
Arthur Creech Jones: the quiet revolutionary

and the Labour Party's pre- and post-war policy on African colonial self-government

Duncan Bowie

Introduction

Much of the literature on the international policy of the Attlee government focuses on the record of Ernest Bevin as Foreign Secretary. Less attention has been given to that government's colonial policy, led by Arthur Creech Jones, Colonial Minister from 1946 to 1950, who is perhaps one of the least known members of Attlee's postwar cabinet.

In his political career, Creech Jones had two main interests – workers' education and colonial self-government, which he saw as inter-related. He served first as Under-Secretary of State and then as Colonial Secretary (Minister) in the post-war Labour government. He should be regarded as one of the founders of the modern Commonwealth as well as the leading advocate of African self-government.¹ Current academic debate on the British Empire tends to overlook the support given by elements of the British socialist movement to African nationalism, or the role of the postwar British government in advancing African self-government. Creech Jones, who had been active on colonial policy since the early 1920s had a central role in both these processes. This article seeks to explain Creech Jones's approach to decolonisation through examining his socialist background and principles and how they impacted on his actions both inside and outside government, and considers the trajectory of the Labour Party's colonial policy over the forty years of his involvement.

Creech Jones's Early Political Career

Creech Jones was born in Bristol in 1891, the son of a lithographic printer. He attended Whitehall boys' school, staying on an extra year on a scholarship to study French, Mathematics and Commerce. On leaving school in 1905, he worked in a solicitor's office. Having studied at evening classes and passed the civil service junior clerks' examination, he moved to London in January 1907 to

work as a clerk in the War Office, later joining the Crown Agents. He became active in socialist politics in South London and served as secretary of the Dulwich Independent Labour Party from 1912 to 1916 and of the Camberwell Trades Council from 1913 to 1922.² During the war, he organised anti-conscription meetings for the ILP. He was an absolute pacifist, and was a member of the No Conscription Fellowship and the South London Federal Council against Conscription.³ He applied to serve in the Society of Friends' (Quakers) ambulance unit but in September 1916 he was court-martialled and sentenced to six months hard labour, which he served in Wormwood Scrubs. He was not released until April 1919. Forty years later, he drew on this experience to publish a pamphlet for the Fabian Society on prison reform.⁴

After the war Creech Jones was appointed organising secretary of the Docks, Wharfs and Shipping Staffs Union, which was in 1922 incorporated into the Transport and General Workers Union (TGWU). Ernest Bevin, the TGWU general secretary, became his political mentor. Creech Jones became national secretary for the union's administrative, clerical and supervisory group. In 1923, the TGWU sent him to the Ruhr with Ben Tillett, the veteran trade unionist who was TGWU international and political secretary, and Samuel Warren, a member of the union executive, to report on the effect of the French occupation of the Ruhr on the workers. Their co-authored 68-page report set out in some detail the negative impact of the French occupation on the Ruhr economy and workforce and called for the withdrawal of the French occupiers.⁵

Creech Jones and Africa in the 1920s

Creech Jones's interest in Africa was first sparked by the campaigns of Edmund Morel and Roger Casement against colonial atrocities in the Congo. In 1925, he was asked to help Clements Kadalie, who had established a union for black workers in South Africa, the Industrial and Commercial Workers Union (ICU). As Kadalie remarked later, 'I felt that the struggle of the African workers in South Africa could be helped by a type of organisation which had contributed so much to the making of British democracy...'⁶ He had made contact with the author Winifred Holtby, an active feminist and member of the ILP, who had visited South Africa and who had contacts with liberals there. She had already been seeking to obtain funds and books for ICU libraries through the ILP's paper, *New Leader*.⁷ Kadalie had also written directly to Creech Jones, who drafted a constitution for the ICU.

Kadalie travelled to Europe to seek support. In Britain, Holtby acted as his host and the ILP's Imperialism Committee, which included Creech Jones and the ILP secretary Fenner Brockway (who also had a lifelong interest in Africa) organised a promotional tour of England. In 1927, Kadalie had attended the

International Trade Union conference in Paris and then the International Labour Organisation conference in Geneva, as well as meeting trade union leaders in Berlin and Prague. He also attended the British TUC conference as a visitor, though his request for delegate status was turned down on the grounds that the ICU was not affiliated to the (white) South African Trade Union Congress.

Holtby and Creech Jones set up a fund to send a British trade unionist to South Africa to help Kadalie. Holtby supported the fund from the sales of her African novel *Mandoa Mandoa!*. William Ballinger, a trade unionist from Motherwell was selected for the task, and reached South Africa in July 1928. Although Ballinger soon fell out with Kadalie, he remained in South Africa, setting up agricultural co-operatives and working with the African National Congress. He was financially supported by a Friends of Africa Committee, established in 1934 by Creech Jones and Holtby, with Julius Lewin, a South African living in London as secretary.⁸ This was a significant example of international trade union solidarity.

Labour and the Empire

Creech Jones was of course not the first Labour politician to be critical of the British governance of its empire. The Labour Party's founder and first parliamentary leader, Keir Hardie, had supported Indian nationalists, and both Hardie and Ramsay MacDonald had opposed the British role in the South African or Boer war, 1899-1901. But figures like Sidney Webb and other early Fabians such as Sidney Olivier, who later became governor of Jamaica, had seen a reformed empire as performing a civilising role, as set out in Webb's classic text of 1900, *Fabianism and the Empire*. As the early historian of Labour and imperialism, Tingfu Tsiang, concluded in 1923, 'the predominant characteristic of the reaction of British labour to British imperialism in Africa from 1880 to 1920 is acquiescence'.⁹

In the years after the First World War, the Labour Party began to issue policy statements on the empire.¹⁰ Official Labour policy was to reform rather than to abolish the empire, although many leading members of the party and the ILP such as Noel Brailsford, Edmund Morel, Leonard Barnes, Norman Leys, Fenner Brockway, Charles Roden Buxton, Leonard Woolf and Philip Noel Baker published books and pamphlets critical of British colonial practice.

