodies and proposed variants of the theme of a hostile world conspiracy. Because of Benson, the RF painted a picture that it was always under the threat of international communism and was there to defend European ‘civilisation’ in the country – which really meant white political and social superiority. In his personal account of the Rhodesian war, David Lemon, the British South Africa Police member, recalls how naively he felt a surge of pride that his little country was to lead the fight against communism. His recollections capture how Smith’s administration used propaganda to successfully brainwash many white Rhodesians. The RF informed the white electorate that it was not fighting Africans but international communism, a myth the regime itself believed. In 1975, one of the founding members of the RF, Harry Reedman, reflected on this point. ’We could see that this was opportunism by the British government pandering to certain black leaders, which was only really leading towards communism.’ Reedman was the first to speak about communism in parliament. ’I was the first speaker in Parliament on this in August 1964. I said that the cry of “Africa for Africans” has no validity, it is merely a matter of who will rule them … [they would] become serfs to the little yellow men [Chinese].’ In the context of the Cold War politics, the position of Russia and China worried Rhodesian whites, Britain and other minority regimes in Southern Africa.

Since Rhodesian whites did not embrace Britain’s idea of majority rule and viewed the metropole as treacherous, many had mixed opinion towards Britain and the future of their country. In March 1963, the Rhodesian Recorder asked some men to give their opinion concerning the future of the country. One of the respondents believed that Britain caused the present political impasse and it was under a moral obligation to white Rhodesians. However, he warned that it was pertinent for Europeans to know Africans for a better future for both races. The second man raised interesting
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observations about white fears and politics. He noted that one of the reasons why many white people elected the RF, particularly voters in the civil service, was because the Whitehead government was incompetent rather than because they objected to its principles per se. He felt, however, that Field should be cautious in pressing for independence. It would be far easier to ride pressures from abroad with Britain as a buffer, he concluded.  

In September 1964, Smith travelled to London for constitutional talks with Sir Alec Douglas-Home, the Conservative British Prime Minister, but could not reach any agreement. Smith tried unsuccessfully to impress the British by organising the ‘Domboshava Indaba’ – talks with chiefs supposedly representing African people instead of nationalists, a move that the British government rejected. The change of government in Britain on 16 October when Labour won the election had immediate political implications in Rhodesia. The new British Prime Minister Harold Wilson made it clear that majority rule was non-negotiable as far as the Rhodesian independence was concerned. Wilson warned Smith that in the event of a UDI, Rhodesia would face the possibility of sanctions, isolation, citizen-striping and expulsion from the Commonwealth. Yet, the Monarch remained sympathetic to Smith as political relations between the British government and Rhodesia continued to deteriorate. For example, the Queen invited Smith at a luncheon of Commonwealth leaders at Buckingham palace although Wilson’s people initially withheld his invitation. The Queen insisted that Smith should be present at the event which annoyed Wilson and his team. To some extent, this event shows the ambivalent feelings of kith and kin between the Monarch and white Rhodesians.

Ironically, Britain ruled out the possibility of using force against Rhodesia should Smith seize independence illegally. In October 1965, Wilson visited Rhodesia accompanied by fifty delegates to enter discussions with Smith. The African population naively thought that Britain had come to replace the fifty RF members of parliament. After the visit, Wilson told journalists that his administration was not going to use force against Smith should the government declare independence. He stated that:

> If there are those in this country who are thinking in terms of a thunderbolt, hurtling through the sky and destroying the enemy, a thunderbolt in the shape of the Royal Air Force, let me
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say that this thunderbolt will not be coming, and to continue in this delusion wastes valuable
time and misdirects valuable energies.39

The leader of ZAPU, Joshua Nkomo, stated that these words sounded as though the British
government gave Smith the green light to proceed with UDI.40 Although Wilson assured African
nationalists about Britain’s seriousness, he admitted that Britain could not impose an embargo on
South Africa or police sanctions evasion.41 According to Sue Onslow, ‘there was also a well-
founded expectation that the South Africa would not support a trade boycott against Rhodesia –
indeed the conclusion of the British Cabinet’s Defence and Oversea Policy Committee was that
economic sanctions would drive Rhodesia into South Africa’s arms.’42

Wilson’s visit left an impression that he was not prepared to stop a UDI or to protect African
interests except to cushion his kith and kin. However, when Smith concluded that Wilson was not
going to concede on the principle of majority rule, he considered prospects of sizing independence
illegally from Britain. White settlers who previously took pride in their so-called Britishness were
beginning to see themselves first as Rhodesians and British second.43 In this case, being Rhodesian
meant identifying with everything Rhodesia stood for and in most cases clinging to the old imperial
traditions. After Smith issued his statement of intent for UDI, the British government made it
clear that such a move was illegal and ineffective in law. The sole power to change the
constitutional status of Southern Rhodesia in this way rested with the British parliament.44 From
the independence negotiations, Rhodesians were convinced that Britain could really do nothing of
significance to harm their cause. Wilson had no clear plan to deal with Smith. As the cartoon below
demonstrates, the Rhodesian Herald caricatured the British Prime Minister’s inability to resolve
the Rhodesian crisis.
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For the greater part, Wilson directed the Rhodesian policy himself but he often received opposition to Barbara Castle who was outspoken for conceding too much control to white Rhodesians. As Coggins reveals, the cabinet and other ministers constrained or opposed Wilson for giving white Rhodesians too much control or the impact of sanctions on British balance of payments and other constitutional discussions. This made it difficult for Wilson to effectively deal with the Rhodesian problem because there were many actors interested in the matter for cultural, economic and political reasons.

The RF proceeded with the idea of seizing independence unilaterally on 11 November 1965. Coincidentally, Smith signed the UDI on Armistice Day under the portrait of the Queen which enabled the Rhodesian regime to claim that it was rebelling against the British government and not the Monarch. Ironically, the document ended with the declaration ‘God Save the Queen’. The regime proclaimed a new constitution, which recognised Queen Elizabeth II as the country’s supreme authority but replaced the British Governor with an Officer Administering the government, Clifford Dupont. The Rhodesian UDI was the first of its own kind in the British Empire since the American independence of 1776. Inside Rhodesia, UDI meant that the RF assumed absolute white control of the country and increased in its suppression of African rights.
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UDI was in itself a treason against the British Crown, an institution which many white Rhodesians revered while the RF reviled the British government. The RF justified its illegal act by blaming external forces working on the African continent to end white rule.\textsuperscript{51} For the greater part of the 1960s, the RF continued to rally behind this popular belief that Rhodesian whites were suffering an onslaught from international communist conspiracies. However, some white moderates such as Garfield Todd and Hardwicke Holderness urged the British government to intervene in the Rhodesian crisis and to incorporate more Africans in the franchise.\textsuperscript{52} Others such as Guy Clutton-Brock continued to defy the regime’s racial regulations by working with and helping blacks. The former Prime Minister of Rhodesia, Godfrey Huggins, called UDI ‘a piece of madness, a sort of collective rush of blood to the head, which cannot be explained by rational means at all’.\textsuperscript{53} UDI marked an era of Rhodesia’s isolation, white unity and solidarity in diversity in defying the world. This period generated debate on why Britain failed to use force against white Rhodesians, as economic sanctions were less effective – or it wanted to protect kith and kin.

Use of Force and Economic Sanctions against Rhodesia

After Smith proclaimed UDI, African countries and the UN called on Britain to end the rebellion or to use force against white Rhodesians. Using fresh archives released in Britain, scholars have discussed that the availability of sufficient forces, logistical support, and the likely extent of Rhodesian resistance, the danger of South African intervention and the willingness of British soldiers to fight against their kith and kin prevented Britain from using force.\textsuperscript{54} This scholarship suggest that the kith and kin was an ‘inflated’ factor used to conceal ‘more compelling reasons’ – economic and political considerations – which led Britain not to use force against Smith.\textsuperscript{55}

Although economic and political aspects were important, feelings of kith and kin between Britain and Rhodesia were genuine but ambiguous. Watts shows that sympathies for the Europeans in Rhodesia divided British public opinion.\textsuperscript{56} In Rhodesia, some white politicians such as van der Byl believed that Britain was not going to use force for political and sentimental reasons: essentially, because of the kith and kin factor. When the Archbishop of Canterbury openly supported for the use of force by Britain against white Rhodesians, van der Byl protested. ‘Certainly, none of us in Rhodesia who, twenty years ago, fought with Britain against the common foe could ever foresee a
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time when the Primate of All England would publicly support the dispatch of our former comrades in arms to shoot down their kith and kin.\textsuperscript{57} This was more than political rhetoric.

There were strong links between the British and Rhodesian armed forces dating back to the Second World War. For instance, some service Chiefs of Staff in the British army trained in the Southern Rhodesia Air Force and worked with the RAF during the war.\textsuperscript{58} Coggins notes that there were reports that RAF officers based in Lusaka were drinking Ian Smith’s health.\textsuperscript{59} Prominent veterans such as Douglas Bader and Brigadier Mike Calvert ‘regarded Rhodesians as kith and kin, embodying the truest Britishness, while entertainers such as Eric Sykes and Jimmy Edwards [had] regularly arrived on morale-boosting tours of the rebel colony.’\textsuperscript{60} Stories circulated of some Rhodesians who resigned immediately after UDI to go and serve in the RAF and Britons in the RRAF who resigned to return home.\textsuperscript{61} Murphy argues that Britain prepared to intervene in Rhodesia militarily but did not use force due to a number of political and military incompatibilities.\textsuperscript{62} However, there was the moral side to Britain’s actions as ‘there was little mention of the possible reluctance of British soldiers and pilots to open fire on fellow whites, although this had long been a concern of ministers and officials.’\textsuperscript{63} Murphy stresses that the Rhodesian High Commissioner in London, Brigadier Andrew Skeen, had assessed that it was difficult for Britain to use force in the event of UDI based on the assumption that ties of 'kith and kin' would preclude any attack.\textsuperscript{64} Murphy shows that the British government and policy makers lacked the political will to decisively deal with white Rhodesians. As a result, the Chiefs of Staff took advantage of this laxity to propagate the impracticalities of any military undertaking in Rhodesia. ‘They were thereby able to avoid opening the more sensitive issue of the likely attitude of the forces under their command to an order to fight their “kith and kin”.’\textsuperscript{65} Scholars argue that an invasion of Rhodesia would have been a major undertaking after the British forces assured their loyalty. However, as we have seen in Chapter Two, immediately after the war, RAF maintained closer ties with Rhodesian Air Force which makes this point contested.

In his autobiography, Denis Healey, the British Labour Party politician who served as Secretary of State for Defence from 1964 to 1970, conceded that kith and kin feelings circulated among top

\textsuperscript{57} Wessels, \textit{Van Der Byl}, 87.
\textsuperscript{58} Watts, ‘Killing Kith and Kin’, 402.
\textsuperscript{59} Coggins, ‘Wilson and Rhodesia UDI and British Policy towards Africa’, 368.
\textsuperscript{60} Lowry, \textit{Rhodesia}, 117.
\textsuperscript{61} White, \textit{Unpopular Sovereignty}, 112.
\textsuperscript{62} Murphy, ‘An Intricate and Distasteful Subject’, 764.
\textsuperscript{63} \textit{Ibid}, 764.
\textsuperscript{64} \textit{Ibid}, 772.
\textsuperscript{65} \textit{Ibid}, 776.
officials within the British army. Writing in confidence to George Cunningham, the adviser of the Labour Party Overseas Department, George Smith pointed out that Britain could have used force against white Rhodesians:

> Britain is a country of fifty million people and Smith has the support of only 200,000 people equivalent to the Mayor of Borough of Harrow. Britain has armed forces twice the size of Smith’s entire European population … If we spend £2,200 million a year on our armed forces, I just do not believe that it is beyond our military means to stamp out a fire in our own back garden.

Cunningham’s remark to the position of British responsibility over Rhodesia is telling. However, Britain ruled out the use of force also because of military impracticalities and complications. Coggins notes that Rhodesia had the largest air force in Africa after Egypt, an effective army, paramilitary and the British South Africa Police which could resist any British invasion. Although the British government considered the military option twice, the plans were not viable and entirely practical to pursue due to political, strategic and military constraints. In addition, the kith and kin factor was also instrumental as far as the British army’s intervention in Rhodesia was concerned.

In Britain, the Conservatives supported the maverick Rhodesian regime and opposed the Labour government. Butler states that the government faced criticism from the Conservative Party among whose members supported the Rhodesian rebels. Labour MPs hit at Smith’s friends in Britain, the Tories, for showing kinship feelings towards white Rhodesians. They were infuriated and hoped that the British government learnt the most important lesson: the appeasement of racialists did not pay. The Morning Star, a left wing paper founded by the Communist Party of Great Britain, reported that Smith’s Tory friends had simultaneously increased their pressure on the government to surrender to the white racialists. They wanted the British government to remove Smith or impose tough sanctions and restore the country back to constitutionalism. If the Tory failed to do so, the simple remedy was to throw Smith out of power and abolish the regime, which was a menace to democracy. Wilson was prepared to use force only in the event of a complete breakdown of law and order in Rhodesia, meaning he was willing to use military power if African
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liberation movements threatened to topple Smith. The *Morning Star* called this act indefensible.\(^{72}\) Ironically, Smith was using force all the time to keep the Africans in check.

White Rhodesians viewed the appeal to use force against them by Britain with incredulity and horror mixed with amusement. The *Guardian*, one of the British leftwing newspapers supporting the Labour Party, showed how white Rhodesians perceived the idea of the use of force by Britain against them as ‘ridiculous’. The *Guardian* interviewed whites in Salisbury who said Britain was not serious, stating that the British public would not support the use of force in Rhodesia. A liberal schoolteacher said, ‘what do they want?’\(^{73}\) A garage mechanic, born in Cornwall, said, ‘I think it is a shocking suggestion. It would mean fighting our own kith and kin. I do not think they have given the matter any deep thought – it is a warped idea, a disgrace.’\(^{74}\) Another white woman, claiming to be against Smith’s policies, nonetheless thought that the use of force was ridiculous; all white Rhodesians would have to fight against the British troops.\(^{75}\) Indeed, in 1966, British officials also expected to face a hostile white population in Rhodesia in the event of any military invasion.\(^{76}\) These comments reveals that the kith and kin factor was both in Britain and in Rhodesia.

As a way of bringing the rebel regime to legality, Britain imposed economic sanctions on Rhodesia that lasted until 1979. Wilson misjudged that sanctions could yield an immediate political solution to the Rhodesian problem.\(^{77}\) The intended political effect of economic sanctions was to cause economic breakdown, a split of the RF cabinet that would in turn force Smith to a negotiating table with Wilson.\(^{78}\) The misconception that the Rhodesian business community estimated serious losses through sanctions bolstered Wilson’s miscalculation.\(^{79}\) The UN General Assembly, the Security Council, and the Special Committee on Colonialism (the Committee of 24) mounted pressure on Britain to take drastic measures against Rhodesia. The UN supported Britain’s stance to isolate Rhodesia economically and politically and urged the Commonwealth countries to cut all trade links with Rhodesia.\(^{80}\) This also applied to South Africa, which had left the Commonwealth in 1961. Britain expelled Rhodesia from the sterling area, ended Commonwealth preferences on Rhodesian goods, including the sugar agreement, banned the import of tobacco, introduced trade

\(^{72}\) *Ibid.*
\(^{73}\) *Guardian*, 15 March 1968.
\(^{74}\) *Ibid.*
\(^{75}\) *Ibid.*
\(^{76}\) Coggins, ‘Wilson and Rhodesia UDI and British Policy towards Africa’ 368.
\(^{77}\) For a comprehensive discussion on sanctions see Strack, *Sanctions*, 16-40.
\(^{78}\) Coggins, ‘Wilson and Rhodesia UDI and British Policy towards Africa‘ 368.
\(^{79}\) *Ibid.*
\(^{80}\) Bowman, *White*, 110.
exchange controls, froze nine million pounds worth of Rhodesian reserves in London banks and abolished export credit guarantees to Rhodesia.\textsuperscript{81}

However, economic sanctions did not change Smith’s mind and failed to make moderate Rhodesians oust him and install someone who would undo UDI and cooperate with Britain. Simultaneously, sanctions had an adverse effect on the British economy as it lost millions of pounds.\textsuperscript{82} Zambia, Tanzania, Kenya and some members of the press in Salisbury interpreted British oil sanctions on Rhodesia as a grudging response to African pressure. In the event that sanctions failed by mid-May 1966, President Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia and Julius Nyerere of Tanzania wanted Britain or the Commonwealth to use force against Rhodesia.\textsuperscript{83} The Liberal leader Jeremy Thorpe reasoned that Britain should have used force within three hours of UDI and bombed the rail link between Mozambique and Rhodesia during the oil sanction breach but economic constrains catapulted the home government.\textsuperscript{84} Unfortunately, in his thinking he did not figure out the pertinent kinship ties between Britain and Rhodesia.

Other African countries blamed Britain for protecting its kith and kin in Rhodesia. For example, during the Lagos Commonwealth conference in 1966, the Zambian vice president, Reuben Kamanga bluntly accused Britain. He charged that ‘behind the present crisis in Rhodesia lay ideas of racialism, colonialism, economic imperialism and the kind of sentimentalism that found expression in the concept of kith and kin’.\textsuperscript{85} Some Africans in the region believed that Wilson’s determination was to remain in office for a long time rather than bring Smith down.\textsuperscript{86} Even so, Rhodesia diversified its economy and involved in sanctions-bursting and managed to sustain the economy at least for the first ten years.

