

EAST AFR. PROT

27016

REC'D JUN 15 1915

27016

Book & Bull

1915

11 June

Last previous Paper.  
W.O.  
25030

Case of M. Ritch

Requests interview, with view to explanation of fact. action & speedy settlement.

Mr. G. Fiddes. He p.p. went on to pm yesterday with a Sgt. but: & say that they are under a misapprehension in supposing that the matter has now been definitely relegated to the C.O. - that it appears to the S. J.S. to be a purely military question - & that their Lt. has accordingly been passed on to the D.O. - & sent the C.O. (keeping copy) with copy of my reply to the D.O.?

Who?  
To Mr Tennant cons. Agents

Next subsequent Paper  
28527

H. J. R.  
12/6/15 - 12/15/15

Mr. Steel Maitland.

This is undoubtedly a W.S. matter, and the only reason why we should take it now is that they are so pressed with matters of greater importance that they haven't the time to deal with it. I offered to advise them and they immediately converted that into an offer to manage the business for them, and Mr. Petch is being handed about from one Dept. to the other. It is impossible for either Dept. to deal with it until the papers are received. When they do come and have been examined perhaps you may feel disposed to see Messrs. Ball & Co. I meantime tell them that they are under a newspaper prohibition as to the matter having been relegated to this Dept. but since that in any case it would be better to have the papers which we are now left to manage on 25<sup>th</sup> May have been read & considered, an interview would serve no useful purpose.

Ch. 12. 6. 75

~~June 15th, 1915.~~

Sir John Anderson.

Ritch  
Mr. Ritch - S. Africa.

I have been through the whole file. It is clearly a W.O. case ~~in substance~~ <sup>how</sup> ~~probably in origin too.~~

Equally clearly we are rather better in a position to deal with it, both from the point of view of machinery and of pressure of work.

The pity is that while I should imagine there was a good case for deportation, the bandying to and fro between us and the W.O. is discreditable to us both.

So if you agree, I propose to write myself to Mr. Tennant as in enclosed draft, and that a letter should go to Messrs. Bull & Bull on the lines also enclosed, <sup>but this letter is of course to be</sup> <sup>modified</sup>

Perhaps Mr. Bonar Law might approve of the general course of proceedings and I could then take the rest off his hands. In that case should the letter to Messrs. Bull & Bull go as from me?

AS.12. 15.4

Mr Bonar Law

I think the course proposed by Mr Steel Mainland is the best. It is of course understood that among friends not the friends of E.A.P. will have to bear any compensation that may have to be paid to Mr Ritch, if it should be found that the action of the railway cannot be sustained. A. 15. 6. 15

Ans 16. 6. 15

BULL & BULL  
SOLICITORS  
COMMISSIONERS

Sir William Hall  
Colbert J. Wood  
J. H. Castello

267 & 269 KING STREET  
HAMMERSMITH

TELEPHONE NO. 1  
HOLDORN 8548 2 LINES  
21 HAMMERSMITH

27016  
REC'D  
JUN 15 1915

*3. New Building*  
*London* 11th June., 1915.

46

W/B

Sir,

We have been consulted by Mr L.W.Ritch in reference to the circumstances under which he was deported from British East Africa in November of last year.

Mr Ritch has handed us the correspondence which he has had with your Department and also with the War Office and we gather that after a good many months discussion between the two Departments the matter has now been definitely relegated to your Office.

Mr Ritch has shown us the whole of the correspondence which started in January last and it seems clear to us that prima facie his cause of complaint is a very serious one.

Neither Mr Ritch nor ourselves have any anxiety to trouble you with a personal matter in times like these, but we cannot help thinking that this a case which ought to be dealt with seriously and immediately.

Although the correspondence has now lasted for some six months, no explanation whatever has been offered to Mr Ritch of the reasons for the treatment which he received.

We assume that by now you have received full reports from the

officials on the spot and we venture to suggest that an interview should be given to our Sir William Bull at which he should be furnished with a full explanation as to the grounds for the action taken by the local officials.

Sir William Bull is anxious for obvious reasons that this matter should be dealt with immediately and without the necessity for any public action being taken and we shall be grateful if you will give him an interview at the earliest possible date.

We are, Sir,

Your obedient servants,



The Under-Secretary of State,  
Colonial Office,  
Downing Street,  
S. W.

B 2706 Ed  
 June 16th, 1915.

Dear Sir,

I am desired by Mr. Bonar Law to acknowledge your letter of 11th inst.

Mr. Bonar Law thinks that you must be under a misapprehension in thinking that the case has been definitely relegated to the Colonial Office.

Without prejudice, however, as to the responsibility of either office, he would be glad to see the matter settled quickly. Papers essential to the consideration of the case, previously unobtainable, were despatched from Mombasa on 25th May, and so should be here in a day or two. In the interim he hopes to have settled which office shall take up the case with you, and will communicate with you further in the course of the week.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant

A.S.M.

ms. Bill Bull

101615  
EAP

16  
June 16th, 1915.

London,

Deportation of Mr. Kitch from East Africa.

Would you either look at the papers about this, or consult Sir Reginald Brade and let him decide on what I propose.

I have been through all the papers on this case. I quite realize how busy you and he must be at the War Office, and so to save you will take the case of Mr. Kitch off your hands if you like, and deal with it. Mr. Benar Law concurs.

But I can only do so on one condition. In strictness <sup>law</sup> I believe there is no doubt that it is a War Office case, (and it appears that the practical origin was military too, though really more controversy on this point would be a pity). If we take the case off your hands, it must be understood to be not as your agents, as well as ourselves as principals. I will hold the balance quite fair as between the departments and take any responsibility which I may find attaches to this office. If on the other hand I should find that the deportation was in any sense an error and that the military were really

responsible, I should take such action in view of it as might be necessary on your behalf, including if need be the admission of mistake.

I do not anticipate that the Department will be found in error, such less that such an admission would be necessary, but I wish to avoid possible misunderstanding.

I need hardly say I will be as careful on behalf of the military as I should be of any official of the Colonial Office. But this seems the only way, consistently with sparing you, to get the matter settled without a further bandying to and fro of a kind which does not really do credit to either Department.

Yours v. truly  
A. S. M.

The Rt. Hon. H. J. Tennant, M.P.  
War Office.



Jan 15. Ritchie speaks to C.O.

Very O.P. to Dept. under review of Under implies to his assistance

(2) helped in function of line given

(3) by 9.0.0 at instance of after arrest did not stay why arrested

Jan 22

Departure of Ritchie about 7.00 AM without Ritchie's knowledge  
Ritchie says Ritchie last seen when - night

Jan 25

Feb. 2.

W.O. says Ritchie asked - Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie

Feb 16

Mar 6

W.O. says Ritchie asked - Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie  
Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie  
Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie

4 news

Ritchie Feb 15. for Ritchie  
(2) Gene Wagon refers to Ritchie's papers  
Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie

(3) W. H. King Ritchie says: Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie  
Ritchie has recognized Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie  
Ritchie has recognized Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie

(4) Proby Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie  
Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie  
Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie

(5) Any information of the fact that Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie

Apr 3.

W.O. says Ritchie asked - Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie

Apr 8.

Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie

Apr 10.

C.O. tells Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie

Apr 12

W.O. says Ritchie asked - Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie

Apr 13.

Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie

Apr 15.

Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie

Apr 16.

Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie

Apr 18.

Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie

Apr 20.

Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie

Apr 21.

Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie

Apr 22.

Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie

Apr 23.

Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie

Apr 24.

Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie

Apr 25.

Ritchie's name & said Ritchie did not appear to be Ritchie

OFFICE: LONDON