

311

KENYA

55548

55548

2 NOV 10

INDIA

1920

TH NOVEMBER

Previous Paper.

55284

POSITION OF INDIANS

Trs copy despatched Govt of India re policy of race segregation and Nairobi Town Plots.

See also 56827.

Subsequent Paper.

5578

in previous correspondence.

Public Dept.

LONDON, S.W. 1.

1920.

Second

F. 7722/20.

the India Office of the 1st November,
No. 52131.

52131

55548

Ref:

P.

INDIA OFFICE

12 NOV 10th November, 1920

Sir,

I am directed by the Secretary of State for India to myself to transmit to you, for the information of the Secretary of State for Kenya, of the papers listed below, on the subject of the application of the policy of race segregation in Kenya to the sale of certain Crown plots in the commercial area of Nairobi.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient Servant

J. W. DUKE

Secretary of State
Colonial

Date

Despatched

On October 1920 From Government of India

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

From

The Secretary
C. A. Innes, C.I.E., I.C.S.,
Secretary, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,

To

Secretary,
Colonial Office Department,
Foreign Office, LONDON.

Under His Excellency the Secretary
Colonial Office, dated 26th October 1920, to the
Government of India, regarding the postponement of
the sale of Government plots in the commercial areas
of Nairobi, it was decided to allow to Mr. Sir
Robert Hartmann, M.P., to form with him a plan
of the plots and a map of these plots. They
numbered 100, and the Government told the said
gentleman, whilst he was in the Uganda, to

use his best endeavours to have the same plotted out, the
plots to be sold at a price of £100 per acre.
The said gentleman has now completed the
plotting of the same, and has submitted the
same to the Government.

The additional business areas, the Uganda Board, and
the paragraph 206 of their report, have strongly
opposed it; and the Government of India understand that the Uganda
Board of Commerce and the Nairobi Municipal Council both
see it as impracticable.

3. Further, even if the principle of segregation is admitted, there appears to be no reason why Indians should not be allowed to bid for plots in the European quarter. Professor Simpson, himself in paragraph (16) of his report says that the division into separate zones "would not prevent any European, Asiatic or African owning land or buildings in any zone, except a neutral zone." The Indian Development Commission, again, in paragraph 211 of its report while advocating segregation in residential areas, consider that "a person should be able to buy a plot of land in a township, even though he may reside outside the town itself," and add:

"This regulation would prevent a plot holder from selling his plot to a person of another race, and is neither difficult to apply nor discriminatory."

4. Dr. T. G. R. Wilson, M.A., discussed the question with his colleagues at a meeting of the Royal Institute on the 23rd of October. His full statement and general views are given below under the heading of Segregation.

Mr. S. S. Roychowdhury gave his views regarding the Indian and European residential and segregation.

He said that we are in agreement with the view that it is in existing tenements in Calcutta, because Europeans and Indians already occupied business premises side by side in the same quarters on freehold title or long leases.

The speaker objects to a commercial area of businesses of the same class, irrespective of race, provided that residence in such an area is not permitted under certain townships rules.

He considers that it would be inequitable to refuse plot leased to an Indian, together with all buildings thereon, without compensation at the expiry of a lease of 49 years or less. He would generally be prepared to renew such a lease in a joint commercial area, provided that the business was of a class conducted in that area and the lessor had no objection to the same.

and sanitary laws. He also said that he would reassure the Indian community on this point.

He also considers that the prohibition of the ownership of land in the Indian quarter by a European, and vice versa, should not be too rigidly enforced. In particular, a European firm should be allowed to own land in the Indian quarter for housing its Indian employees, and vice versa. His view is that the Governor should have discretion to relax the rule in particular cases.

"These are his personal views, but are subject, of course, to the Secretary of State's approval."

6. Sir Benjamin Robertson also reports that Sir Edward Northey himself was inclined to accept the principle of a joint commercial area, regulated by proper sanitary and building laws. Sir Benjamin's conclusion was that Lord Milner's orders regarding commercial segregation, at any rate, would require revision.

6. Meanwhile, however, it seems that the Europeans in Nairobi are pressing for an immediate sale of the plots in question and the exclusion of Indian bids in accordance with Lord Milner's decision. They hope thereby not merely to acquire the best business sites in Nairobi, but also to acquire them at far less than their market value. Hence, even if the policy of commercial segregation is subsequently reversed, they will have secured a substantial advantage over their Indian competitors. They will be able to carry on their businesses on first class sites, which they will have secured at a moderate capital outlay, alternatively they will be able to sell these sites to Indians or others at large profits. Incidentally, the government will be deprived of large sums which will go into the pockets of European speculators. The sites are very valuable, and Sir Benjamin Robertson was informed by the Nairobi Indians that they were asking the sum of £10,000,000 for them. On the other hand, Indian bids are excluded, it is not improbable that the sites will...

will be knocked down at little more than the upset price.

7. The Indians attach the utmost importance to these sales. Commercially they consider that ^{their} exclusion from the bidding will be a ^{severe} handicap to their businesses, and is inconvenient with Lord Lilac's assurance to Lord Islington's delegation that in any decision that might become so he would not allow consideration of trade jealousy to prevail. Politically they regard this as a test case. If the sale is pressed on, it will force a crisis; and it is known that Indian opposition may take a form which will bring in its train such statesunlike settlement of the dispute, as will have serious consequences in India.

8. In these circumstances the Government of India trust that the sale will be stayed until their representations received and the whole question reconsidered in the light of the facts and arguments which they have brought forward.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your most obedient servant

C. A. INNES.

SUPERINTENDENT OF GOVERNMENT PRINTING.