In 1920, the Labour Party had published *The Empire in Africa: Labour's Policy*, which set out two key principles: '1) No economic exploitation of one class (native) by another class (white man); 2) The government must secure for the native the opportunity of developing, as a free man, the economic resources of the land for the benefit of the native communities.'¹¹ A revised edition was published as *Labour and the Empire: Africa* in 1926, with an introduction by J. H.

(Jimmy) Thomas, who set out three key policy positions: '1) The natives must be assured sufficient land for their support and therefore the land must be treated as the property of the native communities; 2) The native must, as a worker, be a free man, and hence there should be no slavery, no forced labour and no pressure upon him to work for settlers; and 3) the administration must make itself responsible for educating the native to take his place, both economically and politically, as a free man in conditions which Western civilization has imposed on Africa.'¹² In 1928, the Labour Party presented a detailed report on its colonial policy and the conditions in each colony, to the 1928 Brussels congress of the Labour and Socialist International.¹³

However neither the 1924 nor the 1929-31 Labour governments had a significant impact on the practice of British colonial administrators, other than some movement towards increase native participation in the government of India. Moreover, Jimmy Thomas, who served as Colonial Secretary in Macdonald's first 1924 government, and as Dominions Secretary in the 1929-1931 and 1931-1935 governments, had declared at the outset that there would be 'no mucking about with the Empire' while he was in charge. Sidney Webb (now ennobled as Lord Passfield) who served as Colonial Secretary in the 1929-1931 government, adopted a more progressive approach than that of Thomas, and promoted 'native paramountcy'.¹⁴

In 1933, the Labour Party published a new policy statement on *The Colonies*. However, there was little discussion within the Labour Party on colonial policy in Africa (as opposed to India) until the Italian invasion of Abyssinia in 1935. In response, the party published *The Demand for Colonial Territories and Equality of Economic Opportunity* (1936).¹⁵ This pamphlet, prepared by a committee (which did not include Creech Jones), called for an international conference to consider access by the competing colonising powers to raw materials, access to trade markets and migration – i.e., colonial settlement. In December 1938, the Labour Party published a speech given by Philip Noel Baker in the House of Commons under the title *Common Sense About Colonies*.¹⁶ It argued that all colonies should be subject to the League of Nations mandate system and that the primary purpose of colonial policy should be the welfare and progress of the native inhabitants. While the mandate system recognised the case for increased native participation in administration, it did not require the mandatory powers to promote self-government or independence in the colonies for which they held responsibility.

Creech Jones and Labour Policy

Creech Jones's interests in the 1920s and 1930s were not limited to colonial affairs. He had a deep commitment to workers' education, becoming a governor

of Ruskin College, the trade union college in Oxford, in 1923. He was also an active member of the Workers' Educational Association (WEA), for which he wrote a handbook, *Trade Unionism Today* (1928), which was widely used in the colonies.¹⁷ This commitment was later to have a central role in his attitude to preparing colonies in Africa and beyond for self-government.

Creech Jones, a member of the Fabian Society executive committee since 1925, became involved in the New Fabian Research Bureau, established by G. D. H. Cole in 1931. He also joined the Socialist League (SL), the Labour left group created after the fall of the Labour government in 1931 and the disaffiliation of the ILP from Labour in 1932. His association with the SL was brief. He did not agree with its position on the British Empire as set out in J. F. Horrabin's 1933 essay 'The Break with Imperialism'. Horrabin argued that 'the British Empire offers us no practical foundation for the building of a Socialist Commonwealth'.¹⁸ Apparently, Creech Jones had earlier offered to write a pamphlet for the League, an offer which had not been taken up.¹⁹ He also kept his distance from the Communist Party-sponsored League Against Imperialism, which adopted a Leninist critique of imperialism and colonialism and which drew in some of his former ILP colleagues, including James Maxton and the Vicar of Thaxted Conrad Noel.²⁰

Creech Jones was keen, with support of his union, to get into Parliament. He failed to get elected in Heywood and Radcliffe in 1929, but was returned for Shipley in Yorkshire in 1935. He joined the Labour Party's advisory committee on imperial questions – a separate body from its advisory committee on international relations, though there was some common membership. He was one of its most regular participants, attending 37 of the 61 meetings between December 1935 and September 1939, becoming chairman in December 1943. He was very prominent in asking parliamentary questions on colonial issues – 46 in the 1935-6 parliamentary session; 55 in 1936-7; 153 in 1937-8 and 123 in 1938-9.²¹ In 1936, he was appointed to the Colonial Office Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies, and served on the committee until the 1945 election.

He used his position as an MP to raise a range of colonial questions. He was especially concerned about labour conditions in the West Indies. In July 1937, together with his colleague, Susan Lawrence, who had visited the West Indies, he called for the repeal of the Masters and Servants ordinances which applied there and called for the establishment of a standing advisory committee on labour questions with non-official representation, a proposal that was rejected by Ministers, with the Treasury refusing to fund the appointment of a full-time labour adviser.