Economic sanctions forced whites to rally behind Smith instead of weakening their support. With the RF in total control of the local media, meant that white Rhodesians blamed Wilson, and not Smith, for all their economic challenges.\textsuperscript{87} Unintentionally, sanctions provided a political space conducive for the propagation and development of the rhetoric of white unity behind Smith. In 1967, some sections of New Zealand which expressed concern over the Rhodesia situation sponsored Samuel Green, the Mayor of Dargaville, to visit Salisbury for a fact-finding mission. He met several people, government ministers and chiefs, ordinary citizens both white and black.
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Among other observations, Green concluded that sanctions hardly affected Europeans apart from delaying development but appeared to be hurting blacks by making employment more difficult.\(^{88}\) Moreover, they forced whites to rally behind Smith. The Labour Party acknowledged that sanctions slowly weakened the economic structure of Rhodesia, rather than to disrupt the day-to-day lives of Europeans.\(^{89}\) It regarded sanctions as a long-term operation applied in a piecemeal fashion, which allowed Rhodesia time to adapt to these changes. Sanctions slowly strangled the economy and affected both the guilty and innocent, mainly blacks. As Figure three demonstrates, Wilson was sure that sanctions would not hurt his kith and kin.

![Figure 3. Source: Rhodesia Herald, 16 December 1965.](image)

As the cartoon shows, Rhodesian Africans were on the receiving end of the brunt of the economic sanctions. In the cartoon, Wilson had enough arrows and ample time to target Smith – yet he aimed at the Africans. This kind of thinking and cunningness extended to other half hatred restrictions the British government imposed on Rhodesians.
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\(^{88}\) MSS.Afri.s.2208 Box 2, S.S. Green to Harold Wilson, 9 October 1967.

Passports Controls and Regulations

Besides less effective sanctions, the British government tried to tighten passport regimes against Rhodesia. The British government passed a Property in Passports Order, invalidating all passports and other travel documents issued after UDI by the RF government. It blacklisted Rhodesians and dual citizens travelling abroad to support the illegal regime. The Home Secretary had powers to recommend to court or deport people on the blacklist on the grounds of their disloyalty or support for the rebel regime. The Commonwealth Relations Office informed other governments to urge their passport issuing offices to report names of any British or Rhodesian citizens supporting the illegal regime for black list. Britain campaigned for other foreign governments to impound passports of Rhodesians on the blacklist and issue them a new travel document for a single journey back to Rhodesia. Other Commonwealth countries received this development with conflicted feelings. For instance, although Australia did not recognise the Rhodesian regime, its nationality and citizenship laws still viewed Rhodesian citizens as British subjects. This meant that Rhodesians could still travel to Australia without first obtaining visas or permits, although Australia did not recognise their passports. However, Britain continued to put pressure on Australia to refuse entry to supporters of the illegal regime.

Britain showed some form of leniency towards the full implementation of passport controls. Cases involving dual citizens holding valid Rhodesian passports embarrassed the Passport and Home Offices. It was an unprecedented move to repudiate a whole class of passports issued in the Queen’s name. Unless the government announced a colour distinction, such repudiation would include African Rhodesians and embrace all loyalists, compassionate cases and those seeking asylum in Britain. Moreover, Britain had obligations towards third world countries in which Rhodesians might find themselves. Most importantly, it would take no account of the entry into Britain by persons of British ancestry, nor of the changes in the British National Act, which made it easier for loyal Rhodesians to obtain citizenship in British colonies and create ill will towards Britain in Rhodesia. Foreign Office officials felt that it was not important to worry about ill feelings when the British government applied sanctions and oil embargoes, and had mobilised world opinion against Rhodesia. In their opinion, the RF regime had started the problem, not
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the British. Despite this rhetoric, it was difficult to shut all Rhodesians from entering Britain or other Commonwealth nations completely.

The UN called on Britain to tighten passport control and restrict the entry of Rhodesians. The Foreign Office authorities expressed some form of hesitation and fear to this action. Passport embargos and controls were not an easy task to implement against whites because the majority of them held dual citizenship – Rhodesian and British. Therefore, it had the potential to inconvenience British citizens. The proposed measures would only affect those who held Rhodesian passports alone, which was perhaps one third of the white population. The remainder were either solely British or dual citizens and were entitled to travel on British passports. As a result, officials did not recommend action against holders of British passports because of the extreme difficulty to distinguish against whom they wished to act. All the same, those individuals determined to travel abroad usually found their own ways to evade passport controls. In theory, Foreign Office officials reasoned that the policy of repudiating Rhodesian passports and of controlling entry into Britain would make ordinary Rhodesians see that the British government was serious. They also wanted to send a message to the Afro-Asian countries that Britain was serious and break the common delusion on the part of many Rhodesians that Britain wished to acquiesce in their unconstitutional action.

Foreign Office authorities were aware of the complications associated with the strict control of passports. The Rhodesian regime would almost certainly retaliate by refusing to recognise British passports. In the end, the restriction on the entry of British people would not be of great consequence to the British government. Moreover, the British government was planning to evacuate British refugees from Zambia in the case of emergency. Part of this exercise required the cooperation of Rhodesia and the regime could deny them entry. However, the British officials thought that the regime would find it difficult to deny entry of refugees amongst whom there would be many Rhodesians and South Africans. Interestingly, Foreign Office officials considered that some Rhodesians remained loyal to the Queen. It was unfair to shut them out under the proposed new passport restrictions, and so they made a provision to exempt any holders of Rhodesian passports prepared to make a declaration of loyalty to the Queen. This category included Rhodesians who supported the RF regime in order to access British passports which were
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valid for six months. Foreign Office bureaucrats contemplated the possibility of making it difficult to declare all British passports invalid for travel to Rhodesia. It was politically unacceptable and made Britain absurd to invalidate its own passports for travel within the Queen’s realm and administratively difficult to deal with evasions or prosecutions.³⁰⁴ To make matters worse, the Rhodesian regime was tottering and Britain wanted to permit visits to extract information and sound opinion. Following the invalidation of British passports for Rhodesia, it would be very difficult to see how the residual High Commission staff could remain in Rhodesia.³⁰⁵

In 1967, the Commonwealth Secretary proposed to deny entry to named Rhodesians on the stop list. Britain invalidated all Rhodesian passports issued or renewed since UDI so that all governments might be in a position to deny entry to anyone travelling on such a passport. British authorities hoped that it would be feasible to repudiate all Rhodesian passports – regardless of the date of issue – in order to inconvenience large numbers of Rhodesian travelers. This punitive measure had its own challenges; only about one-third of the white population of Rhodesia held Rhodesian citizenship alone.³⁰⁶ The remainder was almost certainly entitled to the citizenship. It seemed that by itself, the repudiation of all Rhodesian passports had little effect. The other proposed option was to impound British passports issued or renewed in Salisbury upon arrival in Britain and provide travelers with one-way travel documents back to Rhodesia (except in special circumstances). At the meeting of the Commonwealth Sanctions Committee on 27 July 1966, African members vigorously campaigned for the extension of mandatory sanctions to passports travel and communications.³⁰⁷

Facing tremendous pressure from African countries, the British government proposed to tighten passport controls. Its action was part of a commitment under a resolution tabled at the UN Security Council to tighten the Rhodesian blockade. By agreeing to sturdier passport measures, the British government wanted to mollify angry African states who urged the use of force against Rhodesia.³⁰⁸ The cancellation of passports was in accordance with Article 111 of Britain’s UN resolution. It advocated for the banning of all Rhodesians from travelling outside their country ‘save on exceptional humanitarian grounds’ if they supported the Smith regime.³⁰⁹ Britain sought the support of all member states to make tight restrictions on Rhodesia. The legislation was going to affect most families who had immigrated to Rhodesia from Britain in the past ten years. This
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also included others who had settled since the Second World War and kept renewing their British passports as insurance against trouble in Africa. Sir Frederick Crawford, the resident Director in Rhodesia of the Anglo-American Corporation and a former Governor of Uganda, was one of the high profile cases involving an impounded passport. In May 1968, the British government impounded his passport when he entered the country and issued him return travel papers. When Crawford landed in Salisbury, he told reporters at the airport that he would apply for a Rhodesian passport if Britain did not return his British passport. Far from showing remorse, the British government planned to continue to extend against British citizens resident in Rhodesia suspected of giving comfort to the rebel regime. The Labour MPs envisaged the application of a much more rigorous and extensive policy to confiscate passports. Lord Caradon, Britain’s representative on the Security Council, already committed the government to support action to confiscate the passports of all Rhodesian residents known to be helping the Smith regime.

An Order putting into effect the UN resolution strengthening sanctions and tightening up passport and travel restrictions caused stir a in the House of Commons. One Labour MP, William Hamilton of West Fife, inquired from Wilson about the allegations that the British government had issued British passports to Africans who opposed the RF regime. In his answer, Wilson labelled all Rhodesians British nationals regardless of race and mentioned that British authorities abroad had authority to issue British passports except to known ‘terrorists’. An enraged Hamilton charged that vociferous and rightwing neo-fascist racialists led the Tory Party. He angrily pointed to the Tory front bench and charged ‘these are the men who would have this government crouching and cringing before a gang of white thugs in Rhodesia.’ ‘It had not escaped anybody’s notice’, continued Hamilton, ‘that many of the staunchest Tory apologists for Smith had business interests in Rhodesia.’ Technical, administrative and compassionate considerations rendered passport controls less effective in attempts to frustrate white Rhodesians to stop supporting Smith. Britain could not successfully police its own kith and kin in Rhodesia, a position that extended to the public service.

British passport holders in Rhodesia and those entitled to British passports estimated at between 60,000 and 80,000 people were becoming increasingly concerned about their future status as Rhodesia moved towards republican status. The British Mission closed in Salisbury in July 1968
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resulting in Rhodesians wishing to renew their British passports to flood the British embassy in Pretoria. British embassy officials in Salisbury were working following instructions from the Foreign Office in London.\textsuperscript{117} Passport regimes caused confusion and hardships as Rhodesian residents had to collect their passports in person from Pretoria. However, there was a special concession intended to help individuals who had immediate need to travel to Britain because of the death or serious illness of a relative, the passport would open from 10am to 12 noon for the next ten days to deal with deserving cases.\textsuperscript{118} Two members of the British Mission relocated to Pretoria to cope with the Rhodesian passport inquiries while the other ten returned to London waiting for re-posting. This demonstrates some form of sympathies and kinship feeling the British government had towards white Rhodesians the majority of whom had British passports.

Despite strict passport regimes, Rhodesians could still travel to Britain on different circumstances. Britain allowed the entry of some individuals and diplomatic officials holding Rhodesian passports issued after UDI.\textsuperscript{119} Officials in Salisbury were quick to point out that Britain’s admission was not an isolated case. They stated that people involved had testified that they had families and relatives to visit in Britain. Despite travels restrictions, Rhodesians could still travel to Britain on compassionate grounds to visit their kith and kin, attend funerals and for other family business. For example, Leonard Thompson, a British-born Rhodesian diplomat in Lisbon, travelled to Britain to attend his father-in-law’s funeral.\textsuperscript{120} Thompson was a former principal private secretary to Smith, and was on the blacklist. He produced proof that he was born in Britain; hence, he had an inalienable right to enter the country.\textsuperscript{121} He was one of the several officers at the Rhodesian mission in Portugal with a British passport and so free to travel around the world on behalf of the Smith regime. As a British official in Lisbon commented, ‘it seems astonishing that these people should be aided by British passports in their endeavours to overcome our sanctions policy’.\textsuperscript{122} Upon arrival in London Thompson surrendered his UDI passport and applied for a British one. However, besides the difficulties in passport controls, aspects of loyalty and allegiance exposed the familial and sentimental ties between Rhodesia and Britain.

**Conflicting Loyalties and Allegiances**

After UDI, members of the civil service were in a dilemma as to whether they should remain loyal to the rebel regime or the crown. The Attorney General was particularly concerned with the
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position of the Royal Rhodesian Army, Air Force and the British South Africa Police, which all had an oath of loyalty to the Queen. Service members also swore an oath of allegiance to the Queen and valued their links with their British counterparts. Interestingly, Wilson was of the view that Rhodesian public servants should stay at their posts, continue with their ordinary services and help to maintain law and order. Donal Lowry describes the British government’s position as confused, in that it warned civil servants from aiding the regime and yet they remained on their posts. The British government wanted public servants loyal to the Queen to remain at their posts and frustrate the purpose of the rebellion and speed up a return to their original allegiance to the Crown. Therefore, the British government could not advise public servants to refuse to take the oath because it posed a serious dilemma. It was prepared to take special steps to protect the ‘rights’ of affected civil servants in Rhodesia. In the House of Commons, the Secretary of the State for Commonwealth Relations confirmed that the British government was prepared to assist affected public servants, including military personnel. These comments and promises speaks to the special ties and relationship Britain had towards white Rhodesians.

Whilst British officials were concerned about the loyalty of Rhodesian public servants, the Rhodesian government expressed outright bitterness and disrespect towards Britain’s comments. Smith reminded ‘everyone in the services that first and foremost [they] are servant[s] of Rhodesia – [their] country – and of its government’. He charged the civil service not to entertain any approaches or flatteries made by anyone, including members of the British government. Smith warned against any attempts by the British government to sew doubts in the public servants to sway their loyalty from the RF government and Rhodesia itself. He called upon all public servants, especially service members, to render their services primarily to their country and government. ‘By remaining steadfast and united, come what may, the services will play a powerful part in supporting the efforts of all Rhodesians to weather the storm.’ This galvanised the rhetoric of white patriotism towards Rhodesia and represented a radical shift from the long-cherished idea of
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Britishness. Smith was proud that after UDI the civil service carried on normally and loyalty with their duties in accordance with the directives of his administration.\textsuperscript{131}

After UDI, white Rhodesians cherished a different form of settler nationalism inculcated by the RF despite the fact that there were some Africans in the Rhodesian army and civil service. David Lemon provides illustrative reminiscences of the UDI period to show the RF subjected many idealist white Rhodesians to ultra-nationalist views and conspiracies. They saw UDI as a call to rally behind the Rhodesian flag at a time when their cousins in Britain were shutting them out.\textsuperscript{132}

At the time of UDI, Lemon recalls, ‘patriotic pride beat strongly in my chest...like most young men of my generation, I had been brought up to abhor bullying and UDI seemed to typify the fight of the little man against the bullying British.’\textsuperscript{133} A number of white Rhodesian youths learnt about the ‘heroic’ efforts of the pioneers whose narratives became symbolic in white settler nationalism. As Benedict Anderson has argued, administrative units, over time, can become fatherlands through creating meaning.\textsuperscript{134} As a result, ‘Rhodesians saw themselves as the inheritors and guardians of a sort of British patriotism that almost extinguished at home.’\textsuperscript{135} The inculcation of an imperial-settler patriotism during this period was merely for the purposes of defiance in the face of danger. The myth that ‘Rhodians never die’, a song penned in 1965 with the purpose of instilling patriotic feelings, was an act of defiance as an affirmation of reality or a declaration of intentions.\textsuperscript{136} The song was defiant of all forces that seemed to overthrow the white establishment and created a sense of belonging to Rhodesia through pioneer myths.\textsuperscript{137} Therefore, many white Rhodesians thrived to emulate early pioneers and UDI provided them with a perfect opportunity to excise their loyalty and allegiance to the government in difficult and trying moments.

Rhodesian whites created an image of a thriving settler community presiding over the African majority. However, in the early colonial years, white Rhodesians created a Rhodesian settler self-image which they fashioned in relation to Africans, the imperial homeland of Britain and white South Africans.\textsuperscript{138} When political relations between them and Britain deteriorated and Africans threatened the basis of their survival, they created an exaggerated sense of homogeneity by creating
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a false image of an egalitarian society which concealed divisions within it.\textsuperscript{139} This stemmed mainly from fear, anxiety and uncertainty. As Dane Kennedy observes, settlers matched power with fear, arrogance, anxiety, disdain and suspicion which gave white communities a special character.\textsuperscript{140} Linda Colley shows that those common threats, real or imagined fears, or interests united British people in the Dominions and settler colonies acting as points of convergence at different times. Colley postulates that ‘whatever their own differences, Britons could feel united in dominion over, and in distinction from, the millions of colonial subjects beyond their own boundaries.’\textsuperscript{141} In white Rhodesia, these threats to settler hegemony were also influential in the construction and shaping conservative ideology.\textsuperscript{142} African nationalism, the vacillating political stance of Britain over the Rhodesian problem encouraged whites to create a homogeneous community.

