



of raw materials and machinery sent from Britain and the U.S.A. Such are the real impediments to the success of international charity.

*War on Want*, a world survey published recently by the Association for World Peace, illustrates the attitude of many who advocate international assistance for under-developed countries. On page 52, for instance, the problems of peasant communities are attributed to "avaricious landlordism, or to out-of-date systems of land tenure, or simply to sheer pressure of population" (they actually separate them). "The world can show far too many areas where overcrowded peasant communities have been driven to deplorably low standards of life." The root cause is laid bare—"avaricious landlordism." And in the same paragraph the remedy is advocated—"the problem of overcrowded land requires the opening of new areas." We know that new areas have been opened up because the development schemes have come into being. We know also that the land was not free, for had there been free land there would have been no problems. We must conclude that the "avaricious landlords" were first bought out. Yet throughout this booklet there is no mention of the sums paid for land purchase. Haven't we the right to know? Is it any wonder that Asians are "sick and tired of paper plans and promises and are clamouring for results"?

The people whose living standards we are attempting to raise are poor and "backward" because they have been robbed of their equal rights to the land on which they were born. They have been, and are being, exploited by their own countrymen as well

as by Europeans. What the Lord provided for all has been appropriated by a few. A study of the plans to develop the backward areas of the world leads one to conclude that what the western nations are offering is not really aid at all. No attempt is being made to restore even a part of what has been taken from the landless—that remains securely in the possession of the expropriators. Instead the taxpayers of the world are obliged to contribute to these peoples' rehabilitation.

When representatives of the "poor" countries come cap in hand to the round table to plead for international charity, they should be asked one simple question: In your country, what is the relationship between the people and the land on which they were born? Means tests and large scale enquiries are unnecessary; this one question provides the acid test. If the answer is that a few own the land while the rest are landless, the plea for financial and other assistance should be dismissed. The delegates should be instructed to return to their own countries and to inform their Governments that the means for helping their people lies in their own hands—not in the mulcting of foreign taxpayers. For the immediate and fundamental "aid" that the people of the backward countries require—just as do their brothers in the West—is the restitution of their equal rights to the land, the value of which collectively they create and enhance. Unless and until this is achieved, foreign assistance is powerless to help the exploited; it merely condones and consolidates privilege and injustice.

L. J. HUBBARD.

## NYASALAND - WHY FEDERATION IS FEARED

A survey of developments in the Nyasaland Protectorate, which adjoins the north-eastern boundary of Northern Rhodesia, affords useful information on the question whether Africans can develop land. As that Central African Protectorate embodies some of the aspects of West and East Africa other details are also of general application. Here, in 1889 and 1891, the British Government, pressed by anti-slavery opinion, proclaimed a Protectorate "with the consent and at the desire of the chiefs and people." There was a somewhat denser population in a fairly well watered country and the inhabitants were adaptable and well disposed. After slave raiding had been suppressed the cost of maintaining peace and public works was remarkably low, and to save further expense the administration tended to avoid interference. Hut tax for revenue was according light. Europeans who had already acquired land from chiefs—in the most promising situations—naturally were confirmed in possession, but further land grants were made only reluctantly. The steady progress of European plantations demonstrated that Reserves, Pass Laws and Colour Bar regulations were not necessary for development. Africans began to acquire technical skill as well as scholastic education; a few started to grow export crops on their own account.

Europeans and African cultivators continued to thrive. In the Labour Government's White Paper on Federation figures of imports, exports and revenue show that, during the ten year period to 1950, Nyasaland's rate of progress in every instance

but one surpassed that of both its partners in the proposed federation. A more reliable guide to prosperity, however, is furnished by growth of population. Nyasaland's population is estimated at nearly 2½ million compared with approximately two millions each for Southern and Northern Rhodesia, countries that are respectively four and eight times the area of Nyasaland, perhaps equal in fertility and favoured by immense mineral resources, whereas Nyasaland is lacking in them. Part of Nyasaland's prosperity is derived from wages paid to Nyasaland Africans who, when it suits them, work in Rhodesia for the higher rates payable, due to the proximity of great mineral wealth, and then return to their homes in a freer country where the cost of living is lower.

After the first World War a number of settlers came to Nyasaland from Rhodesia and the Union. Finding all freehold land at a monopoly price and labourers, unhampered by Pass Laws, able to change employment at will, the newcomers pressed for Pass regulations and the alienation of more land for Europeans. These requests were refused on the ground that Nyasaland was a Protectorate. A group of these settlers then determined, as they said, to "smash the Protectorate" by some form of amalgamation with the Rhodesias. To familiar observers, of which I was one, they were quite frank about their motives and these do not accord with the tone of later official statements of the proposal. For a time the agitation languished, but as increasing peasant pros-