The same year, oil workers went on strike in Trinidad, leading to unrest and riots. Creech Jones called for the nationalisation of the oil companies.²² He campaigned successfully with Leonard Woolf and the West Indian economist,

Arthur Lewis, to secure for local trade unions the same legal protections as British trade unions.²³

Creech Jones was linked to a number of networks. He joined the executive committee of the Anti-Slavery Society in 1938, a role he continued until 1954. He also helped to set up a Trades Union Congress colonial affairs committee in 1937. Following the Jamaica revolt of 1938, he joined the Committee on West Indian Affairs, which included Harold Moody of the League of Coloured Peoples, Reginald Bridgman of the League against Imperialism, Norman Manley of the Jamaican Peoples' National Party, with Paul Robeson as fundraiser. He participated in the Union for Democratic Control and spoke at its conference in July 1939, called to resist proposals from appeasers both within and outside the national Government to transfer British colonies to Germany. He was also a visitor to the West African Students Union (WASU), which included future African nationalist leaders such as Kwame Nkrumah, Joe Appiah and J. B. Danquah of Ghana, Nnamdi Azikwe of Nigeria and Milton Margai of Sierra Leone, and called for universal suffrage and dominion status for the West African colonies.²⁴

At the Labour Party 1939 conference, Creech Jones argued that western democratic institutions such as local government and trade unions should be introduced in Africa – 'do not let us be hoodwinked by anthropologists and those who believe in indirect rule and would ask us to work through the Chiefs'.²⁵ He lobbied against the introduction of sedition ordinances in Sierra Leone and opposed the reservation of land to white settlers in the Kenyan highlands. He was also central to committing the Labour Party, through its advisory committee on imperial questions to extend the colonial franchise 'without restrictions on the grounds of race, colour, religion, property or sex'.²⁶ His overall position was to advocate self-government within the framework of the Empire.

Establishing the Fabian Colonial Bureau

In 1940, together with Rita Hinden, a South African economist who had just returned to London from Palestine, and with the support of the Fabian Society's Margaret Cole and John Parker, Creech Jones founded the Fabian Colonial Bureau (FCB). This body, which he chaired, was to be the main focus of his political activity until 1945, when he became a Minister. The only two other people who attended the founding meeting were Professor William McMillan, who had published books on Africa and the West Indies and Wilfred Benson of the International Labour Organisation. The purpose of the organisation was to be 'a clearing house for colonial information and research'. The bureau was to inspire appropriate informed parliamentary questions and Creech Jones organised a panel of interested MPs to do this, which had grown to twenty members by

1945.²⁷ Funds were obtained from Lord Faringdon. He used his networks to involve a wide range of individuals in the bureau's executive and advisory committees including Leonard Woolf who chaired the Labour Party's advisory committee, J. F. Horrabin, Arthur Lewis, the biologist Julian Huxley, the Africanist Margery Perham, the Scottish Labour MP Sir Drummond Shields, H. N. Brailsford, Reginald Sorensen MP, Lord Listowel, and C. Greenidge of the Anti-Slavery Society.²⁸

Together with Rita Hinden, the FCB secretary, Creech Jones became the leading supporter of African nationalists, an advocate of both colonial self-government and native education in the colonies as well as a constructive critic of British colonial policy under the succession of wartime coalition government colonial ministers, Malcolm Macdonald, Lord Lloyd, Lord Moyne, Viscount Cranborne and Oliver Stanley. He campaigned against the suppression of African associations in Kenya. He was also a member of a 'commonwealth group' of Labour MPs, led by Dr Haden Guest, which at the 1942 Labour Party conference, pushed through a policy against Attlee and the party leadership calling for a Charter of Freedom for Colonial Peoples. This was based on five key principles: full equality in political, economic and social rights of colonial peoples with British; the abolition of colonial status and the elevation of former colonies to equal status with the self-governing dominions; the organisation of democratic systems of government based upon indigenous institutions; communal native ownership of land and the nationalisation of all natural resources; and the establishment of a Commonwealth council.²⁹ In his contribution to the 1942 National Peace Council pamphlet, Creech Jones concluded that

We have passed through the days of aggressive imperialism in our own empire; liberal imperialism has also proved inadequate and negative, though important and valuable in establishing order and justice and shaping political advances. We are now entering on another phase, the beginnings of which are already marked by constructive achievements in a number of the colonies. This phase is the period of constructive work in health, education, economic advance and improved standards of living. Coincident with it must be political development and world order, international accountability and organisation. It is our duty to make our sacred trust vital and dynamic, so that the colonial peoples may, as early as possible, take their place as free peoples in the commonwealth of free nations.³⁰

Creech Jones and Labour Colonial Policy during World War II

During the war, Creech Jones acted as the Labour Party's spokesman on colonial affairs in Parliament. He welcomed the proposal by the Colonial Office's Lord Hailey to use the term 'partnership' rather than 'trusteeship' for Britain's relationship with the colonies as it better expressed 'equality and friendship, the idea of service and practical assistance and which expresses it in dynamic and constructive terms'.³¹ He also accompanied Hailey and Attlee to the Institute of Pacific Relations conference at Mount Tremblant in Canada in December 1942, which discussed postwar policy on the colonies with the Americans, who were critical of the previous British record. Creech Jones reported to Harold Macmillan that

The temperature about Britain is pretty low... the ignorance about colonial policy is the past four or five years is profound... It is difficult to discuss the subject with Americans because they are not only uninformed about it but they picture an almost semi-feudal Britain and society nearly 100 years out-of-date. They love idealistic generalisations, glowing phrases, which ignore the actualities of the colonial situation, and seem impatient of the practical approaches to policy-making so common with Englishmen.³²

Creech Jones contributed to the 1943 Labour Party statement *The Colonies. The Labour Party's Post-War Policy for African and Pacific Colonies*,³³ which was apparently based on a draft Leonard Woolf had written two years earlier.³⁴ The general principles of Labour's policy were stated as:

- 1) The territories should be administered by colonial powers as a trust for the native inhabitants, the principal object of the administration being the well-being, education and development of those inhabitants; and
- 2) A primary object of the administration should always be to train the native inhabitants in every possible way so that they may be able in the shortest possible time to govern themselves.