In 1968, there was a move to force the Rhodesian judiciary to demonstrate whether its allegiance laid with the crown or with the Smith regime. Judges swore allegiance to the crown just like uniformed forces and were committed to uphold the 1961 constitution, which the RF suspended. The case of Daniel Madzimbamuto, an African political detainee, was a decisive test for judge’s loyalties and allegiance. On 1 March 1968, five Appel Division judges, presided over by Sir Hugh Beadle, the Chief Justice, refused an application on behalf of Madzimbamuto for a declaration that he had the right of appeal to the Privy Council in London. The RF government had issued an affidavit to the court stating that it would not recognise the right of appeal to the Privy Council. The conclusion led to the resignation of one of the five judges. Justice Fieldsend said he had not been able to agree with his colleagues that the government was in de facto control.\textsuperscript{143} One of the Rhodesian judges, Justice Young, criticised what he called contradictory rulings by the Rhodesian high courts’ Appellant Division. However, he announced his resignation. He felt that every judge should await a Privy Council ruling on the case of Madzimbamuto.\textsuperscript{144} When the Queen commuted the death sentences, Beadle dismissed this decision on the premise that his intervention was unconstitutional. Murphy argues that from this point on the myth of the RF’s loyalty to the crown became increasingly difficult to maintain.\textsuperscript{145}
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Awkward Kinship Ties, White Rhodesians and Britain

As the political relations between London and Salisbury severed, Britain remained worried about the Governors’ status as the representative of the crown in Rhodesia. The Governor Sir Humphrey Gibbs acted as the link between Britain and Rhodesia. Immediately after UDI, Smith asked the Governor to resign from his post. He refused, remaining as a representative of the Queen. Gibbs reminded Smith that ‘I have no intention of resigning as Governor. Nor do I intend to leave government house. I hope…that if I continue in office I may provide the link which makes a satisfactory settlement of the present situation possible.’ The regime cut off his phones, stood down the sentries and took away his Rolls Royce. Gibbs refused a salary from Britain because he felt it would prejudice his position in Rhodesia and drew heavily on his private resources. Numerous supporters and sympathisers created a fund to pay salaries for his staff at government house. Since UDI, the Smith regime appointed Clifford Dupont as the Officer Administering the Government instead of the Governor. This move divided Rhodesians between Dupont and Gibbs. It created competition for loyalties between the Rhodesian regime and the office of the Governor that resulted into ‘the battle of the books’ between Dupont and Gibbs. Both had a book where visitors signed. Frederick Crawford stated that ‘if the Governor’s book has become a method for registering political affiliations then it has lost its purpose.’ Two distinguished Rhodesians, Lord Malvern and Sir Malcolm Barrow, appealed the public to sign the visitor’s book at government house as a mark of respect for the Queen and Gibbs.

Despite the RF’s vilification of Gibbs, he managed to send a Christmas message of good will to all Rhodesians, black and white. In his message, he reiterated that he remained Rhodesia’s legal Governor and hoped that the country would return to constitutionality and loyalty to the Queen. Gibbs’ attitude exasperated some Rhodesians, who asked him to become a centre of opposition to Smith’s government. Illustrated Rhodesia Life, a monthly periodical read by many white Rhodesians, stated that Gibbs denied any interviews but courteously welcomed his guests in his study, dominated by the portrait Queen Elizabeth, and poured out tea in cups stamped with a gold Crown. It embellished the image of Gibbs to portray a picture of a tough, steadfast and undoubted tenacity diplomat. It portrayed Gibbs as a good Rhodesian, but above all, as the Queen’s man, the appointed guardian of the constitution bearing her name. Ironically, the RF

146 Flower, Serving Secretly, 28.
147 MSS.Afr.s.2208, Pestell Box 2, Gibbs Public Statement, 26 November 1965.
148 Illustrated Life Rhodesia, December 1968.
149 Times, 8 June 1968.
150 NAZ S3279/11/211 Loyalty to Rhodesian Government 1965, 31 December 1965
151 Illustrated Life Rhodesia, December 1968.
152 Ibid.
had suspended the legal 1961 constitution. Smith also mentioned that Gibbs ‘assured me that he was a good Rhodesian.’\footnote{MSS.Afr.s.2208 Pestell Box 2, Statement by Smith, 15 November 1965.} In one of his public statements, censored from all local news media in Rhodesia, Gibbs denied being loyal to the Smith regime. ‘Although some attacks have been made upon [my] personal integrity, and innuendoes whispered about [my] loyalty to Rhodesia, [I] must, of necessity, remain aloof. [I] am a man of character, who would not in any event stoop to petty recriminations which would be of no value and only cause a lowering of standards.’\footnote{Ibid.} Some white Rhodesians vilified Gibbs for his stand and he received the most appalling letters describing him as ‘traitor’, ‘a tool of Harold Wilson’ and a ‘communist’.\footnote{Ibid.}

In June 1968, the Queen sent a message to Gibbs asking him to convey to all the people of Rhodesia her deep and continuing interest in their welfare.\footnote{\textit{Times}, 8 June 1968.} By this, the Queen confirmed that she was representing all people in Rhodesia regardless of race. Yet, the Rhodesian regime decided not to celebrate the Queen’s birthday as a public holiday nor hold any official receptions on 9 June. Since UDI, Smith and his supporters maintained the fiction that their quarrel was with Wilson and the British government and not with the crown.\footnote{\textit{Daily Telegraph}, 23 May 1968.} Though Rhodesia was technically and constitutionally in rebellion against the crown, the more ‘moderate’ sections of the ruling RF sought to maintain allegiance to the person and office of the sovereign.\footnote{Ibid.} Although Rhodesians rebelled against Britain politically, they still could not shed their cultural connection with Britain completely and awkwardly cherished the sense of their British heritage.

In 1969, the regime passed a constitution, which renounced Britain’s sovereignty and made the country a republic. The country moved to a republic effectively in March 1970. As the illegal regime moved towards assuming a republican status, the British government reviewed its links with organisations in Rhodesia. A number of informal regimental alliances between units of the British Army and the Rhodesian forces and organisations had the royal title or prefix.\footnote{Murphy, \textit{Monarchy and the End of Empire}, 105.} In the event of an illegal republic, British authorities felt it necessary to remove the Royal prefix from the Rhodesian Air Force and Regiment.\footnote{TNA FCO 36/736 Position of Monarchy and Relinquishment by Royal Family in UK of Appointments and links with Rhodesia, 27 February 1970.} They reasoned that it was undisputed that the regime and its supporters were seeking to deprive the Queen authority in her part of her dominions.\footnote{Ministerial Statement on Purported Assumption of a Republican Status by the Regime on Southern Rhodesia, 2 March 1970.} It was
illogical for the Queen to remain the patron of many bodies in the illegal regime bearing the Royal title. The scraping of such titles had its own complications. Some organisations wishing to retain the royal title as a form of protest against the Smith regime could find it difficult. The Queen was a ‘die-hard Tory’, Murphy argues, ‘she was critical of Wilson’s handling of the Rhodesian case. She would reputedly urge British ministers “not to be nasty to Smithy”’. As a result, the Queen was never happy whenever ministers suggested that she should cut her links with Rhodesia. Finally, in March 1970, Rhodesia moved to become a republic. Consequently, the Queen suspended the Royal title applied to the Rhodesian Air Force and Regiment, terminated her appointment as honorary Colonel-in-Chief of the Royal Rhodesia Regiment and dismissed the appointment of Queen Elizabeth the Queen Mother as honorary Commissioner of the BSAP.

Anti-British feelings among white Rhodesians continued to rise. For example, one prominent Rhodesian politician, Evan Campbell, was appalled at the anti-British feeling throughout Rhodesia. He classified this as unjustified because there was tremendous sympathy for the Rhodesian case both in British political circles and among the people of Britain. The Rhodesian Recorder, reporting commerce and industry in Rhodesia, changed to Industrial and Commercial Recorder in 1965 and became political. It recorded Campbell as saying:

We in Rhodesia tend to be far too inward looking we are a tiny country, immersed in our own problems, and it is easy for us to feel persecuted and hard for us to remember that Britain is in fact a very good friend. So many of our immigrants, born and brought up in England, appear unable to look at this aspect objectively. Rhodesians too, particularly the younger ones, just do not know the British people because they have not had the opportunity to travel overseas.

His comments demonstrate that, despite political tensions, some white Rhodesians still had faith in Britain. He was convinced that political differences could not cloud kith and kin ties between Rhodesian and Britain. Campbell observed that the Tories could not commit themselves to open support for Rhodesia because they knew that Labour, for party political considerations, would not back them up. To Campbell, the British opinion changed in favour of Rhodesia because of three main factors: the example of what took place in several parts of ‘free’ Africa; the often-irresponsible actions and statements that emanated from the UN; and of course the growing colour
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problem in Britain.\textsuperscript{166} Rhodesians could not accept that the world around was changing and that they needed to adjust accordingly.

Wilson and the Conservative opposition leader Edward Heath accused each other of hypocrisy over Rhodesia in the House of Commons. It started after Wilson confirmed that British policy remained set against any economic confrontation with South Africa and using force against Rhodesia.\textsuperscript{167} Heath declared, amid Conservative cheers, ‘is it not nauseating humbug and hypocrisy to pretend that the government’s policy is based on any sort of morality whatsoever.’\textsuperscript{168} Wilson repeated that Britain could not accept any agreement, which did not fulfill the six principles. He stated that the British government’s experience with Smith was that on alternative weeks he accepted the six principles on others supported the racialists. The \textit{Guardian} claimed that Wilson always seemed to be ‘thrown over by racialists’ when he got home.\textsuperscript{169}

After UDI, Britain tried to settle the Rhodesian problem through dialogue. In December 1966, Britain engaged Smith in the talks aboard the British cruiser \textit{HMS Tiger} just off Gibraltar. Smith could not agree with Wilson on the principle of majority rule, end racial discrimination and amend the franchise and that he had no power to agree without consulting his cabinet.\textsuperscript{170} The RF caucus rejected the \textit{Tiger} proposals, as they feared the possibility of black rule.\textsuperscript{171} Wilson conceded that the British government would accept the 1961 constitution, which had the provision of leading to majority rule gradually. However, negotiations were not acceptable to the rest of the white Rhodesian electorate because the rightwing saw it as an appeasement and synonymous with concessions.\textsuperscript{172} Wilson thought that Lord Graham and William Harper, former Rhodesian Minister of the Interior, sabotaged his agreement with Smith after their meeting aboard \textit{HMS Tiger} in the Mediterranean. After their departure from the RF, Wilson hoped for fresh talks with Smith. Most sections of white Rhodesian opinion welcomed Britain’s initiative except the extreme rightwing bloc in the RF, which was against any settlement.\textsuperscript{173} Some ultra-racist Rhodesians could not see why Wilson wasted so much energy against Rhodesia yet he presided over a country with more overt racism. They wondered why Wilson expended so much futile energy on Rhodesian while his own was so blatantly racist.\textsuperscript{174}
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However, by the late 1960s, strong evidence was reaching the British government through diplomatic and political channels that the Smith regime was desperately anxious to bring ‘talks about talks’. Three separate messages along these lines arrived in London, conveyed through the Governor. An old flying friend of Smith, Sir Max Aitken, chair of the Beaverbrook group of newspapers, confirmed that he saw Ian Smith and the Governor in his visit to Salisbury. The Salisbury correspondent of the *Times* reported that Max paid a secret visit in an effort to get talks going again between the British and Rhodesian governments. The British government knew about the visit and Sir Max indicated to those he spoke in Salisbury that he would report on his visit to Wilson, or the Commonwealth Secretary, George Thompson, on his return to London. Smith thought it was necessary for the Rhodesian government to enter into negotiations with Britain, reasoning that it was good to terminate the economic war between Britain and Rhodesia, which was detrimental to both countries. His reply was surprising since the usual government attitude was to argue that sanctions were having little or no effect on the Rhodesian economy and were probably doing more damage to Britain. Smith had stated that Britain was the unwilling party for holding talks with Rhodesia. The Commonwealth Secretary argued that Britain was always ready for a settlement with Rhodesia. ‘We would never be the first to slam the door. We have always been anxious for a settlement.’ The fear that the Rhodesian problem would lead to opposition of his government in Britain motivated Wilson to agree to meet with Smith. The talks resumed in 1968, off Gibraltar aboard the warship *HMS Fearless*. Despite the fact that Britain dropped the demand for a return to legality, no agreement was reached on the principle of majority rule. Wilson insisted that there would be ‘no sell-out’ over Rhodesia by Britain. He remained resolute that Britain would remain resolute with its six principles for a new independent constitution, cardinal to the future of Rhodesia – both black and white.

After the failed talks, Rhodesia and Britain remained apart without formal negotiations or engagements to settle the dispute. However, it was not until early 1971 when British officials started secretly to have talks with Rhodesian bureaucrats. Later in the year, the British Foreign Secretary, Alec Douglas-Home, met with Smith in Salisbury. On 24 November 1971, they signed the Anglo-Rhodesean Proposals. Part of the proposals called for an increase in African
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representation in parliament and contained a passage to majority rule. Surprisingly, the 1969 republican constitution offered the basis of the proposals.\textsuperscript{184} This shows the extent to which Britain was prepared to legitimise another illegal constitution promulgated by the rebel regime. However, Britain offered that the proposals undergo a test of acceptability by all Rhodesians – black and white. The Conservative government voted in 1970 under Edward Heath appointed Lord Pearce to investigate the acceptability of the Anglo-Rhodesian Proposals. This resulted in the Pearce Commission of 1972 discussed in detail in the next chapter.

Some associations in Britain expressed outright kith and kin ties with white Rhodesian settlers. For example, the Monday Club of the Conservative Party urged Britain to establish a settlement with Rhodesia. In 1971, the Monday Club of Scotland condemned Britain’s attitude towards Rhodesia. It felt that the continued strained relations between the two countries were economically and politically disadvantageous. Its secretary stated that:

Time was ‘ripe for a fresh top level approach to be made to our kinsmen in Rhodesia with a view to arriving at a resumption of our previous close relationship, not necessarily along the lines of rigid principles already laid down.'\textsuperscript{185}

Some of its members saw Rhodesia as a representation of Britain at its best enjoying self-reliance maintaining law and order.\textsuperscript{186} The Club condemned what it called the vociferous Left, altruistic in approach to Rhodesian problems only for political capital. In 1971, eighteen members of the Monday Club of UK visited Rhodesia and expressed racist views towards Africans. The chairperson of the Monday Club, George Pole, could not see any reason to emphasise the integration of the races because Africans were very ‘backward’.\textsuperscript{187} The Club believed in settler supremacy and the perpetuation of minority rule. The Sunday Times, anti-settler in outlook, condemned the Monday Club’s pro-settler stance stating that ‘only a few Monday Clubbers in Britain publicly defend a Rhodesian regime committed to principles so utterly different from our own.’\textsuperscript{188}

Another association, the Anglo-Rhodesian Society launched a big campaign in Britain with the objective of persuading the Conservative Party constituency associations to support a motion calling for the abolition of sanctions. The main weapon of the campaign was a thirty-minute colour film commissioned by the society. Entitled ‘So Far and no Further,’ the film had an enthusiastic
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reception by society members at its first showing in London.\textsuperscript{189} The Anglo-Rhodesian Society, Metropolitan Essex Branch, urged Britain to end tensions with Rhodesia. It pointed out that one chief in Wedza district stated, ‘a father and son have quarreled. We do not understand why reconciliation takes long.’\textsuperscript{190} This comment buttressed the idea that white Rhodesians and Britain had real familial ties. The Society blamed the Conservative government for buying time and not solving the Rhodesian crisis. ‘The Conservative record on Rhodesia has been a shoddy one from the betrayal of Welensky and the Federation to the Heath/Wilson alliance on sanctions.’\textsuperscript{191} It urged the Tories to redeem themselves from this mess. According to the Society, to maintain a high standard of government and diplomacy necessary for continuing prosperity and to keep peace between the races a predominantly white government was necessary.\textsuperscript{192}

Sympathetic feelings towards loyal Rhodesians continued to trouble British officials. Britain came up with a plan to help anti-Smith whites to settle in the Dominions with the intention of shaming the regime. In 1966, British Ministers discussed the possibility of compensating or re-settling loyal Rhodesians who felt that they could not continue to live in the country. It planned to settle them in Canada, Australia and New Zealand. However, the Commonwealth Secretary gave further thought to this matter and reached the conclusion that it would not be desirable to raise this issue with any other Commonwealth government.\textsuperscript{193} The move was politically misleading and dangerous to indicate to other governments that Britain was considering certain consequential action, which might follow a transfer of sovereignty over Rhodesia to UN or to any other authority.\textsuperscript{194} These fears were not entirely genuine. Correspondence between Commonwealth officials and the British High Commissions in Canada, Australia and New Zealand shows the British government’s enthusiasm to relocate white Rhodesians. It was particularly anxious to hear if Australia could accept white Rhodesians.\textsuperscript{195} Australians had some evidence that financially stable or professionally qualified migrants from former British colonies in Africa settled reasonably well. However, the Australian government expressed that it was not open to accommodate Rhodesian whites used to have African domestic servants because this class of settlers would find life difficult in a new country with no such services.\textsuperscript{196} Australians also wanted Rhodesians who had connection with Australia and were generally pro-British. Like Australia, Canada was prepared to accept Rhodesians.
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on compassionate grounds, especially those with qualifications, but had reservations about a scheme that would attract African criticism on grounds of racial discrimination. However, for some unspecified reason, Canadians could not entirely foresee many Rhodesians wanting to migrate to their country.