The statement included detailed policies on abolition of all racial discrimination in political representation, land ownership, trade unions, taxation and colonial administration, on labour protection and wages, on primary, secondary, technical and higher education and on public health.

The Fabian Colonial Bureau during the war

The FCB was to publish a wide range of books and pamphlets on Africa and colonial policy during the war. Rita Hinden published her *Plan for Africa* in 1941, for which Creech Jones wrote the foreword, arguing

I believe the British people are liberally and humanistically inclined... By the passing of the Colonial Welfare and Development Act, Parliament has already declared the bankruptcy of the old *laissez-faire* policy.... This book will help to eradicate the romanticism of false doctrines of empire, and show us, in the light of our past and present policies, how to reshape our work in bringing nearer the day when the African can stand erect, healthy, prosperous, independent, and free in a world that has learned to replace imperial rivalries by a rational commonwealth of free peoples.³⁵

Other publications by the FCB during the war included a 1941 report on labour in the colonies, and a short book *Downing Street and the Colonies* edited by Hinden in 1942, with contributions from Creech Jones, Sir Drummond Shields, Arthur Lewis and C. Greenidge.³⁶ There was a pamphlet on *International action and the colonies* published in 1943, and a report on co-operation in the colonies in 1945. Creech Jones, Hinden, Lewis and Professor Norman Bentwich also contributed to a National Peace Council pamphlet *Freedom for Colonial Peoples* (1943).³⁷

Creech Jones also actively pursued the issue of international trusteeship for colonies. There was a debate at this time about what should be done with the Italian and Japanese colonies captured during the war, and a proposal that the United Nations take over the mandated League of Nations territories such as Tanganyika. He wrote a pamphlet on the *International Trusteeship of Colonies* for the Anti-Slavery Society in 1945, and co-authored with Rita Hinden a pamphlet on *The Colonies and International Conscience* for the Fabian Society in the same year.³⁸ This latter pamphlet responded to the adoption of the United Nations Charter, with its provisions that all colonies, not just the former League of Nations mandates, should be monitored by the United Nations. This met with some resistance from the British government and Colonial Office. Unlike George Bernard Shaw and Leonard Woolf, however, Creech Jones thought that Britain had a continuing responsibility for its colonies and was not in favour of handing them over to an international body.³⁹

In 1945 Creech Jones contributed the introduction to *Fabian Colonial Essays*, edited by Rita Hinden, as well as writing an essay on the need for an accelerated policy of social reconstruction in the colonial empire. His introduction made the case for socialists to be interested in colonial matters. In true Fabian tradition, it raised a number of questions without setting out an overall policy

position. His essay was more substantive, setting out the position of development funding in specific colonies before stating that

social and economic development is the necessary condition of freedom and independence. The mere declaration of freedom is of no avail if the people of a territory are too weak, too poor and too inexperienced to stand on their own feet. In this insecure world of power politics, small peoples, are of themselves, likely to be unable to maintain independence and meet the needs of defence and economic stability. Yet, they must be helped to pay their way and sustain the fabric of civilized life. They must know how to work political institutions and engage in administration. But these things depend on the development of resources of a territory and the growth of economic organization and sound social conditions. It means that there must be achieved a wide advance in education and the conditions for preserving important social services and standards of living.⁴⁰

Creech Jones joins the Government

Between 1940 and 1944, Creech Jones was PPS to Ernest Bevin, Minister of Labour in the wartime coalition. With the election of a Labour government in August 1945, Creech Jones was appointed Under-Secretary of State in the Colonial Office. The Secretary of State (Minister) was George Hall, a former miner and MP for Aberdare. Hall was the leader of the Welsh Labour Party, a friend of Attlee who had served as a junior Colonial Minister, and then as a junior Foreign Minister in the wartime coalition government. His main interests were trade unionism and cooperatives. Creech Jones, as Hall's junior Minister, with more extensive expertise in and interest in colonial matters, was given significant responsibilities.

While Hall focused on the Palestine mandate, a policy led by Bevin as foreign secretary, Creech Jones focused on colonial policy. In promoting the 1945 Colonial Development and Welfare Bill, which increased colonial development and research funding to £120 million for the following decade in parliament, Creech Jones openly declared that the Labour government was ultimately aiming at 'the liquidation of colonial status'.

Creech Jones as Colonial Minister

In August 1946, Hall was given a peerage, becoming deputy Labour leader in the House of Lords, and Creech Jones was promoted to the Cabinet position, which he held until his defeat in the 1950 general election. As Secretary of State for the Colonies, Creech Jones sought to prepare them for self-government,

with a focus on their social and economic development, and in particular on education.

It is perhaps surprising that Creech Jones had not been given that post already in 1945. He had after all been the most prominent speaker in Parliament on colonial questions since his election in 1935, being known as the 'MP for the Kikuyu' or even the 'MP for Empire'. He was Labour Party spokesman during the war years. However, he was apparently not a friend of Attlee. Their backgrounds were very different. Creech Jones had been educated in a state school, had not gone to university, and had been a conscientious objector, trade unionist, and critic of British colonial practice. Attlee had been educated at Haileybury School and Oxford University, had served in the army during the war, and was a fairly uncritical defender of Britain's imperial record.