However, New Zealand had a different view. The Prime Minister, Keith Holyoake, believed that Rhodesia was Britain’s responsibility. As a result, neither Holyoake nor his cabinet could welcome the influx of Rhodesians. This was also amidst accommodation challenges in New Zealand and that Britain was supposed to bear all the costs involved in the scheme. New Zealand immigration regulations were also tight. Apart from special arrangements for the recruitment of teachers, New Zealand assisted immigrants only from Britain. Basic qualifications were that migrants should be British or Commonwealth citizens who would have stayed in Britain for ten years and were of European extraction. Overall, British officials concluded that the project to relocate white Rhodesians opposed to the Smith regime was not viable. First, experience had shown that a sustained publicity drive was essential to achieve any large-scale movement and it was difficult to conceive of the regime permitting any such activity. Secondly, those who could lead the ranks of the disillusioned in Rhodesia and expected to start the exodus would be those who left Britain for an ‘easy life, which was sunshine and servants and may not fancy the rigours of the Australian domestic scene.’ These colonial privileges made Rhodesian whites to defend their country which they could not afford to obtain in Australia, Canada or New Zealand.

Not all whites in Rhodesia supported the idea of UDI and right wing policies of the RF. The UFP renamed as the Rhodesia National Party (RNP) and later Rhodesia Party (RP) was the vehicle of moderate politics for the greater part of the 1960s albeit with little electoral success. After receiving pressure from other moderate whites and Africans, Welensky felt he needed to come back to politics and stop UDI. He formed the Rhodesia Party with Whitehead as his deputy, contested in the October 1964 by-elections for Salisbury seats of Avondale and Arundel constituency and lost. He explained that his idea for entering the Arundel by-elections was to try to demonstrate that some white Rhodesians opposed the idea of UDI. He was sure that he was
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going to lose in the election. After the election, his party dissolved and replaced by the United Peoples Party (UPP) under the leadership of J. M. Gondo.\footnote{Clements, Rhodesia, 205.}

In 1968, there were prospects that the Reform Party, dormant since the 1965 general election when the RF won all white seats in parliament, would make a comeback paving way for moderate politics. Morris Hirsch, leader of the Reform Party, hinted that when he attended a convention of the Centre Party (CP) formed in March 1968, a moderate group dedicated themselves to racial equality and a settlement of the independence issue with Britain. The party felt that there was a need for an alternative to offer Rhodesia the possibility of effective constitutional protection to all, to avert a mounting battle for racial power.\footnote{Times, 9 December 1968.} The CP believed in majority rule but in the hands of African middle class committed to the preservation of western ‘standards’.\footnote{Hancock, Moderate Liberals and Radicals, 128.} In other words, the CP still believed in the preservation of white interests by reviving the liberal ideas of the 1950s to delay majority rule. At its 1969 congress, the chair of the Centre Party T.H.P Bashford captured how whites viewed his party. When the CP came into existence, people called it ‘the illegitimate product of some sort of clandestine union of the naughty old UFP and the allegedly left-wing harlot to the University College.’\footnote{MSS.Afr.s.2208 Box 2, T.H.P. Bashford Address to the Centre Party Congress, Salisbury, 12-13 April 1969.} However, the idea for the Rhodesia Party was to avoid confrontation with Britain especially on the independence issue. White moderates could not survive powerful right wing elements in European politics. Although others such as Arhn Pally, an independent candidate, tried hard, their efforts could not abate white extremism.

Some whites in Rhodesia, who wanted to cut all ties with Britain and form a republic, called Smith a ‘liberal’. Len Idensohn, leader of a Right-wing Rhodesian National Party and a former RF divisional chairperson, was a case in point. ‘It was essential for Rhodesia to declare a republic immediately it is ridiculous for Rhodesian armed forces to swear allegiance to the Queen when the British government was out to destroy Rhodesia.’\footnote{Guardian, 23 March 1968.} Idensohn called Smith and his colleagues ‘a crowd of screaming long-haired liberals’. Smith’s regime infuriated him and by what he saw as a perpetuation of racial integration. Idensohn gave a different view for those who thought Smith was the quintessential exponent of colour bars and racial discrimination. He declared, ‘in four years of RF rule there is still racial integration in hospitals, swimming pools, cinemas and parks … in fact we are still carrying out the integration policies of Sir Edgar Whitehead.’\footnote{Ibid.} This did not go well with a small number of whites who advocated total racial separation and development. ‘We
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want straight-forward racial segregation and say so, unlike the government which shields under an umbrella of phoney multiculturalism’, he declared.\textsuperscript{210} With his new ambitious political party, he thought he would capture substantial support from white artisan lower and middle-class and farming elements.

British officials in the Rhodesia Political Department (RPD) were convinced that Idenoshn’s defection was a manifestation of internal tensions in the RF. However, these tensions were not sufficient to cause any significant shift to moderation in the RF regime.\textsuperscript{211} The RF also suspended Robin James, who proved to be too right wing and supported ‘apartheid’ publicly. The affair brought to the surface a creeping internal policy clash in the RF over the pace of racial separate development and the form it would take in Rhodesia. One of the British news agencies, \textit{Gemini}, assessed that it would be wild exaggeration to state that the RF was in the process of breaking up.\textsuperscript{212} James’s case was especially curious because the RF was always bent over backwards to conceal and heal its internal divisions in the common cause of white unity against a black takeover. The \textit{Rhodesian Herald}, effectively under the control of the government, buttressed the idea of white solidarity against Britain and Africans. Hilda Burke of Avondale wrote to the \textit{Herald} stating that ‘for the past two years, we have all been pretty good Rhodesians, standing shoulder to shoulder behind Smith…determined to show a united front to Harold Wilson and the world…the majority of us are as determined as ever not to surrender our independence…’\textsuperscript{213}

\textbf{Whiteness and White Solidarities}

Political insecurities forced Rhodesian settlers to embrace other whites whom they previously considered as undesirables. Their ‘undesirability’ shifted as long as they were prepared to stand against African threats and British betrayal. The RF skillfully manipulated white fears and anxieties and absorbed previously largely excluded ethnic groups such as Greeks and Afrikaners.\textsuperscript{214} For example, Smith appointed the South African born Afrikaner Pieter van der Byl as the Minister of Information, Immigration and Tourism in September 1968. Because of his job, he was ‘eternally grateful that the privilege has fallen to [him] to play some part in this epic period of Rhodesia’s history.’\textsuperscript{215} \textit{Illustrated Life Rhodesia} called him ‘the most elegant bachelor, a self-confessed dilettante, a casual student, a connoisseur of food and wine, sportsman, traveler, farmer – and above all, a successful politician and elegant Edwardian.’\textsuperscript{216} In addition, the Association of Afrikaans
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Rhodesians expressed appreciation to the Smith regime for its sympathetic attitude towards the Afrikaners institution of Bothashof. In 1967, the association complained about multiracial sports meetings, a general practice amongst most government schools. It requested government to guard, and if necessary legislate, against the subtle onslaught on Afrikaner youth by liberal forces among other recommendations. Parker concludes that Rhodesian whites found unity based on mutual greed and fear as they had everything to lose so they banded together. There was no reason to show disunity in the face of common uncertainties and fears among Rhodesian whites.

In order to survive the political and economic uncertainties associated with UDI, Rhodesians looked to white South Africans and the Portuguese in Mozambique in the region to safeguard their future. Independent African countries facing serious post-colonial economic and political crises fueled white solidarities in the sub-continent. Fear gripped both Rhodesian and South African governments from African nationalism, decolonisation on the continent and the threat of Russia and China in the region. South Africa pursued an ambivalent policy towards Rhodesia militarily and economically to sustain the economy in the UDI years. In early 1965, Rhodesians held a meeting with South Africa and the Portuguese in Salisbury to strengthen their cooperation in the region. Enthusiastically, one of the RF cabinet Ministers, William Royal, expressed that one of the purpose of the Salisbury meeting was to achieve maximum coordination between South Africans, the Portuguese and the Rhodesians in economic, political and military fields. There were thirty-nine Portuguese taking part in Salisbury meeting, eleven of whom were military personnel. This proved to be useful in the years following UDI when Britain imposed economic sanctions on Rhodesia. South Africa and Portugal provided Rhodesians with the lifeline to survive economic sanctions from 1965 to 1979. Rhodesia-South Africa solidarity was not only on the political front, but also economic. The activities of the Rhodesian Promotion Council, a private organisation of Rhodesian firms and businesspeople, show how South Africans and white Rhodesians cooperated despite Rhodesian sanctions. The organisation specialised in disseminating information regarding Rhodesian economic potential, attracting foreign investment into the country. In June 1966, a delegation of the South African Handelsinstituut paid a visit to the Rhodesian Promotion Council and made its recommendations. One of its recommendations was to strengthen economic ties between South Africa and Rhodesia among other concessions.

---

217 NAZ S3269/69/195 Genootskap van Rhodesiesse Afrikaaners, Association of Afrikaans Rhodesians, 17 February 1967
218 Parker, Rhodesia, 96.
220 Ibid, 133.
221 MS. Eng.c. 6478 George Ivan Smith to U Thant, 26 March 1965.
However, Portugal did not offer the necessary financial and military help that Smith needed. As a result, South Africa remained Rhodesia’s ally throughout the 1960s to late 1970s. However, South Africa’s support for Smith was ambivalent because of persistent historic, cultural, unequal trade relations, racial policies and political differences between the two countries. South Africa’s tacit support of the UDI state by not imposing sanctions, economic and political support and security measures provided another dimension to the meaning of kith and kin in the region between white minority regimes. South Africa’s support of Rhodesia enabled the RF to continue with its rebellion against Britain. Such support from South Africa engendered stronger kith and kin like ties compared to Britain and Rhodesia.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, this chapter was concerned with the political developments since 1963 in Rhodesia up to 1971. It has argued that the coming into power of the RF in December 1962 was a turning point of white politics in Rhodesia. White conservatism and solidarity against African nationalists soon heightened. The move to the right in European politics in the 1960s showed that liberalism among Rhodesian whites was ineffective. Since post-war industrial development began, whites dominated blacks and the wealth they gained entrenched their position in all fields. Because of their position and the threat coming from African nationalists, Rhodesian whites were not prepared to accept majority rule making opportunities for racial cooperation fewer and slim. As this chapter has demonstrated, the dissolution of the Federation in 1963 opened a new episode in Rhodesia and British relations. When Britain refused to grant white Rhodesians independence, the move did not receive the approval of the RF government culminating in UDI on 11 November 1965. Because of kith and kin ties, Britain could not effectively punish the rebel RF regime. Economic sanctions could not produce the desired effects. If anything, they pushed whites closer together to rally behind Smith. Equally, passport controls and travel restrictions coupled with administrative challenges, conflicting loyalties and kinship ties were less effective. The crown and the Governor all showed a sense of awkward kith and kinship ties towards Rhodesians. By the end of 1970, as Rhodesia declared republic status, relations between Rhodesia and Britain entered a new phase to be explore in the next chapter.
Chapter Six

Britain and the Capitulation of White Power in Rhodesia, 1972 – 80

Introduction

On 18 April 1980, Rhodesia held its first ever general election based on one person one vote. The election marked the fall of the Rhodesian Front and settler colonial rule by ushering in a new independent Zimbabwe under the leadership of Robert Mugabe and his ZANU party. Christopher Soames, the last British Governor in Rhodesia, monitored the election and transitional period and witnessed the lowering of the Union Jack for the last time in an African colony. Prince Charles, heir to the British throne, presided over the ceremony. The presence of Lord Soames, Prince Charles and especially Lord Carrington at this particular occasion had different meanings for blacks and white Rhodesians. The African majority saw it as the official granting of political independence whilst white Rhodesians felt betrayed. For them Britain had abandoned its kith and kin at the last minute. In view of this, this chapter sets out to explore feelings of kith and kin between white Rhodesians and the British between 1972 and 1980. It follows the open and secret political developments aimed at ending the Rhodesian problem. As in the previous chapters, the British government’s position was ambivalent; it wanted to protect the interests of white Rhodesia settlers at the same time being pragmatic. In the end, it appeased neither white Rhodesians nor the Africans. This chapter continues to illustrate Anglophobic sentiments among white Rhodesian settlers as minority rule was ending, following the intensification of the African war of liberation and the biting effects of sanctions.

Kith and Kin Feelings or Pragmatism? Britain and White Rhodesians

After the RF declared a republican status in 1970, it officially cut off all ties with the crown and abandoned the office of the Governor. Despite this, British officials remained sympathetic towards Rhodesia’s white settlers, especially those holding British passports – estimated to be about 250,000 people. In 1972, the RPD at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) reconsidered plans for intervention by the British military to rescue white Rhodesians in the event of a breakdown in law and order. This plan, code named “Operation Embryo”, was a top secret limited only to British military personnel and political figures, not the public. The file in the British National Archives, Kew, containing this information is marked ‘secret’ and ‘UK eyes’ only.¹ Of the various plans prepared shortly after UDI to use force in Rhodesia, only Operation Embryo

¹ TNA FCO 46/854 Reinforcement of Rhodesia by Armed Forces of UK, 6 July 1972.
survived. Its name is suggestive of the cultural and political connections between Britain and white Rhodesia.

This plan stemmed from Harold Wilson’s statement in the House of Commons in November 1965. He stated that the British force or police would only intervene in Rhodesian if requested by the Governor to preserve law and order, avert tragic action, subversion, murder and so on.² For the plan to work British officials did not expect resistance from the Rhodesia Air Force and army, they needed to place their army in loyal hands and wanted cooperation from other African countries.³ Since 1966, at the request of the Ministry of Defence, the RPD often considered the possibility of resuming this plan. After Africans rejected the Pearce Commission, the RPD considered whether the plan was worth preserving since Britain’s policy was to maintain the status quo, including sanctions. As a result, RPD officials thought that it was the wrong time to abandon Operation Embryo or to radically revise it.⁴ They did not rule out entirely the possibility of using force to restore law and order and safeguard lives and white property in Rhodesia. In an unlikely event of breakdown of law and order, was ready to respond to a call for a rescue operation for British citizens.⁵ The thinking at the time was that a breakdown in law and order could come because of a combination of economic pressure, a resurgence of loyalty and fear of the long-term consequences of sanctions. Either this would result in a power vacuum or the Governor would assume control.⁶ By 1972, circumstances and assumptions on which the Chiefs of Staff and political officials based the plan had altered considerably. The Governor was gone and the possibility of a Rhodesian government committed to return the country to its pre-UDI status assuming power was remote.

Later in 1979, the RPD officials discussed the situation of white Rhodesians as the political and military situation in Rhodesia deteriorated. They considered the possibility of secretly encouraging large scale white emigration from Rhodesia. The RPD estimated that the exodus of whites was running at about 1, 500 per month, a severe drain on a base population of around 250, 000.⁷ The growth of net emigration of whites was not only a symptom of war-weariness and a growing conviction that they had no long-term future in the country. It directly contributed towards a decline in economic activity, especially in agriculture, and lessened the ability of the security forces
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to contain the guerrillas.\textsuperscript{8} The RPD believed that minority rule was ending in Rhodesia and it was better to encourage white emigration.

Financial strains also facilitated the fast rate of emigration from Rhodesia. House prices were falling and exchange control was strict.\textsuperscript{9} The RPD considered that an effective way to increase the outflow would be to offer whites financial inducements in the form of grants or loans to help resettlement in Britain or elsewhere.\textsuperscript{10} However, this decision had its own drawbacks. More than any other measure, the offer of financial inducements would lead to suggestions that the British government was deliberately destabilising the situation.\textsuperscript{11} Whites who had left already would say the British government ignored them and was now helping the feckless and the last-ditchers. Any such scheme might revive the claims of Rhodesian public servants that the British government should guarantee or take over payment of their pensions, which Britain rejected.\textsuperscript{12} Overall, RPD officials concluded that they should discreetly promote a progressive reduction in white numbers through financial incentives. They advised British politicians to make public statements designed to alert residents in and travelers to Rhodesia of the dangers they were facing.

Some European countries such as Italy offered to assist in these secret plans. Through its embassy in Britain, the Italian government informed the RPD that its government was ready to cooperate in mounting any operation to evacuate whites from Rhodesia in the event of an emergency, whether civilian or military assisted.\textsuperscript{13} As the reality of majority rule increasingly became evident, British subjects in other countries were worried about the future of their relatives in Rhodesia. They were worried since that British government had not furnished Rhodesians with information as regards evacuation in the event of a full scale civil war developing.\textsuperscript{14}

Some firms planned to evacuate their staff from Rhodesia and applied for approval from the Bank of England and the Rhodesia Political Department. For example, Gallaher Ltd applied for permission to open a line of credit of 100,000 pounds with Nedbank in Johannesburg in order to evacuate its staff and dependents from Rhodesia.\textsuperscript{15} It required the approval of the Bank of England for such a transfer and Gallaher was prudent not to leave such a plan until the last moment. The RPD considered accepting this proposal on humanitarian grounds but were afraid that this would
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lead to other companies making similar applications and would result in accusations that they were encouraging the exodus of whites out of Rhodesia.\textsuperscript{16} This had the potential to seriously affect any prospects of a peaceful settlement. However, the RPD advised that the Bank of England to tell Gallahers that they did not object in principle to a transfer of funds for this purpose.

Britain’s compromised attempts to control the movement of white Rhodesians sympathetic to the Smith regime continued to reflect kith and kin feelings. Significant numbers of white Rhodesia settlers continued to have friends, relatives and kinship ties with their relatives in Britain. In the circumstances, it was difficult for the British government to ban the movement of people on compassionate grounds simply because they supported Smith. For example, in September 1972, John Wrathall, the Rhodesian Minister of Finance, asked for permission to visit Britain to see his ailing mother. The RPD considered that with her age and winter approaching, there was clearly a strong compassionate case for allowing Wrathall to visit his aging mother despite him being on the stop list.\textsuperscript{17} Eventually, British authorities allowed Wrathall to secretly pay a visit to his mother, thus ignoring the political circumstances surrounding his office and profile. They only requested Wrathall not to communicate with the press or other news media and to make his visit as discrete as possible.\textsuperscript{18}

The RF regime continued to enjoy support from some conservative Friends of Rhodesia associations scattered all over the world.\textsuperscript{19} These associations believed in white supremacy and supported the RF regime for defying the British authorities and suppressing Africans. This reflects how kith and kin notions transcended national boundaries. For instance, the Scottish Friends of Rhodesia fervently supported white Rhodesians. There was a large measure of support for Rhodesia, especially in Central Scotland and from widely read papers such as the \textit{Dundee Courier} and its sister paper, printed in Glasgow, the \textit{Sunday Post}.\textsuperscript{20} Nicholas Fairbairn, the Scottish MP, was one of the most knowledgeable and ardent supporters of Rhodesia. After touring Rhodesia for three weeks at his own expense, Fairbairn gave publicity to the Rhodesian cause in Parliament, the press and on television. Several other younger Scottish MPs visited Rhodesia with the hope of influencing the Conservative leadership to settle the Rhodesian problem. On 10 December 1977, the Scottish Friends of Rhodesia passed some resolutions which they distributed to British authorities asking them to resolve the Rhodesian problem. They demanded the recognition of
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Rhodesia’s independence according to international law. The association argued that the recognition of a ‘de facto’ or ‘de jure’ government should not depend on whether the character of the regime was such as to command the British government’s approval.\textsuperscript{21} It further argued that in the confirmation of the ‘de facto’ and ‘de jure’ status of Rhodesia by the Chief Justice of Rhodesia and the Appeal Court of Rhodesia on 14 September 1968, gave formal recognition to the Smith administration under the 1965 constitution. It also demanded the removal of the UN sanctions on Rhodesia because not all the permanent members of the Security Council supported the Order.

The Scottish Friends of Rhodesia blamed Britain for not supporting white Rhodesians since the break-up of the Federation in 1963. It argued that Britain granted independence to Zambia and Malawi because they were black-led, whereas the truly ‘democratic’ parliament of Rhodesia was white-dominated. ‘This wanton act by the Conservative government in 1963’, it stated, ‘not only ashamed that party and Britain, but was the direct cause of the Rhodesians declaring UDI.’\textsuperscript{22} The reasoning behind these charges were that the RF had ample proof that neither the words nor the actions of successive British governments could be trusted. The association further accused Britain of not being grateful to white Rhodesians who passionately supported the Empire during the Second World War. Therefore, alleged the association, ‘it was a measure of the cowardly state of Britain, and the hypocrisy of its politicians that they repay the debt we all owe to Rhodesia in the way we are doing.’\textsuperscript{23} As such, if Rhodesian settlers supported their kith and kin during the war, Britain had a moral responsibility to return the favour by granting white minority rule in Rhodesia, so the argument went.

Meanwhile African nationalists continued to attack Britain and singled out some Conservative members who allegedly supported Rhodesian whites. Africans wanted the Conservative Party to take responsibility and force the RF to relinquish power to the Patriotic Front, the authentic Liberation Movement of Zimbabwe. The \textit{Zimbabwe Peoples’ News}, a ZAPU news bulletin accused certain members of the Conservative Party of using their feudal-capitalist heritage to thwart the revolution by supplying white Rhodesians with arms, oil, finance and military expertise including mercenaries.\textsuperscript{24} This is despite the fact that some big business in Rhodesia, such as Lonrho, started to support African nationalists especially after 1976, which infuriated some sections of the white Rhodesian community.\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Zimbabwe People’s News} drew up a list of Conservative Party members and
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MPs whom it accused of supporting white Rhodesians: Margaret Thatcher, the Conservative Party Chief; Lord Carrington, former Conservative Defence Secretary and later British Chief Representative at UN; John Davies, Shadow Secretary for Foreign Affairs; and Winston Churchill, a journalist and grandson of Sir Winston Churchill, the well-known supporter of British imperialism during the zenith of his political career. It charged that these people had been motivated for centuries by traditional sentiments of British imperialism.

According to Zimbabwe People’s News, in 1977 alone, there were several occasions when these British MPs openly expressed their Party’s support for the Smith regime in Salisbury. The exasperated African nationalists perceived these moves as deliberate efforts by the Conservatives MPs to openly support their kith and kin in Rhodesia:

Firstly, Thatcher protested to the British Foreign Secretary, David Owen, about the way he was handling the Rhodesian settlement issue. She flew to Washington and expressed the same sentiments to both the US President Jimmy Carter and his Secretary of State, Cyrus Vance. Thatcher declared that it was wrong for the British and American governments to demand the disbanding of the Rhodesian forces during the so-called interim administration leading to majority rule. Secondly, on his return from Salisbury, Churchill, told his fellow journalists that Rhodesians “would be stupid to dissolve their security forces.” He is responsible for the maintenance of the regime’s army in its war effort. He used his journalistic techniques to promote and preserve British rule in Rhodesia by acquiring more aid for the colonial settlers. Moreover, he has a chain of business enterprises in Rhodesia of which he is one of those companies’ directors. Thirdly, Lord Carrington, on a recent annual conference of the Conservative Party, expressed his wish to see a peaceful transition to majority rule in Rhodesia with a moderate black leadership, which includes Muzorewa, Chirau and Sithole. Like Thatcher and Churchill, he declared that Smith regime’s soldiers were a stabilizing force in Rhodesia. He had been in Rhodesia on several so-called fact finding missions.

Although African nationalists exaggerated their allegations, they still reveal kith and kin feelings between British officials and Rhodesian white settlers. This was not only limited to cultural ties but also extended to business connections.

In their allegations, African nationalists conflated British imperialism and settler colonialism. They contended that Conservative MPs who were visiting Rhodesia assured whites of their unlimited support in perpetuating British imperialism in Rhodesia. For instance, on 25 October 1977, the Smith regime invited John Davies, Conservative Shadow Minister for foreign Affairs, to re-visit
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Rhodesia for consultation on the possibility of an Internal Settlement. The Zimbabwe Peoples’ News condemned both the Conservatives and the Labour government for being soft towards white Rhodesians. ‘The Conservatives with their feudal-imperialist connections are the hawks of British imperialism, bringing under their wings the Labour Government, which now, in support of international imperialism, is unable to solve the colonial problem of Rhodesia.’

Whilst ZAPU incriminated both the Conservatives and the Labour Parties for supporting and protecting their kith and kin, it also lashed out at the Monarchy. It argued that the Queen Mother wanted Smith and his racist henchmen to remain in perpetual control of Rhodesia for the exclusive benefit of the white settler minority. ZAPU accused the Queen Mother of believing that it was ‘better to have a disloyal white minority regime in Rhodesia than a free and independent Zimbabwe run by all Zimbabweans based on universal adult suffrage’, warning that ‘the British ruling circles would never stand against their Rhodesian kith and kin.’ Generally, Africans believed that both the British government and the Crown were hypocritical in their actions as all they wanted was to safeguard the interests of their kith and kin in Rhodesia at all cost. To this end, African nationalists saw no reason than to believe in them. Instead, they resolved to intensify the armed struggle declaring that the British government and the Crown ‘should be well advised to know that [Africans were] determined to free [themselves] from their kith and kin and agents at any cost in the shortest possible time.’ This was a clear message of intent and defiance to the Royal family.

Another nationalist party, ZANU also blamed and attacked the British government for giving moral support to white Rhodesians. This reflected in a number of instances and pronouncements by some British officials which irked ZANU officials. On 23 and 26 November 1979, Rhodesian Security Forces attacked ZANU refugee camps at Chimoio and Tembue in Mozambique killing hospital patients, schoolchildren, non-combatant men and women. David Owen, the British Foreign Secretary, congratulated the Smith regime for a fine job done. In a BBC news interview, Owen said in part, ‘Rhodesia’s acts of aggression against Mozambique last week might help achieve the overall settlement, by showing that the British colony’s armed forces are not weak.’ The British High Commissioner in Tanzania and the British embassy in Maputo confirmed these remarks. Because the British government did not retract these statements, ZANU argued, it was its authentic policy. According to ZANU, Rhodesian whites used their political power and the
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doctrine of racism to entrench British and American imperialism and capitalism in Rhodesia. Thus, Britain certainly forfeited the moral or legal right as the administering power when it abandoned Africans in favour of its kith and kin in 1965. The utterances by the Labour Party during their election campaign that they would end the constitutional deadlock with their kith and kin if returned to power was just a fraud designed to hoodwink the international world and neutralise the tide of revolution sweeping across Zimbabwe. It defined the white minority as gangsters, usurpers and impostors living on the sweat and blood of the Africans.

Following the Anglo-American initiatives to end the Rhodesian problem between 1976 and 1979, African Members of Parliament (MP) in Rhodesia continued to condemn Britain for protecting its kith and kin in Rhodesia. They projected a more inclusive form of nationalism. In the late 1970s, they reflected on the trajectory the Anglo-Rhodesia crisis had taken and blamed Britain. Their reflections resonated with African nationalists’ call for Britain to use force and to be tough on white Rhodesians since UDI. They argued that successive British governments showed paternalism and bias towards Rhodesian settlers whom they left to administer Africans through a harsh ‘native policy’ based on racist pieces of legislation. According to them, Britain was guilty because of its indecisiveness in dealing with the Rhodesian problem. One black parliamentarian, Dewa, charged that ‘the British government stand equally guilty in the eyes of the African people for having pushed the whites to take a course that would plant this country into a mess we find ourselves today.’ Others compared the relationship between Britain and white Rhodesians as that of a father with a delinquent child. B. A. Mabika gave a revealing anecdote in the Rhodesian Parliament. ‘You have a child who has a habit of stealing something, refuse to go to school, or in the case of Africans, go and herd cattle. You cannot punish or threaten by saying you are not going to give the child sweets. You have got to discipline that child saying, “I am going to give you a hiding.”’ Britain, as a father with a rebellious child, was supposed to seriously reprimand white Rhodesians by either military force or the mandatory sanctions advocated by the UN and the Commonwealth countries to bring the rebellious regime to its knees. Yet, Mabika condemned Britain for being silent when the RF government rounded up African nationalist leaders and put them into detention.
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M. M. Bhebhe, another African MP, accused the British of strongly believing in the custom or tradition of protecting their kith and kin. He accused the British people for believing in a ‘very funny custom, belief, or law that they should not make their kith and kin feel uncomfortable or insecure in a situation like the one obtaining in Rhodesia.’\textsuperscript{40} He added that many white Rhodesians had British passports and could leave the country whenever they felt that their future was insecure. As a result, they behaved the way they did because they had more than one travel document so that if anything went wrong, they could leave the country.\textsuperscript{41} He asked why the RF did not legislate or introduce a Bill prohibiting any white Rhodesian from having two travel documents. This would allow individuals who declared themselves Rhodesians to have one type of travel document and not be in possession of British passport.

Bafanah, another MP, pointed out the British government could not invade Rhodesia because it clearly understood that in the process it would produce undesired effects. If Britain had chosen to invade Rhodesia, ‘it would have killed its own sons, daughters and children.’\textsuperscript{42} Because British leaders had relatives in Rhodesia, they could not act in a radical manner that would hurt their own kith and kin. He elaborated:

\begin{quote}
We must not forget that the external leaders have got relatives in Rhodesia who have been killed by the [guerrillas]. The Security Forces have also killed their own men through cross-fire and by other accidents in the course of their work.\textsuperscript{43}
\end{quote}

All these accusations directed towards the British government highlight African perceptions of the influence of kith and kin on white Rhodesia-British relations. But, this was to suggest that Rhodesian settlers were a homogeneous lot, which is far from the truth. Within white Rhodesia itself, the RF government labelled sections of the settler population as enemies for not supporting the regime. Classified as sell-outs and enemies to the settler cause, such individuals were deported.

\textbf{‘Enemies of the State’: Prohibited and Undesirable Immigrants}

As noted in chapter four, the RF regime continued not to trust whites whom it considered too liberal or ‘undesirable’ for political reasons. It served such individuals with deportation notices as prohibited and undesirable immigrants, sometimes without explanation. Those accused of being ‘disloyal to Rhodesia’ were either denied citizenship or detained under the State Emergency Regulations.\textsuperscript{44} This applied to a number of classes – academics, journalists, missionaries and

\begin{footnotes}
\item[40] \textit{Ibid.,} Col, 121.
\item[41] \textit{Ibid.}
\item[42] \textit{Ibid.,} Col, 122.
\item[43] \textit{Ibid.}
\item[44] Niesewand, \textit{In Camera,} 22.
\end{footnotes}
anyone it suspected for helping Africans or holding liberal views. The regime harassed controversial journalists who did not support it. One example was the journalist John Paker, who was eventually deported. This also included the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), which the RF declared *persona non grata*, and ordered its staff such as Peter Niesewand to leave the country. The RF deported Niesewand for publishing ‘sensitive’ information about the Rhodesian security forces’ involvement in Mozambique. The state considered this unacceptable. The Ministry of Information declared a British born photographer Paul Harris as a prohibited immigrant on 1 February 1977 without giving reasons. Harris was a senior photographer for the *Rhodesian Herald*, the country’s largest daily newspaper with the widest circulation. It followed a decision to restrict Harris from every Joint Operations Centre in the country without giving reasons for each action. Harris had arrived in Rhodesia in March 1976, and the *Rhodesia Herald* employed him on photographic assignments in each of Rhodesia’s operational areas. Harris did not contest his deportation because he knew that the authorities were not going to give him any reason.

In the 1950s, the state had already started to deport academics holding leftwing or liberal views, such as Terence Ranger. This pattern continued into the 1970s with the deportation of Kenneth Good as another clear example. The government deported him in 1973 from the University of Rhodesia for being critical of the state and because of his liberal ideas. The state also deported Michael Macara, a doctoral student at the University of Rhodesia, on 11 October 1976. Macara needed two months to submit his thesis on *Political Sociology in Rhodesian Affairs from 1890 to 1971* when the government declared him a prohibited immigrant because of ‘undesirable character.’ He refused to leave the country citing reasons that he did not receive any written order for his deportation and that his passport went missing. After spending some time in prison, he eventually left Rhodesia on 4 February 1977. The government must have deported Macara because of his doctoral thesis which focused on race relations in Rhodesia. It was likely to expose the horrors of settler colonialism in the country since the early colonial years.

Another victim of government arbitrariness was Selwyn Spray, an American United Church of Christ Missionary Doctor at Mount Selinda on the border with Mozambique. Without any
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explanation, the regime ordered him to leave the country and this was likely because the regime suspected him of supporting the freedom fighters. This was especially so because more than 100 Africans from Mount Selinda, his area of missionary work, had by 1976 left to join the liberation war. According to Andre Astrow, by the middle of 1975, thousands of young, radicalised Africans were leaving the country to join the war. To confirm his support for the liberation war, after arriving in London, Spray refused to call freedom fighters ‘terrorists’ but preferred to identify them ‘just young men, many of them students, who were concerned about their country.’ He also mentioned that the prison guards treated him well because he was white at Chipinga jail:

I was treated fairly well in the prison because I was white. I had a board to sleep on and fed regularly. However, the blacks in the prison had to sleep on stone floors and prison guards herded into pens – whereas I had a cell to myself. They were also tortured frequently.

Despite his undesirable status, Spray enjoyed colonial benefits in a Rhodesian jail because of his race.

**War and Declining Settler Morale**

After the Anglo-Rhodesian proposals failed in 1972, the freedom fighters increased their attacks as the war entered a new and decisive phase. The Soviet Union trained the ZAPU military wing, Zimbabwe People’s Revolutionary Army (ZIPRA), which was based in Zambia. The Chinese trained Zimbabwe African National Liberation Army (ZANLA), which operated from Mozambique, which started to infiltrate into the north-eastern parts of the country. Although the two liberation armies employed different strategies, which were informed by their different training and ideological inclinations, between 1972 and 1979, they intensified their attacks on isolated white farms, ambushed enemy envoys, and destroyed the settler state infrastructure. Freedom fighters incorporated the African masses through either propaganda or violence which enabled them to penetrate and caught the Rhodesian regime unprepared. There are scholarly debates about whether there was popular support for the war among peasants during the liberation struggle. These
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debates also extends to the role played by women during the war. However, what is important to note here is that the war made it difficult for the RF regime to govern the countryside, parts of which effectively fell to the guerrilla armies. These armies then radicalised, politicised African masses, and deprived the government of rural administration. The escalation of war resulted in a decline in settler morale in farming areas and towns, thus prompting the emigration of white Rhodesians. Josiah Brownell shows that during the war, Rhodesia lost an average of 13,070 emigrants a year and gained an average of 7,542. This meant that the country lost an average annual net of 5,528. As the situation became gloomy, settlers left the country worried about their future. According to ZANU, settlers were fleeing the judgment day. African nationalists described the settler flight in dramatic fashion, describing Smith as the captain of the UDI-ship, steering it in the mud since 1965 together with his ‘cowboys’ – the cabinet. They reported that:

Smith’s ‘once loyal and ardent followers during the good old days are knocking one another’s head trying to board the first passenger airplane out of Rhodesia without even waiting to sell their property they used to guard so jealously in the past.