Moreover, Creech Jones was an associate of Ernest Bevin, Attlee's foreign secretary and greatest rival within the administration. Attlee was apparently reluctant to promote Creech Jones, commenting that he was 'perhaps hardly strong enough for the position'. Attlee was later to comment that 'Creech Jones despite much hard work and devotion had not appeared to have a real grip of administration in the colonial office. He was bad in the house and contributed nothing to Cabinet'.⁴¹

In view of this lack of support from Attlee or the Chancellor Hugh Dalton, it was remarkable how much Creech Jones achieved during his tenure. This was partly because Bevin, although much more of a supporter of the Empire than Creech Jones, left colonial matters to his protégé, while he focused on Atlantic and European politics, NATO, and the cold war with the Soviet Union. As long as Creech Jones kept communist influence out of the African colonies, Bevin was prepared to tolerate reforms in colonial practice, even those involving collaboration with African nationalists.

It is interesting to note Rita Hinden's view of the position of the Labour government after its first year, that is just before Creech Jones took over from Hall. Writing in *Socialists and the Empire*, her review of the first five years' work of the Fabian Colonial Bureau, she commented:

As the disappointments of ambitious colonial peoples become more articulate, and as what appears to be a close continuity of policy with the Conservatives stirs increasing uneasiness among the Party's own supporters, a new phase of heart-searching begins... under the pressure of political reality, Labour has shed its early attachment to the idea of a simple and immediate liquidation of the Empire. Instead, it has evolved a reformist policy, bringing it perilously close to the policies which history and the force of public opinion have already impelled other parties to adopt. Now the power is its hands, it finds this line cannot satisfy. A policy of reforms, however worthy, does not begin to answer the strident cries of colonial nationalists, and carries no

conviction that the British Empire, even when run by socialists, is anything but the same old wolf flaunting a new lambskin.⁴²

Creech Jones was perhaps the first Colonial Secretary to sympathise more with the indigenous population than with the colonising settlers. On occasions, he referred to African nationalist leaders as 'his friends'. He was certainly a contrast to his Labour predecessors, Jimmy Thomas and Sidney Webb, although some of his measures followed through on reforms initiated by previous colonial secretaries such as Malcolm MacDonald or the relatively progressive Conservative, Oliver Stanley.⁴³ Creech Jones later remarked 'I suppose I brought to the Colonial Office a fresh comprehension of the new African and other colonial aspirations.'⁴⁴

He nevertheless inherited an official team that was only gradually recognising how Britain's colonial position was changing. It now faced pressure from the United States government and later from the United Nations to surrender its colonies to some form of international control if not to full independent status. In the colonies themselves a small but active educated urban class of natives was becoming involved in politics. Creech Jones also inherited a cohort of colonial governors, mostly educated in the pre-war imperialist tradition, who saw themselves as the experienced 'men on the spot'. They felt entitled to ignore the views of Whitehall-based Colonial Office bureaucrats with no experience of service in the actual colonies. In practice, the Colonial Office, and Creech Jones as the Minister, could only advise and encourage, and not direct. He made strenuous efforts, certainly more than any of his predecessors, to work with the colonial governors, but in doing so met with considerable resistance. Several governors would claim that the new policy of promoting self-government was not appropriate in their colony. Creech Jones did, however, find some younger, more progressive officials with whom he could work, among whom the most influential was Andrew Cohen, head of the Colonial Office's Africa section from April 1947.⁴⁵

Creech Jones was not a Marxist. He could perhaps be seen as a radical Fabian social democrat. While not explicitly anti-Communist like Bevin, he nevertheless kept his distance from Communist and Communist-leaning organisations. In his early dealings with Kadalie and black trade unionists in South Africa, he had clearly resisted the interventions by Communist organisers and agitators. During the 1930s and 1940s the British Communist Party had been most active on India. It had paid less attention to the British colonies in Africa, and had been criticised by the Comintern for this neglect. Many African nationalists in London in the 1930s and in the post war years had found more support from ILP figures such as Fenner Brockway, and from Creech Jones and his Fabian Colonial Bureau colleagues. These links continued once Creech Jones had moved into the Colonial Office. Some African nationalists would criticise him for not

moving fast enough, but leaders such as Danqua, Azikwe, Kenyatta and Nyerere were not going to alienate their most important British political contact.

Creech Jones was an open and tolerant empathiser with the nationalist cause. He was always prepared to talk and negotiate if there was a shared objective, even if there were disagreements over the means and the timescales. He was clear that days of the British Empire were numbered. During the war, in an unpublished note on 'Colonies in the Modern World', he wrote that 'Colonial territories need to be liquidated as soon as circumstances permit', and in 1945, promoting the Colonial and Development Bill in Parliament, he went so far as to comment:

It is a commonplace of American criticism in respect of British Imperialism... to demand the liquidation of Colonial status. It is significant that the very purpose of this Bill is to achieve these purposes. I doubt if any Imperial Power has ever before embarked upon a policy of deliberately disintegrating its Empire. That is the effect of the Bill in the long run.⁴⁶

It is hard to imagine Attlee, Bevin, or for that matter George Hall, who was still Colonial Secretary, using the same language.

Creech Jones viewed economic and social development as a precondition for self-government, a view he maintained as Minister. However, he recognised that neither social nor economic development could be imposed on Africans. He was also well aware that development was at very different stages in different colonies. But unlike his predecessors, and most colonial officials, he regarded the Africans themselves as partners in this process. In a speech in Parliament in 1942, he had argued:

There must be a recognition of Africans' rights and status. There must be a big drive in social services, in education and development. We must associate the Africans in the administration of local government. We should nationalise the mineral resources of these areas. We should redistribute the land and there should be planned development of smaller industries.⁴⁷

These remained his key objectives as Minister, though he was in practice able to make much more progress on social services, education, development and local government, than on nationalisation of mineral resources and land redistribution.

Resistance to Creech Jones's Colonial Policy

The centrepiece of Colonial Office policy under Creech Jones's direction was the promotion of 'efficient and democratic' local government. He wanted to

replace the chiefs who dominated the native authorities by urban professionals. The approach was set out in a circular dispatch, drafted by Andrew Cohen, from the Minister to colonial governors on 25 February 1947.⁴⁸ The new policy was to be

local because the system of government must be close to the common people and their problems; efficient because it must be capable of managing the local services in a way which will help to raise the standard of living, and democratic because it must not only find a place for the growing class of educated men, but at the same time command the respect and support of the mass of the people.

The dispatch set out a wide definition of local government:

It covers political questions such as the functions of native authorities, the composition and method of appointment of councils and the constitutional position of chiefs; financial questions such as the workings of national treasuries and the relationship between central and local taxation; judicial questions such as the operation of native courts and the development of African law, both traditional and statutory; and economic questions such as the control of land usage and the evolution of systems of land tenure.

Creech Jones explicitly recognised the potential role of local government in the political development of Africans. He argued that councils at all levels should be directly or indirectly elected to ensure they were representative: 'Local government must at once provide the people with their political education and the channel for the expression of their opinions', and insisted that 'An efficient and democratic system of local government is in fact essential to the healthy political development of the African territories; it is the foundation on which their political progress must be built.' He requested that governors circulate the dispatch to all their administrative officers, so that the new policy was widely understood.

The approach presented several challenges for governors, especially those in colonies where the African population was considered by the colonial authorities to be less advanced. The most vigorous response came from Sir Philip Mitchell, the governor of Kenya, where the administration was in practice in the hands of the white settlers. He responded

Whatever may be the case elsewhere, the only way in which the multitude of East African tribes can enjoy the benefit of civilised government, both central and local, now and for generations to come, before they have become themselves civilised, is under the forms of Colonial Government administered by a strong and enlightened Colonial power and directed, as British

Colonial policy has been for centuries, to the achievement of not any particular system but of a state of society in which the men and women of which it is composed – or at least a large part of them - have reached a state of spiritual, moral, cultural and economic development capable of supporting and operating such democratic forms of government as may then appear desirable to them.

Mitchell was not convinced that 'Western' systems of government were necessary applicable in Africa, claiming that 'Africans are by nature easy going people, unpunctual and inexact and zeal for efficiency on the part of supervising British authorities has to be tempered with tolerance and human understanding if there is not to be disillusion and frustration on the one hand and irritation and fractiousness on the other.'⁴⁹ He went on to comment on the difficulty of obtaining honest African cashiers, arguing that 'this relatively simple moral question is today perhaps the greatest practical obstacle to the progress we all want to see'. He also pointed out that African local authorities could not be seen as sovereign bodies as they derived their powers solely from the colonial government. A chief, traditional or hereditary, only had authority on being officially appointed as a Government servant. Mitchell argued that it was the colonial government that had created the system of chiefs, and that in 'pre-British days, civil administration as we know it, did not exist beyond the village circle'. Mitchell expressed concern lest Creech Jones's reference to an 'educated minority' in practice included 'the large number of Africans who have barely achieved the education of an English boy of fourteen and suppose themselves to be educated'.⁵⁰

Mitchell copied his response to his fellow colonial governors in Africa. The acting governor of Nyasaland said he agreed with Mitchell. Mitchell was not impressed when Creech Jones presented his proposals at the conference of African governors held in Cambridge in November 1947. He was the leading critic of the approach and later commented that 'Creech Jones's speech had 'little relation to realities' and that 'he blathered a good deal'. Mitchell was highly critical of senior officials in the Colonial Office, whom he accused of being 'ignorant schoolboys' taking 'childish nonsense' with 'incredible naivete'.⁵¹ He was disappointed that the West African governors were 'a silent lot, with the exception of Lord Milverton, formerly Sir Arthur Richards, the Governor of Nigeria, who wanted assurances to protect the status of the chiefs. Fortunately for Creech Jones and Cohen, the three main West African governors and the governors of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland were due for retirement. In practice each colonial governor was allowed to proceed with constitutional reforms at his own pace.

In late September and early October 1948, Creech Jones held a first conference at Lancaster House in London of African representatives on the legislative councils, though for most of the conference delegates from West Africa and

East Africa met separately.⁵² In closing the conference, Creech Jones sought to reassure the representatives that 'There is a plan... We know what we are doing. We are not fumbling. We are organising things at this end to help.'⁵³ Creech Jones seemed to have more support for his plans from the African representatives than he had from the colonial governors.