There were reports of an Australian office covertly providing travelling documents and financial assistance to whites who wanted to immigrate to Australia. Whites emigrating under the pretext of being holidaymakers or executives claiming that they were going on a short working vacation registered through the office. Reportedly, the scheme only attracted skilled immigrants and intended to accommodate 20,000 to 30,000 white Rhodesian emigrants. African nationalists greeted these reports with contempt. To them, the whole essence of the scheme was Australia’s collaboration with white Rhodesians and Britain. They argued:

Australia feels that it has kith and kin ties with Rhodesia. White racism in Rhodesia and Australia has one common denominator – British racism, hence the deepening unholy alliance between the two has a historical base.

Australian immigration officials revealed that the number of Rhodesian immigrants rose sharply between January and March 1979 to about 740. African nationalists indiscriminately applied this
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principle to all white governments who were sympathetic towards white Rhodesians. In this case, Africans conflated kith and kin with whiteness. Certainly white Rhodesians had limited or no kith and kin cultural and political ties with Australia.

The war had other profound effects on settler attitudes. White Rhodesian men spent more periods on call-up and away from farms and homes. In their absence, wives had to take over the direction of farms carrying guns and ready to protect their own lives and those of their families. The novelist, Alexander Fuller, remembers how her parents slept with loaded guns beside their bed rugs and that her mother ran the farm whilst her dad was away fighting. This comment captures the mood of uncertainty and fear among rural whites in the 1970s.

There were rumours circulating in Rhodesia a Bolivian immigration scheme almost similar to the Australian one. One of the local Bolivian newspapers, *Presencia*, published an article outlining the government’s $150 million resettlement scheme for Southern African whites. Guido Strauss, Bolivian Undersecretary for Immigration, painted a very rosy picture of a vast and rich territory in Bolivia’s eastern province, with roads constructed in anticipation of colonial settlers. Many people telephoned *Illustrated Life Rhodesia* asking for more details about this scheme. Some whites wished to remain anonymous afraid that, they might suffer persecutions and victimisation, should their desire became public. ‘Sure I want to get out,’ said one white Rhodesian man in Salisbury, ‘I have already written to the Bolivian authorities direct for more information. But I could lose my job if people get to hear of this.’ He was afraid that Rhodesian authorities would intercept his letter of enquiry and never reach Bolivia. After UDI, many whites chose to leave the country without voicing their political views against the regime because it was ineffective and harshly suppressed. The regime was ruthless to individuals who spoke against it and showed dissent. As a result, many just chose to leave quietly.

One of the factors that led to settler fears and anxieties was a sense of isolation. This whittled away white morale, especially the rural Afrikaners in Enkeldoorn, revealing some tensions within the Rhodesian settler community. Rural Afrikaners were disgruntled with the RF. Ronald Wheeler, a Rhodesian farmer based in Enkeldoorn, testified that he was disappointed, disillusioned, and wanted to leave Rhodesia with his family. He bitterly said ‘I am fed up with the lies we have been fed by the Rhodesian Front over the years. I have no faith in the white electorate to try to pull this
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country straight. If there is a referendum, they will vote yes and then we have got no country’.\footnote{Illustrated Life Rhodesia, July 1978.} Wheeler's three sons-in-law and one son all were fighting in the Rhodesian security forces. They got tired and could no longer see the reason for the fighting. Afrikaners in Enkeldoorn formed an enclave different from the rest of the Rhodesian settler community. The cartoonist Rose Martin noted that Afrikaners saw Enkeldoorn as a ‘Republic’ within Rhodesia.\footnote{R. Martin, Meet the Rhodesians (Bulawayo, Books of Rhodesia, 1974), 73.} Enkeldoorn was predominantly an Afrikaner enclave inhabited by Africans and other isolated white settlers of other ethnic origins. The Dutch Reformed Church served as the medium of cultural and spiritual purity and inspiration in the republic while Anglican and Catholic denominations could not flourish or find their way in this strict district.\footnote{Ibid.} The cartoon below demonstrates how Afrikaners in Enkeldoorn entertained republican ideas.

Wheeler's brother, Ron, who owned a farm in Enkeldoorn as well as other family members, who farmed in Featherstone, felt the same way. They felt that the end of white rule was imminent and that it was time to leave. Ron was eager to attract many whites and leave the country in large numbers in order start a new life in Bolivia as a group. He spoke to a number of whites who expressed interest in leaving Rhodesia. Convinced that ‘there [was] no place for the white [people] in the whole of Africa', a sixty-one year old A. E. Holt from Salisbury was keen to join Ron

Cartoon 2: Source: R. Martin, Meet the Rhodesians (Bulawayo, Books of Rhodesia, 1974), 73.
Wheeler’s group. 77 He was in the building trade for twenty-two years and was no longer receiving his pension. He owned a house in England but was not willing to go there at least for moral reasons. He considered England ‘an immoral, debauched, dropout country run by a knucklehead bunch’, declaring ‘give me Bolivia any day; I would be prepared to do anything out there’. 78 Some women expressed a keen desire to leave the country but had reservations about moving into the unknown. They wanted specific details about the Bolivian scheme. Although some were willing to leave, they felt too old to do so. For them, leaving was for the sake of their children. For instance, Lorna Williams, a divorcee with two children aged seven and eighteen years, wanted to leave because of her children but she felt too old to start again. 79

In the mid-1970s, the need to create a white Rhodesia overtook the earlier desire to maintain the British standards in the country. This manifested in the relaxing of the pre-1960s immigration policies in a bid to attract as many whites as possible. The new criteria, according to the Minister of Information, Immigration and Tourism, was to attract whites who would become good Rhodesians – those who were politically ready to stand behind the RF regime. Contrary to the previous emphasis on ‘Britishness’, the most important consideration in accepting new immigrants was whether they were going to be of consequence and of benefit to the country. According to the Minister, this new move was ‘a step forward despite the nostalgic regard in which many Rhodesians hold their ties to Britain’. 80 He regretted that due to ethnic discrimination of the 1950s, Rhodesia lost a big opportunity for acquiring trained Italian professionals and artisans after the completion of the Kariba Dam. The country did not accept the Italians who desperately wanted to stay in the country. 81 The Development Magazine noted that between January and September 1975, about 9570 new people entered the country compared with 7,105 for the same period of 1974. On the other hand, 7,950 Rhodesian residents left compared with 6,590 or total net gain of 1,640 for the period as against 510 in the first three quarters of 1974. 82 The state assured the white community that all new settlers had bona fide skills for the considerable benefit of the various sectors of the economy. 83 However, this seemed to be the state’s propaganda to allay white fears.

However, the desire to create a white Rhodesia had contradictions. The fall of Portuguese colonial rule in Mozambique in 1974 had undesired demographic effects in Rhodesia. It led to large Portuguese refugees from either Mozambique or Angola, together with their wives and families.
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Apart from losing a white ally in colonial Mozambique, Rhodesia received increased numbers of Portuguese fleeing the Frente de Libertação de Moçambique (FRELIMO) rule. The large influx of non-English speaking immigrants created problems, particularly with regards to schooling, assimilation into the settler community and the fact that these newcomers often had no assets. Because of their economic status, white Rhodesians failed to appreciate these new comers. The Development Magazine had misgivings if Rhodesia was able to absorb and assimilate large proportions with different cultures, alien language, diverse political complexion in a Rhodesian settler population of about 227,000. The state expected newcomers to be productive and old settlers to take the initiative to assimilate them into the Rhodesian settler community. The magazine trumpeted that the country had many excellent and long-standing Portuguese citizens who were keen to adopt a Rhodesian citizenship. However, it expressed discomfort that the country could accept newcomers because the traditional rate of immigration into Rhodesia dropped forcing the government to settle for unsuitable whites to make up for the shortfall. Whilst Rhodesia received Portuguese refugees from Angola and Mozambique, its collapse was also near as evidenced by a series of diplomatic meetings of the 1970s.

**Britain and the Collapse of White Rhodesia**

In 1971, the British government once again sought a solution to the Rhodesian problem. Ian Smith and the British Foreign Minister, Alec Douglas-Home, produced a White Paper, which disowned British responsibility over Rhodesia, provided other concessions and an eventual majority rule. The details of the Anglo-Rhodesian proposals, as Luise White points out, represented major concessions for both Smith’s RF government and British bureaucrats. The Anglo-Rhodesian proposals provided a property-qualified franchise which would lead to parity of white and black seats in parliament with half of the latter elected indirectly by African chiefs. Under the terms of the proposals, Britain dispatched Lord Pearce to test the acceptability of the settlement among Africans. Under Bishop Abel Muzorewa – with the blessing of detained African nationalists – and other and other church leaders, the ANC campaigned against the proposals. Edgar Tekere, a nationalist from ZANU, later revealed that Muzorewa was a creation of ZANU and ZAPU.
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specifically formed to campaign against the proposals. The commissioners based the test of acceptability on a YES and NO vote. Africans convincingly rejected the Anglo-Rhodesian proposals. Responses against the Pearce Commission by Africans revealed their serious misgiving towards Britain, which they accused for supporting its kith and kin. For instance, they complained that the British government carried out a dialogue with the Rhodesian authorities completely excluding African nationalist leaders. As a result, they argued, on behalf of overwhelming majority of people of Rhodesia, the ANC cannot, in any circumstances accept a settlement whose result, directly or indirectly, is the legalisation of UDI and the Republican Constitution. In spite of the fact that the government banned the ANC from operating in Tribal Trust Lands, it vociferously campaigned for a NO (kwete) vote throughout. Africans felt that if they said YES to the proposals, they would have perpetuated the status quo. As Astrow argued, the 1971 proposals were direct attempts to legalise UDI and grant independence to settlers by Britain. Overall, the Pearce Commission, published in 1972 concluded that despite intimidation, Africans did not trust the British government and rejected the proposals as a basis for independence.

It is important to reflect on some of the African responses which accused Britain of allegedly protecting its kith and kin at the expense of majority rule. Some Africans perceived that Britain was planning to hand over the country to the whites. For them, the fact that the British and Rhodesian governments entered the agreements without the voices of the African majority was testimony to that. Between 24 December 1971, and 5 January 1972, Thomas Dube, visited Rhodesian cities of Bulawayo, Gwelo and Salisbury, as well as the African rural districts of Essexvale, Gwanda, Filabusi and Seke. Dube was a Rhodesian African teaching in the Department of Social Science and Teacher Education at Western Michigan University in Kalamazo. He recorded some revealing African responses to the Anglo-Rhodesian proposals. A selection of the responses shows how Africans did not trust both the white Rhodesians and Britain for playing kith and kin politics and forgetting majority rule. An elderly African woman from Seke said, ‘young man, when you return overseas, tell the English people to stop robbing our country; we have had enough trouble with them.’ In this context, the English people were robbing Africans their independence by secretly supporting white Rhodesian settlers. A sixteen-year-old boy at Filabusi
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said that ‘Britain was planning to hand the country over to Rhodesia’s European population in order to create more room for England’s excessive scum population.’ The boy’s answer is revealing of the deep seated Africans’ mistrust towards Britain as far as the Rhodesian problem was concerned. A black entrepreneur in Salisbury displayed the same levels of mistrust. He said ‘the European in Rhodesia will ask you for a favour only when [they] see that [they are] in trouble. [They] will ask you to help [them] cross a flooded river only to throw you into the same turbulent river once you are no longer useful to [them].’ Indeed, this comment is revealing of the widening rift between blacks and whites and the controversial position of Britain. Africans reasoned that the proposals were there to leave them at the mercy of the minority regime that rebelled against Britain. According to Nkomo, a key figure in nationalist politics, the proposals were a superficial modification of the 1969 illegal Republican constitution, whose main purpose was to entrench, maintain and enforce oppressive and discriminatory practices in Rhodesia permanently. Africans were afraid that the proposals were going to leave them in a worse position than before UDI because whites were going to retain absolute power. Discriminatory legislation in land, education and the franchise remained unchanged which displeased Africans.

After the verdict of the Pearce Commission, white Rhodesians and the RF government continued to drift towards the rightwing philosophy. Evans shows that in order to explain and deal with the failure of the Anglo-Rhodesian proposals, a strong sense of Anglophobia and betrayal by Britain intensified among white Rhodesians. White Rhodesians blamed Britain and the way the commissioners conducted their business. According to Evans, the RF blamed the British government for giving way to mob power, instigated by African nationalists, white liberals and various “external forces”.

By external forces, the RF leadership meant international communism, the British Foreign and Commonwealth Office, the British Trades Union Congress, Churches, international finance and the Organisation of African Unity (OAU). Smith and the RF government used the language of communism in order to appeal to the Conservative elements in Britain and America and to justify white rule in Rhodesia. The Ministry of Internal Affairs usually believed the rhetoric that chiefs were the sole representative of the Africans, a reflection of its colonial practice which relied on traditional leadership for rural administration. Allegedly, the
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RF government bribed chiefs and headmen with beer and meat to support the proposals, which added to the festive mood of the gatherings.\(^{104}\) This may partly explain why the government wanted the Commission to engage with chiefs and not individual Africans.

However, Michael Bratton reveals that there were divisions among chiefs exposing the fiction that traditional leaders spoke for all the Africans in support of the RF regime.\(^{105}\) The British government insisted on asking the African opinion and not only chiefs, a decision which displeased white Rhodesians. The RF and its politicians trumpeted the rhetoric and colonial prejudice that it was alien to the African custom and tradition and that it would arouse suspicion among blacks. Smith stated that the British delegates scoffed at this suggestion and believed they knew more about Africans than the Ministry of Internal Affairs.\(^{106}\) This way, Rhodesian settlers believed that customary law governed Africans. According to Mahmood Mamdani, this allowed the colonial state to excise power over Africans.\(^{107}\) Smith resorted to the unfounded conspiracy theory that the RF ‘enemies’ in Britain campaigned and influenced and used Muzorewa as the frontman to reject the settlement proposals.\(^{108}\) This helped him to propagate a strong Anglophobic tendency and sarcasm towards the British government. In Parliament, Smith promised that Rhodesians were supposed to determine their future course without Britain’s help:

> I believe that we should bear no malice against the British government for their conclusion that a NO verdict was the best answer for them, in their present circumstances. We should indeed be naïve to presume that the British government, reputed for their experience and ability in government, diplomacy and finesse in negotiations, were incapable of managing an exercise such as this test. But likewise, they should not take exception to the Rhodesian government’s declared policy that henceforth, when making our decisions; we do so exclusively, on the basis of what is best for Rhodesia and its people.\(^{109}\)

From this quotation, Smith mocked Britain for allegedly failing to handle the Pearce Commission in the favour of the RF government. His remarks clearly demonstrates how white Rhodesians were disillusioned by the way Britain handled the Rhodesian problem. There was a strong feeling among Rhodesians that Britain was conceding to African wishes instead of protecting its kith and kin. As
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a white Rhodesian hero of his time, Smith encouraged his electorate to be strong in the face of danger. He declared:

> Once again, the Rhodesians have shown their resilience, ability to turn disappointment and adversity into hope and success. Every such experience enriches man’s character; it tempers his sinews and his body as a result of which he is better able to face up to the challenges which lie ahead.\textsuperscript{110}

Although this might have been an exaggeration, it highlight a strong sense of white determination to defy Britain and the world at all cost.

Other RF parliamentarians who also blamed Britain and the Pearce Commission for pursuing selfish motives other than settling the Rhodesian problem shared the same sense of betrayal displayed by Smith. By respecting African opinion and wishes, white Rhodesians felt that Britain was succumbing to international communism and wanted to protect its own self-image in England. This, they reasoned, compromised Britain’s commitment to protect its kith and kin in Rhodesia. One white MP, Fawcett Philips, argued that ‘the Pearce Commission was more concerned with its image in England than the future of Rhodesia and the task it was going to perform. A foreign commission in blinkers obsessed with their powers to adjudicate and assess the African mind has bedevilled us.’\textsuperscript{111} Fawcett agreed with Smith that the commission did not respect the African tradition – by not involving chiefs, instead it went about the universal suffrage even asking black women and argued that many Africans did not have any faintest idea of what the Pearce Commission was all about.\textsuperscript{112} This reflects his patriarchal, paternalistic and parochial thinking that it was wrong for the Pearce Commission to explain everything to Africans. ‘It is regrettable fact that democracy, as understood in Britain, does not work in Africa. It is not common to African tradition and neither Africans understand it.’\textsuperscript{113} Clearly, democracy, according to Fawcett, was when whites decided what was best for Africans.

Fawcett’s comments highlight the magnitude of anti-British sentiments among many white settlers. He complained that the Pearce Commission gave an impression that Britain still ruled Rhodesia, a position and belief he vehemently opposed. According to him, the Pearce Commission travelled into the countryside with the Union Jack as its emblem sometimes displayed upside down.\textsuperscript{114} Smith also added that the charade of the Union Jack and the constant playing of ‘God Save the Queen’
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on the radio made Africans to think that Britain had reinstated its authority over Rhodesia.\textsuperscript{115} Clearly, the symbol of the Union Jack in the countryside disgusted the RF politicians and those Rhodesian whites who loathed British authority, thus exposing the ever widening rift existing between them and Britain.