In reality, the pace of constitutional reform tended to follow events on the ground. For example, the speedy move towards representative government in the Gold Coast was due more to the impact of major riots in Accra in February and March 1948, than any plan by Creech Jones, with the reforms creating a precedent not just for Nigeria but for the East African colonies as well.⁵⁴

Colonial Education and Economic Development

Creech Jones and Cohen were however more successful in obtaining support for their plans for colonial education and economic development. In 1948, Creech Jones published the report of a commission on *Education for Citizenship in Africa*. The focus of the report was training the colonies for self-government and educating the colonial peoples for democracy. It set out what it called the spiritual and economic pre-requisites of democracy, but recognised what it referred to as 'the disintegrating impact of Western civilisation' on traditional African society. (The anthropologist Margaret Read, who was an education advisor to the colonial office and later wrote a book on *Africans and their Schools*, was a commission member). The report's recommendations stressed the principle of linking the education of Africans to practice in managing their own affairs. Local self-government was presented as education for national self-government, and character-training as the foundation for citizenship. The report discussed different classroom methods in some detail, together with an extended section on education for citizenship amongst adults, drawing on the experience of adult education in England, with which Creech Jones was intimately connected through the WEA. An appendix to the report set out a curriculum for primary and secondary education, and its bibliography included a separate list of reading material for 'African readers' including books on 'character aims' and 'character training'.⁵⁵

Creech Jones also established the Colonial Development Corporation (later renamed the Commonwealth Development Corporation) to support agricultural development in the colonies. An Overseas Resources Development Bill, enacted in 1948, provided £100 million for the corporation. An Overseas Food Corporation provided a further £50 million, though the project to grow groundnuts in West Africa as well as East Africa was to prove a dismal failure, which led to much political controversy which extended beyond Creech Jones's tenure

of office. The government's hope that African resources could help feed Britain in its period of post-war rationing was never realised.⁵⁶

In March 1947, the FCB published a pamphlet containing a speech by Creech Jones outlining Labour's colonial policy, along with a summary of reports, white papers and 'important pronouncements' on colonial affairs by the Labour government that ran to eleven pages, which was quite impressive as it covered a mere eighteen months. The speech restated the party's policy objectives from its 1943 report. However, it was the headings of the speech which gave a sense of Creech Jones's personal approach: Labour's declaration and purpose; Patient work in nation building; From domination to the cooperative approach; Colonial peoples as willing partners; Two-way traffic in understanding; Steps towards political democracy; Bold planning in the colonies; The immensity of the task; Building up social institutions; Private and public enterprise; Economic planning in practice.' No doubt had the speech been given a year later, it would have included a section on 'Education for citizenship'. His opening paragraph stated: 'The Labour government was elected to put through a socialist policy and to apply enlightened principles to the tasks of reconstruction both at home and abroad. I come to my task as a socialist, and I am not content to leave my ideas and political convictions on the threshold of the Colonial Office'.⁵⁷

Out of Office

In November 1950, after he had lost his parliamentary seat, Creech Jones reflected on the Labour government's colonial achievements in an FCB pamphlet entitled *The Way Forward*. He clearly felt undervalued, commenting that 'The remarkable progress in colonial development under the Labour Government in recent years has hardly received from the Party – or the public – the recognition it merits.' Its record was 'unsurpassed by any previous government of this country'.⁵⁸ After a discussion of the constraints on and achievements of his department, he concluded:

The Colonial people are set on the road; we have helped to build for them the machines for their progress; we have given them the technical and financial aid necessary and brought more of their resources into their control and possession; the beginnings in education, better social living, improved economic standards are being made, and the old ideas are passing, as the peoples advance in responsibility. It is a good beginning – but it is only a beginning and we shall press on with the work with pride in our hearts that we are extending the boundaries of freedom and enlightenment and in so doing are winning goodwill and friendship.⁵⁹

Nine years later, when he was back in parliament, and eight years into a Conservative administration with Ghana independent and the independence of most of the other African colonies on the horizon, Creech Jones edited a volume of *New Fabian Colonial Essays*. In this further reflection on his years as Colonial Secretary, he returned to the comments in his 1950 speech and pamphlet quoted above, before concluding:

the conceptions of the Labour government of 1945-51 were clear. Labour was ready with a policy. Its colonial work (inadequate as some of it may have been in the few years available, and mistaken as a few of its actions may have been) was one of the most constructive and satisfying chapters in its whole record, indeed in British colonial history ... Its main decisions affecting nations and peoples stand out as historically momentous ... The socialist Ministers transformed promise into achievement and assisted the dependent countries in their advance to nationhood, independence and better living ... Labour showed great vision and practical confidence ... its remarkable record of liberation and nation building was not only in tune with its own ideas and purposes but with the world which the war of 1939-1945 had ushered in.⁶⁰

It is interesting that in both these reflections, Creech Jones demonstrates a fairly paternalistic, even patronising approach to decolonisation, which does rather overlook the struggle of the African nationalist leaders themselves.

After losing his parliamentary seat, Creech Jones returned to his work in the FCB, although he held off until June 1951 in the hope of a swift return to Parliament, as he believed he had been promised the opportunity to stand in the first by-election. He had maintained close contact with Hinden and his former colleagues during his years in government. Hinden had been replaced as secretary by her assistant, Marjorie Nicholson, while Lord Faringdon had taken over the chair from Horrabin, with Sorensen as vice-chairman. In 1951 Creech Jones published a pamphlet on the *Future of the African Colonies*. He worked with Rev. Michael Scott, who had been jailed for opposing race laws in South Africa and had established an Africa Bureau to provide support for opponents of apartheid and other oppressive regimes in Africa. Creech Jones wrote the Africa Bureau's first pamphlet: *African Challenge: The Fallacy of Federation* (1952) opposing the proposal by the Conservative government for a Federation of Northern and Southern Rhodesia and Nyasaland under settler control. This proposal was being supported by Jim Griffiths, who had succeeded Creech Jones at the Colonial Office 1950-51, and the Labour shadow Commonwealth Secretary, Patrick Gordon Walker.⁶¹

The position of Creech Jones within Labour politics is well illustrated by the case of Seretse Khama. In 1950, after Creech Jones had left office, Gordon