After the fall of the Caetano regime in Portugal in 1974 and the eventual collapse of Portuguese power in Mozambique and Angola, regional powers became more determined to end the Rhodesian problem. Since the debacle of the Peace Commission in 1972, guerrillas intensified their attacks from the north-eastern parts of the country. African nationalists were convinced that the only language Smith understood was war instead of dialogue or political settlement. This further drove the RF administration into far rightwing ideological inclination. It associated African nationalism with international communism especially in the context of Cold War politics in Southern Africa. With all these developments going on, ‘South Africa attempted to improve its relations with African-controlled frontline states to try and stabilise the region and control the spread of dissent and African resistance.’\textsuperscript{116} From 1974, John Vorster, the South African President, began to consider the Rhodesian problem as a liability and wanted to replace the RF with black moderates through the support of regional power.\textsuperscript{117} Frontline states – Zambia, Tanzania, Mozambique, Angola and Botswana – were also desperate to end the Rhodesian problem. South Africa and Zambia wanted moderate African nationalists – Muzorewa, Sithole and Nkomo – to enter a settlement with the RF. By the late 1979, South Africa hoped to have a moderate regime on the same terms as the Zimbabwe-Rhodesia arrangement.\textsuperscript{118} South Africa wanted to retain regional supremacy for its own economic and political selfish reasons.\textsuperscript{119} Vorster and President Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia worked the détente exercise with the hope to bring peace in Rhodesia. Because sanctions were also affecting the Zambian economy, Kaunda was eager to see an end the Rhodesia war. During the Victoria Falls Conference of 1975, Smith remained resolute and refused to agree to any settlement that threatened settler interests. The talks reached a deadlock, as Pallotti reveals, because of the disagreement over the meaning of majority rule.\textsuperscript{120} Nkomo insisted that any talks between Smith and the African nationalist would only be possible if all exiled leaders were present and that talks should be in Rhodesia. Above all, Nkomo
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wanted Smith to agree to majority rule. In response, Smith stated that ‘not in a thousand years’ would he imagine Africans in power. He declined this condition, insisting that nationalists were ‘terrorists’. Later, Nkomo claimed that this broke the conference up and called the gathering ‘a waste of time’.\textsuperscript{121} Nkomo was also afraid that his followers and other nationalist leaders would label him a sell-out for partnering with the RF. He also blamed Smith for prolonging the war unnecessarily and speaking for all whites whom he believed were tired of the situation.\textsuperscript{122} The RF viewed détente as another strategy by South Africa to place Rhodesia into the hands of international communism and other Free World countries.\textsuperscript{123} The South African government was also realistic about the inevitability of majority rule in Rhodesia.

In 1976, Britain tried to settle the Rhodesian problem in Geneva at an all-party conference. The frontline states forced ZANU and ZAPU to form the Patriotic Front (PF) in order to negotiate as one voice, but there was no agreement among its members. In coming up with the PF, frontline countries and the United States wanted to avoid another Angola, where three liberation movements fought each other for power.\textsuperscript{124} Like any other previous negotiations, the Geneva Conference failed to produce a lasting solution to the Rhodesian problem because the PF could not agree with the British government on the independence date.\textsuperscript{125} The PF wanted the independence by 1 December 1977 against the British date of 1 March 1978.\textsuperscript{126} In addition, it wanted a British transitional government to do everything necessary to enable the pre-independence elections and to govern the country from day to day. It could not separate between the Smith regime and the role of Britain. It stated that Smith was an agent of the British colonial ambitions and South Africa supported by international imperialism.\textsuperscript{127} Therefore, the African liberation movements were fighting British imperialism, as represented by the white settlers. The PF celebrated that it demonstrated its negotiating muscle at Geneva Conference.\textsuperscript{128} The PF did not see the British government’s commitment in events leading to and even during the Geneva Conference. According to Tekere, ‘it was not clear what the British government wanted, and in fact, what we were doing in Geneva at all, apart from enjoying a holiday in Switzerland.’\textsuperscript{129} Timothy
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Scarnecchia argues that the nationalists expressed a disdain and mistrust of the British and American efforts.\(^{130}\) The PF felt that the British government was not serious by sending Ivor Richard, Britain's representative at the United Nations, who was less effective.

When the Geneva Conference failed, the PF again did not trust the 1977 Anglo-American proposals. The proposals came after the United States shifted its policy in Southern Africa to stop the inroads of communism in the context of Cold War politics.\(^ {131}\) As a result, the US Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, came up with a plan to work with South Africa and other frontline states to force Smith to grant majority rule in two years. In 1976, Kissinger articulated that the United States was prepared to work with moderate blacks in power by supporting the independence of colonised people and respecting human rights and self-determination in Southern Africa.\(^ {132}\) However, the PF felt that the Anglo-American plan was a change of tactics by the British government in order to protect its kith and kin in Rhodesia. It alleged that the RF government was no longer serving British and American imperialist interests. Therefore, Britain and the United States preferred to substitute the RF regime and replace it with moderate blacks to serve their interests. They viewed the major purpose of the conference as the creation of a black puppet government, which would continue to dance to their tune.\(^ {133}\) The PF complained that the British representative, Ivor Benson, did not set the definite date for independence and failed to distribute his statement to them but did so to other parties. It became obvious to the PF that the British government had no intention of transferring power to black people. It stressed that its differences with the British government were not only over dates and over months of independence but also basic intentions and motives. Britain’s refusal to commit itself to independence date demonstrated this point and made deliberations difficult to proceed at the conference.\(^ {134}\) The PF firmly believed that it was imperative that there was supposed to be a time limit as to the period necessary to establish a transitional government.

Africans argued that British economic interests coincided with settler interests, hence they worked together to oppress blacks. They stated that the British and Americans were eager to work with the so-called moderate Africans to preserve their interests and white rule in Rhodesia. The PF called this African group the petty bourgeoisie in Rhodesia, which included the likes of Muzorewa, Sithole, and Chikerema. This class was allegedly opposed Smith so that they might have a freer
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hand to practice capitalism and to continue the economic exploitation of the African people. As Evans has demonstrated, the RF framed African nationalism and guerrilla warfare as communist inspired, backed by the Soviets, Chinese and other Western governments to precipitate the end of white rule in Rhodesia. In 1976, John Wrathall, now the President of Rhodesia, accused Britain of aiding guerrillas who shared similar objectives with Soviet Russia. As the war intensified, the RF leadership embarked on an Anglophobia crusade and conspiracy theories engineered by the so-called enemies of the regime. It continued to deny that the war in Rhodesia was a challenge to settler colonialism, racism and racial discrimination by Africans.

By the late 1970s, the Rhodesian Security Forces, African nationalists, guerrilla armies and the general population – black and white – were tired of war. Economic and political developments outside and inside Rhodesia forced both the RF government and the guerrilla armies to a negotiating table in 1979. The sharp increase in oil prices in 1973 by the Organisation of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) affected the economies of the Western countries. Alois Mlambo argues that Rhodesia lost markets as some of the western countries it illegally traded with lost faced economic hardships caused by high fuel costs. In 1973, Zambia closed its boarder, Mozambique did the same in 1976. This all negatively affected the Rhodesia’s economy. White Rhodesians were beginning to experience economic hardships caused by sanctions especially when South Africa also imposed sanctions, on Rhodesia. Unstoppable war budget, escalating taxes, military conscription of all able-bodied males all contributed to settler's loss of the comfortable life they have been leading all along. This greatly affected white morale and ignited a desire for a settlement. Guerrilla armies had their own challenges too – short supplies, personal, ideological and ethnic struggles among political leaders and military commanders all contributed to a host of difficulties which lowered morale in the rank and file of liberation armies. Tribalism and power struggles within nationalist camps especially in ZANU, which also resulted in the 1975 assassination of Herbert Chitepo in Lusaka – significantly altered the course of the war. The economic cost of the war affected the frontline states – Zambia, Tanzania, Botswana and
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Mozambique making them desirous of a political settlement to the Rhodesian problem. As a result, they mounted pressure on the nationalist leaders to agree to a settlement.

In order to quell white fears and anxieties, Smith entered the Internal Settlement of March 1978 with so-called moderate Africans – Muzorewa, Sithole and Chief Jeremiah Chirau. However, the OAU recognised the externally based nationalist movements and their leaders Mugabe and Nkomo, which seriously watered down the settlement. Under the Internal Settlement terms, the structure of white power did not alter much and the country changed its name to Zimbabwe-Rhodesia. Nicholas Waddy notes that the Internal Settlement produced an interim Executive Council, as well as a constitution, which safeguarded white interests, but nonetheless conceded majority rule and a universal franchise.142 Although the 1979 election installed Muzorewa as the Prime Minister, the RF controlled the army, civil service and enjoyed the popular support from the business community.143 Rhodesian settlers wanted the Conservative British government to support the Internal Settlement which cushioned settler supremacy in Rhodesia. However, Peter Carrington, the British Foreign Secretary, made it clear that he did not acknowledge Zimbabwe-Rhodesia despite Thatcher’s promises to recognise the settlement.144 Carrington’s decision angered many white Rhodesians, who felt that he arm twisted Thatcher not to recognise the Internal Settlement deal. African nationalist saw this partnership as selling-out by Smith, Muzorewa, Sithole and Chirau and the settlement lacked international credibility.145 The Zimbabwe-Rhodesia experiment failed to thwart guerrilla incursions causing white fears and widening acrimony between blacks and white in the country.

During the 1979 Commonwealth heads meeting in Lusaka, members agreed that Britain was supposed to take full responsibility and decolonise Rhodesia. This resulted in the 1979 Lancaster House negotiations chaired by Lord Carrington. At the opening of the conference, Carrington was aware of the accusations Britain informed from all over the world for not being serious about decolonisation of Rhodesia. He assured all delegates that the British government was more serious in its intention to achieve a satisfactory basis for the granting of legal independence for the people of Rhodesia and to end the war.146 Carrington made it clear that the British government assumed full responsibility over Rhodesia and was ready to put forward proposals to achieve the independence objective. Britain was also eager to end the war, do away with colonial obligations,
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and rectify its image tarnished by the Rhodesian problem. Carrington made sure that the new constitution preserved white interests. The new constitution reserved twenty seats for whites in Parliament for a transitional period of seven years. It provided for a ceremonial President, and left the civil service white dominated.\(^147\) The sensitive land issue was Carrington’s masterstroke, demonstrating his subtle ambition to preserve settler interests. The constitution provided that land could only change hands on market terms between willing sellers and buyers. However, vast acreages of land lay idle, unused and without a market price in the areas reserved for white ownership and it was going to be expensive for the new government.\(^148\) Carrington did not want to upset the developmental needs of Zimbabwe by keeping experienced white farmers and public administration skills in place (in 1980 there were 62,000 civil servants in the country).\(^149\) The British government considered political, strategic and economic factors as the need to protect white interests in independent Zimbabwe.

Britain wanted to keep many whites, along with their administrative and farming expertise, and minimise the drain on foreign exchange reserves for the newly independent state.\(^150\) Carrington took a political gamble to allay all the fears and pressures from the warring parties. Britain and the United States gave an unwritten promise to the new PF for land compensation to white farmers.\(^151\) Summing up the Lancaster constitution, Bratton argues that Africans obtained their goal in the form of majority rule in return for guaranteeing white economic interests.\(^152\) To this point, Astrow argued that Britain managed to eliminate the war which was a threat to imperialist interests.\(^153\) Nkomo claimed that Carrington was hostile to the nationalist cause and had links with old-style imperialism in Southern Africa, because he was once a director of Rio Tinto.\(^154\) Nationalist leaders made compromises with imperialism at Lancaster House which many Africans regarded as a tactical manoeuvre rather than as the logical consequence of petit bourgeois nationalism.\(^155\) Nkomo confessed that the constitution was not satisfactory – a result of muddle and compromise to stop the war.\(^156\) Ironically, Nkomo and his ZAPU felt seriously betrayed by Mugabe, who hastily left
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for Tanzania soon after the conference and announced that ZANU would be fighting the elections on its own.

However, some sections of Rhodesian whites expressed unhappiness over the way Carrington handled the settlement terms at Lancaster House, even though the constitution preserved their property rights. They argued that overall, Britain had sacrificed its kith and kin by supporting majority rule based on one person one vote. They blamed Lord Carrington for abandoning them into the hands of the PF. Some whites in Rhodesia complained that Britain sold the Rhodesians and that Lord Carrington was the architect behind the ‘disaster’ that followed the Lancaster House negotiated settlement and majority rule. They believed that if Muzorewa had won the election, he was likely to partner with whites and safeguard their interests. One white Rhodesian wrote a letter to Lord Carrington complaining that he had placed the lives of many Rhodesians at risk:

We will have to make an unnecessary election which, unlike the last, cannot be fair or free because of the gangs of thugs who have had a free run to date while the country paralysed under the palsied hand of a British Governor. My personal dam of bitterness will burst if I am forced to find consolation for any new young widows. Life goes on normally for your staff and soldiers returning to comfortable homes and safety but not so for us left to face the music of your making. 

Many Rhodesian whites feared a black government and believed that Britain had abandoned its kith and kin at the last moment. Brownell notes that many white Rhodesians believed that Britain had grown into moral decadence and believed that Rhodesia was the only country in the world upholding white civilisation. ‘Rhodessians thought the west had grown spoilt, decadent, and soft, while Rhodesia maintained its vigour and vitality.’ Even if Rhodesian settlers defied Britain, some leading figures such as Smith ‘remained a militant advocate of Greater Britain’, at least rhetorically. This explains why some admirers came to regard Smith as the ‘last white man’, a description which he also personified. The Reverend J. R. T. Wood of Salisbury expressed his unhappiness towards British officials after the 1980 general election. He declared that ‘soon we must witness the victory parade – marching past Lord Soames – of those thugs and bandits who never won the battle through your action and Lord Soames’ default.’ Wood identified himself as one of the most loyal subject of the Crown. However, he found himself in agreement with the
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almost unbelievable anti-British sentiment, particularly among the British born in Rhodesia, and charged that Thatcher, Carrington and Soames would live to regret their gamble. Whether this was just a sentimental talk or genuine feelings, this goes to show that some white Rhodesians continued to regard their attachment with Britain even in the last stages of colonial rule.

Britain chose the most pragmatic option available to stop the war in Rhodesia and a solution acceptable by the international community, other than merely influenced by the desire to protect its kith and kin. As Onslow argues, the British government focused on perceived practical politics in the domestic and international context of 1979. Carrington also added that if the British government had not considered to settle the dispute in the way it did, the plight of Rhodesians, black and white, would have been just as a bad as before. Some others, especially the elderly, simply committed suicide as they failed to accept that settler rule had finally crumbled. Others lived to regret and lamented to see their country under black rule. Fuller’s mother, for example, reiterated that settlers were prepared to die to keep Rhodesia white-run. Since UDI, Rhodesian whites continued to dwell in the past and failed to recognise that time was moving. They remained conservative ideologically and racially, drifting into the past and wanted Britain and the world to respect their stand. Unfortunately, they tried to propel the tired ideas of old settler societies in a modern world. Indeed, they felt betrayed by Britain, the Commonwealth and the West for supporting what they perceived as communist inspired African nationalism. These were part of what Yuka Suzuki call ‘white lies’ – Rhodesians propagated narratives that they did not lose the war but were defeated by shrewd British politicians and dehumanised guerrillas as malcontents and communist inspired. However, the Lancaster House conference ended white rule in Rhodesia.

Conclusion

After the Lancaster House conference, Britain appointed Lord Soames as the last British Governor to monitor the transitional period and the electoral process leading to Zimbabwe’s independence in 1980. Finally, Britain agreed to assume the responsibility to deal with the Rhodesian independence. The outcome of the conference and the eventual election left a bitter taste for some whites who did not believe in black leadership. This chapter has demonstrated that between 1972
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and 1980, issues of kith and kin remained relevant and shaped the Rhodesian political problem. The ambivalence shown by the British government in the political developments of the late 1970s forced Africans to further accuse it for protecting its kith and kin in Rhodesia. Yet, some white Rhodesians also accused the British government for dumping them the last hour. However, the Lancaster House constitution preserved significant settler interests which the new black government had challenges to deal with.
Chapter Seven

This thesis has explored the historical significance of kith and kin ties between white Rhodesians and Britain from 1939 to 1980. These notions when conflated with Britishness, imperial loyalty and patriotism meant different things to many Rhodesian whites (pp. 2-3). The thesis showed that when the Second World War broke out in 1939, many Rhodesian settlers did not hesitate to help their British kith and kin. As shown in Chapter Two, support of Britain’s struggle were extremely strong (pp. 15-18), and were not limited to politicians. They affected ordinary settlers in different occupations. The Second World War provided the great majority of Southern Rhodesian whites with a perfect opportunity to demonstrate their loyalty, allegiance and imperial patriotism towards Britain (pp. 14-16). In doing so, they projected a different image from that of South Africa, as the latter was riddled by strong anti-British feelings held by many Afrikaners (pp. 18-19). The war solidified these ideas in the Rhodesian settler community, many of whom strongly believed and regarded themselves as British. The enthusiasm with which white Rhodesians supported Britain was in inverse proportion to the tiny size of the settler population (p. 21).

Imperial loyalty and patriotism profoundly influenced Southern Rhodesian government participation in the Empire Air Training Scheme. The scheme brought Southern Rhodesian whites even closer to Britain (pp. 21-28), with Royal Air Force personnel themselves stationed in the colony. The Southern Rhodesian government helped finance the scheme, further testimony to its willingness to support its kith and kin (p. 25). British Air Ministry officials showered praises on Southern Rhodesia for the smooth operation of the scheme, enthusiastically supported by local whites (p. 20). Military cooperation between Southern Rhodesia and Britain after the war was proposed by the British Air Ministry. Rhodesian facilities would be part of Britain’s peacetime defence arrangements (pp. 23-27).

An important observation made in Chapter Two was that notions of imperial loyalty and patriotism towards Britain had their limits. Some sections of the white community, especially those in the gold mining industry, complained when the government taxed heavily them for the war effort (pp. 27-29). Specifically, gold miners were torn between helping their British kith and kin and sustaining their business. Nor was the Southern Rhodesian government prepared to put its economy at risk by allowing too many whites to leave their employment and enlist for war service (p. 16). This prompted the introduction of the National Service (Armed Forces) Act in 1940, which attempted to reconcile settler and imperial interests. As Chapter Two discussed, Southern Rhodesia greatly contributed economically to the imperial war effort (pp. 25-29). But here too,
Salisbury emerged from the war with its economic prospects enhanced, for all that the war had disruptive economic ties with the metropole.¹

Noting the importance of the language of imperial loyalism, patriotism and Britishness, this thesis also pointed that these ideas were also a source of exclusion within the settler society. Rhodesian settlers and officials did not welcome whites whom they suspected or accused of not being pro-British. The case of Norma de Jager, whom the Department of Education expelled in 1939 because of her anti-British sentiments, testifies to the tensions within the Rhodesian settler community (pp. 31-33). The fact that she was of Afrikaans background aggravated her position in an overwhelmingly English-speaking and overtly British Rhodesian setting. Rhodesian settlers viewed Afrikaners with much the same as that of English-speaking South Africans in the Union of South Africa. Kith and kin notions, Britishness, imperial patriotism and loyalty within the Rhodesian settler community had certain boundaries and Rhodesian settlers and officials expected to see all whites in the colony subscribing to these notions. Rhodesian authorities suspected non-British whites of harbouring enemy sympathies (pp. 34-35). Yet, it was difficult to police individual political and cultural preferences. When dealing with these issues, Rhodesian officials invoked ethnic differences as a way of excluding whites whom they considered not white enough if they failed to subscribe to dominant ways of thinking. However, this thesis also showed that some Afrikaans-speaking individuals challenged the Britishness of Southern Rhodesia (pp. 35-37). Arguably, the overt British character of the Rhodesian settler society discriminated other whites in the region who professed to be loyal to Britain and the Empire.

Rhodesian settlers not only constructed their identities against Africans, but also against other white groups especially Afrikaners, Greeks and Italians. It defined these groups as ‘white aliens’, for all that English-speaking Rhodesian settlers were also immigrants (p. 47). Rhodesian officials complained about those whites who did not speak English, and worried that this might dilute the Britishness of Southern Rhodesia. To them, Rhodesia was a British space and English language was a symbol of their Britishness (pp. 53-56). Those who strayed from this script were cast as suspect subjects who might undermine order within the Colony.

A number of studies have acknowledged the importance of post-war white immigration for Rhodesia’s subsequent trajectory. Indeed, this thesis has argued that quite apart from immigration contributing to an economic boon, the arrival of new settlers after 1945 had crucial implications for the meaning of whiteness, Britishness and imperial loyalty (pp. 60-66). At a time when Britain faced serious economic challenges, Southern Rhodesia’s contrasting fortunes boosted settler

confidence and pride, without diluting their Britishness. Chapter Three showed that post-war immigration campaigns targeted mainly settlers of British extraction, not least because Rhodesian officials were anxious to maintain the ‘Britishness’ of the country (pp. 39-43). Through British immigration, they hoped to foster kinship ties with Britain. These ideas were real and strong in the post-war era among Rhodesian settlers. Many whites were in regular communication with their relatives and families in the metropolis, and regarded Britain as ‘Home’ (p. 39). Chapter Three argued that Rhodesian settlers imagined and articulated robust notions of imperial Britishness at a time when such ideas were increasingly under strain in Britain (43-47). Ideas of Britishness co-existed with settler nationalism, a potential source of conflict further down the line. Arguably, the language of Britishness as an expression of imperial patriotism was more prevalent in colonies of white settlement than it was in Britain. In any event, after 1945 Rhodesian settlers were eager to maintain economic ties with London, which further strengthened their sense of Britishness (pp. 66-73).

To some extent, post-war immigrants to Southern Rhodesia reconfigured the meaning of whiteness. Some newcomers brought with them British liberal political and social ideas that were often incompatible with Southern Rhodesian racial outlooks and policies (p. 57). As demonstrated in Chapter Three, new arrivals sometimes mixed freely with Africans, thereby transgressing Rhodesian settler standards of respectable behaviour (p. 58). Because of their conduct, many Rhodesian settlers labelled such newcomers as ‘undesirable’ whites. The Rhodesian settler community often conflated socially stratifying categories of race, class and culture to classify other white groups as undesirable despite their strong economic position and white skins. However, despite the existence of many layers of whiteness, colonial laws favoured settlers of all classes. Africans remained underprivileged and dominated throughout the entire colonial period despite the fact that the educated elite possessed qualifications that could have enabled them to climb the social hierarchy. Nevertheless, their skin colour disqualified them from doing so.

Chapter Four suggested that the post-war economic boom in Southern Rhodesia significantly contributed to the development of settler confidence and pride (pp. 75-80). This came at a time when Britain faced severe post-war economic challenges. As noted in Chapter Four, the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland coincided with Britain’s desire to remain relevant in Central Africa (p. 80). At the same time, Southern Rhodesian whites wanted to boost their population and maintain closer cultural and economic ties with Britain during the Federation. During the Federal period, racial partnership was an abstract idea that lacked substance as policy (81-83). The competing and
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contested meanings of partnership increased racial tension in the Federation. Andrew Cohen recently argued that from the beginning, whites saw themselves as superior to black Rhodesians. The politics of racial partnership as envisioned by Southern Rhodesian settlers often excluded non-British whites from full acceptance within the community of white kith and kin. Whilst the Federation wanted more settlers, whites in Southern Rhodesia considered Italians working at the Kariba dam with scorn, because they were ‘poor’ and could not speak English (p. 87). Some Rhodesians called Italians and Greeks, as the novelist Doris Lessing observed, ‘wops and dagos’ or even worse ‘scum of the earth’ (p. 87). Southern Rhodesian whites based these ideas on ethnic, linguistic and class prejudices. English-speaking settlers constructed these prejudices against other whites, because they sought to cultivate an image of whiteness that demonstrated moral uprightness, British loyalism, the superiority of British culture, and thus the suitability of white British Rhodesians to be at the helm of government.

The 1950s in Southern Rhodesia were characterised by mixed attitudes towards African advancement. The handful of white liberals who supported African advancement and inclusion in mainstream politics, were criticised by their fellow settlers as ‘idealists’ (p. 83). In fact, liberalism and racial partnership were political abstractions meant to satisfy the British public opinion without changing as far as race and class were concerned in Southern Rhodesia. White Rhodesians were not prepared to treat Africans as equals despite their education (pp. 84-85). This brought class conflicts which made settlers to rally behind race.

The leadership of Garfield Todd and his mildly liberal approach contributed to the development of increasingly rightwing attitudes in settler society. Many whites objected to the pace of African advancement advanced by Todd (pp. 88-92). Chapter Four argued that the ensuing white fears and anxieties resulted in the majority of Southern Rhodesian whites rallying behind settler conceptions of racial superiority. The emergence of mass African nationalism in the second half of the 1950s significantly changed white political attitudes. Africans sought inclusion and participation in the social and political life of the country and an end to white supremacy. This further strengthened rightwing attitudes among whites (pp. 92-98).

The swing to rightwing attitudes among many Southern Rhodesian whites coincided with a shift in British policy in Africa towards decolonisation (98-105). As Britain started to retreat from Empire, the great majority of Southern Rhodesian settlers remained trapped in past imperial fantasies. As a result, a significant number of whites stopped paying lip service to ‘partnership’ and openly embraced reaction. This ideological shift gave room for the development of anti-British
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sentiments among a growing number of Southern Rhodesian whites, especially those who previously looked to the British Empire with so much loyalty (p. 101). Divergence between imperial and settler interests witnessed the development of a love/hate relationship between white Rhodesians and Britain from the 1960s. This form of relationship added a further dimension to kith and kin sentiment.

The electoral victory of the rightwing RF in December 1962 marked the end of any lingering liberalism and the beginning of open hostility between many white Rhodesians and Britain. The RF emerged as a response to mounting anti-liberal and to degree anti-British feelings in the late 1950s and early 1960s in Southern Rhodesia. The United Federal Party and its predecessors which had enjoyed political hegemony over other parties for decades underestimated the grassroots support the RF enjoyed and the changing mood of the white electorate (p. 108). The old Anglophile elite represented by the then Prime Minister, Sir Edgar Whitehead and later Winston Field wanted to pursue dialogue with London in order to reach agreement over the independence of Rhodesia (p. 109). This ultimately cost Field his premiership.

With Britain supporting majority rule in Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland, a growing number of Southern Rhodesian settlers begun to feel a sense of betrayal by their kith and kin. Chapter Five also demonstrated that the British government’s refusal to grant Rhodesian whites independence had far-reaching consequences for white political attitudes (pp. 111-114). Believing in past British imperial glory, many white Rhodesians could not accept that Britain had changed after the Second World War. Rhodesian whites felt that they had a duty to uphold what it meant to be British.

Contrary to historians who have insisted that the kith and kin factor was ‘inflated’ when explaining why Britain did not use force against Rhodesia after UDI, this dissertation has argued for its importance in this particular period. For many studies, economic and political factors were of greater significance than moral or cultural reasons.4 This thesis, however, has suggested that notions of kith and kin were an important part of the explanation for the policies followed by Britain immediately before and after UDI (pp. 114-119). Chapter Five concluded that both Britain and white Rhodesians respected the significance of their kinship relations. Through migration, many white Rhodesians were of recent British origin and had families, relatives and friends in Britain. Military ties created during the Second World War and the presence of British citizens in Rhodesia complicated any mooted invasion of Rhodesia. As Chapter Five noted, British army
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personnel had trained with the Rhodesia Air Training Group during the Second World War (p. 115).

After UDI, the British government continued to show awkward kith and kin feelings towards white Rhodesians through passport controls. Moreover, kith and kin considerations continued to manifest themselves through passport issues (pp. 120-124). A significant number of white Rhodesians were in possession of British passports and had relatives in the UK. This presented the British government and its Rhodesia Political Department with complex challenges when dealing compassionately with individual cases in the context of a general travel ban (p. 143). Some sections of British society and its white Dominions continued to have strong kinship feelings towards white Rhodesians (pp. 134-135; 143-144).

The years of Rhodesia’s international isolation consolidated a picture of settler society united in its determination to defy Britain and the international community. This thesis agreed with Brownell’s observation that the RF was less than tolerant of any dissenting voices (p. 152). The regime censored the media and policed critical voices within the white electorate, thereby suppressing public dissent. But the myth of white unity had contradictions. A closer look at the settler community after UDI revealed that the regime expelled other whites whom the RF government regarded as enemies of the state (pp. 148-150). In most cases, journalists, missionaries, activists and whites sympathised with African nationalism or leaked sensitive information. These expulsions demonstrate that the state was ever suspicious and riddled with anxiety over their hold on power. Additionally, this also reflects that notions of kith and kin in the 1970s were no longer strong in Rhodesia at a time when the African nationalists intensified the liberation struggle (pp. 150-155).

Chapter Six showed that certain British government activities revealed that ideas of kith and kin persisted to a degree when it came to white Rhodesians of British descent. Officials in the Rhodesia Political Department planned to evacuate white Rhodesians in the case of a breakdown of law and order in the 1970s. This top-secret plan, code named “Operation Embryo”, was evidence that despite everything, kinship ties still influenced British policy (pp. 140-141).

As argued in Chapter Six, in the late 1970s, African nationalists still blamed British politicians for protecting their kith and kin in Rhodesia (p. 144-148). This they thought was the only explanation for British initiatives to solve the Rhodesian problem. Starting from 1966, and again in 1968, throughout the 1970s, Africans accused Britain of entering settlement talks with the Rhodesian government without the presence of African nationalist leaders (p. 156). This did not change after the United States of America became involved (p. 161).
During the Lancaster House negotiations, Britain managed to secure its kith and kin interests in the new constitution. With all the pragmatism that Britain and the British Foreign Secretary, Lord Carrington, could muster, the new constitution entrenched white interests at the expense of immediate reform in support of African interests (p. 165). Nonetheless, many white settlers blamed Carrington for ending white-minority rule in favour of black leadership. While they would have welcomed a Muzorewa-or-Nkomo-led government, whom they considered more conservative, they feared the Marxist rhetoric of Mugabe (p. 166).

Overall, this thesis has explored the historical significance of the kith and kin factor and the ways in which it played out between white Rhodesians and Britain between 1939 and 1980. Overlapping ideas about kith and kin imperial loyalty, patriotism, Britishness and whiteness significantly influenced Anglo-Rhodesian relations in various ways at different times and places. These ideas had a long and complicated historical trajectory, not least because the Rhodesian settler community was never entirely homogenous between 1939 and 1980. While this thesis agrees with John Lambert’s view that British South Africans formed their identities in relation to Afrikaners and Africans, this thesis further argued that Rhodesian settlers also constructed their identities against the so-called desirable and undesirable whites (pp. 47-60). It showed that whites of British ancestry could also become undesirable.

However, these sentiments fluctuated; there were periods where they were stronger than others, especially before UDI. Before the Second World War, white Rhodesians were proud to identify themselves with Britain and expressed strong imperial and patriotic feelings. The immediate post-war years were characterised by strong Anglophile feelings in Southern Rhodesia. This trend continued until the late 1950s when African nationalism and decolonisation pushed a majority of whites into adopting ultra-right-wing ideologies. The thesis has argued that changes inside Rhodesia in the 1950s and beyond reshaped meanings of whiteness, Britishness, imperial patriotism and loyalism. The shifts in British colonial policy in the post-war years triggered a love-hate relationship with its kith and kin in Rhodesia. However, despite political tensions between Rhodesian whites and Britain after UDI, kith and kin factors remained important both in Rhodesia and in Britain. This thesis demonstrated that there were always tensions and as well as different layers of whiteness.

The thesis has argued that kith and kin feelings in white Rhodesia fluctuated between 1939 and 1980. As argued in Chapter Two, ideas about kith and kin were strong in Southern Rhodesia as demonstrated by the manner white Rhodesians supported Britain during the Second World War.

---
This thesis reached a different conclusion from Ian Johnston’s argument that the British Empire Air Training Scheme was instrumental in shaping national identities in Canada, Australia and New Zealand during the war. This thesis has contributed to the historiography on the Second World War showing that the scheme had different results in Southern Rhodesia (pp. 19-25). The thesis concurs with Donal Lowry’s observation that Southern Rhodesia regarded itself very much as a British country before UDI. Rhodesian settlers defined their culture at first in terms of Britishness and later only in terms of Rhodesianess. This overtly British identity in Rhodesian settler community for lengthy periods highlighted kith and kin connections with Britain.

Andrew Thompson argues that English-speaking South Africans expressed a sense of loyalty towards Britain for different purposes. Similarly, this thesis concludes that Rhodesian settlers demonstrated a sense of loyalty towards Britain and the Crown for cultural, political and sentimental reasons. However, this slowly changed in the late 1950s onwards after Britain refused to grant Rhodesian settlers minority independence (pp. 106-114). In the 1960s, Rhodesian settlers looked towards their British kith and kin with feelings of betrayal as British colonial policy changed. This thesis agrees with John Lambert’s observation that in the 1960s, English-speaking South Africans saw no incentive in continuing to look towards Britain for leadership after it entered the European Community and admitted black members in the Commonwealth. This thesis went further on to argue that in Rhodesia, kith and kin ideas as conflated with Britishness remained relevant after the 1960s and influenced Anglo-Rhodesian relations. Thus, Britishness in Rhodesia as well as white Rhodesians’ loyalty to Britain were complicated and fluid. They were strong during the Second World War and further complicated by UDI politics. Chapter Five and Six showed that these ideas also operated from the metropole as shown by the activities of the British government after UDI.

As stated in Chapter One, this thesis sets out to investigate the historical significance of the kith and kin factor as far as the relations between white Rhodesians and Britain. The thesis reached a conclusion that kith and kin ideas significantly influenced relations between white Rhodesia’s settlers and Britain between 1939 and 1980. However, these ideas were strong during the Second World War and after 1945. After UDI in 1965, these notions remained relevant but not as strong as before. By focusing on the social and cultural aspects of Rhodesian settler community, the thesis

---

has contributed to the historiography about Rhodesian identity, whiteness and the British Empire. It called for historians to rethink race relations, the formulation of colonial identities, and their impact on Rhodesia and decolonisation in the British Empire. Broadly, it has contributed to the scholarship on settler colonialism, the importance of kith and kin ties and decolonisation in the Anglophone world in the twentieth century. In addition, it contributed to the historiography focusing on the construction and contestations of identities based on Britishness in the British world. To this growing body of literature, the thesis has presented the Rhodesian case which is missing in this broad historiography, except some few works.
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