Walker as Commonwealth Secretary prevented Khama, then resident in Britain, from returning to the British Protectorate of Bechuanaland to stake his claim to the chieftdom. This was because Khama had married a white woman, Ruth Williams, and the second Attlee government was afraid of offending the South African government, which had just banned interracial marriage.⁶² Creech Jones supported figures like Michael Scott and the new Labour MP Anthony Wedgwood Benn who protested against what amounted to the exile of Khama from his homeland. But he did not go along with the critique of empire and colonialism adopted by Wedgwood Benn, Fenner Brockway and the 72 Labour MPs who founded and sponsored the Movement for Colonial Freedom (MCF), which was altogether more radical than the Fabians. The MCF favoured setting target dates for independence of specific colonies, an approach rejected by the Labour Party in its official statement, apparently on the advice of Creech Jones.⁶³

Creech Jones and Hinden were nevertheless happy to collaborate with the radical African nationalists – Julius Nyerere, Hastings Banda, Jomo Kenyatta, J. B. Danquah, Nnamdi Azikwe, Kenneth Kaunda and Tom Mboya were all members of the Fabian Colonial Bureau in the 1950s. Mboya contributed to a pamphlet by Margery Perham on *East African Future* and later wrote his own pamphlet *The Kenya Question: An African Answer*.⁶⁴ It has been argued that the FCB was especially influential in the support it gave to Nyerere and the nationalist movement in Tanganyika, leading to the independence of that former trust territory in 1961.⁶⁵

Creech Jones continued to advise the Labour Party on its colonial policy. In 1956, together with Rita Hinden, he was on the drafting committee for the policy statement *Labour's Colonial Policy: The Plural Society*, which included a stipulation that transfer of power would only be supported on the basis of a constitution incorporating the principle of one person – one vote.⁶⁶ However, the influence of the FCB was waning, while that of the more radical MCF was growing.⁶⁷ Creech Jones returned to chairing the FCB, renamed the Fabian Commonwealth Bureau in 1959.⁶⁸ He managed to get back into parliament in the 1954 Wakefield by-election, and sat until retiring in August 1964 on the grounds of ill-health. He died two months later. He had ceased chairing the FCB in 1962, when it amalgamated with the Fabian International Bureau.

In his final years he continued to visit many Commonwealth countries, many of which were attaining independence, often as a delegate from the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. He retained his other interests, serving as a vice president of the WEA and on the committees of the Ramblers Association and the Youth Hostels Association, and remained involved in the Oxford-based Institute for Commonwealth Studies.

Conclusion

As Patricia Pugh's biographical entry in the *Dictionary of National Biography* comments, Creech Jones 'was unimpressive in appearance; he was not a brilliant or witty speaker; but he was one whom the House of Commons greatly respected for his knowledge, integrity, and sincerity.' His former Cabinet colleague Ernest Bevin, in a letter commiserating with Creech Jones on losing his seat in the 1950 election, wrote:

Looking back over the history of colonial development, I do not think anyone has a greater record – the constitutional changes you have carried through, the development of education, the promotion of universities, the constant attention you have given to economic development, the way you have applied your mind to the problems of soil erosion and transport. If only it had been done long ago. What a different world it would have been!

As Robert Pearce, the author of the most detailed study of British colonial policy towards Africa in the war and immediate post-war years put it: 'many people in Britain felt that they had been fighting to keep the Empire intact and had no intention of liquidating it. This makes even more remarkable, and revolutionary, the work of Creech Jones and Cohen at the Colonial Office'.⁶⁹

Why Creech Jones was so influential, given his views on colonial policy were far more progressive than those of his Cabinet colleagues, especially Attlee and Bevin who were both strong defenders of the British Empire? The answer probably has several components. Firstly, Bevin's and Attlee's attention was on other issues, and neither was interested in the details of African colonial administrative arrangements, on which Creech Jones was the acknowledged expert. Secondly the issues concerned rarely reached the Cabinet so there was no high-level discussion of the principles behind the changes. The Cabinet had to deal with significant civil unrest in Palestine, Cyprus and Malaya, while the African colonies were relatively quiet. Creech Jones said little in Cabinet. He was not seen as challenging the political leadership. Thirdly, it does not appear that Attlee, Bevin and other cabinet colleagues really understood the significance of what Creech Jones was doing, and he appeared to want to keep it this way. Had he pressed for more funding, things might have been very different.

There is also the question of how far the reforms were led by Creech Jones, and what part was played by Andrew Cohen and other progressive colonial office officials and governors such as Bernard Bourdillon? While Cohen drafted many of Creech Jones' circulars and speeches, and worked through the technical details, it was Creech Jones who set the overall policy direction and gave Cohen this role, and their relationship is best seen as a partnership. They supported each other when challenged by their more traditionalist colleagues, and it was

Creech Jones who ensured that when the traditionalist governors were due for retirement, that they were replaced by progressives.

There is one further question – were Creech Jones's reforms that radical, or did they just continue the policy of the wartime administrations pursued by Malcolm MacDonald and Oliver Stanley? Was Cohen simply continuing the approach of the Colonial Office's Lord Reith? To some extent, both Creech Jones and Cohen stressed continuity when presenting their proposals to British politicians and officials, while giving a more radical interpretation to African nationalist leaders. To some the reforms to local administration and focus on education for citizenship were seen as too radical, and to others not radical enough. While no timescales were set and progress towards independence was much quicker than either Creech Jones or Cohen had anticipated, the reforms they put forward were intended to lead at some point in time to self-government and independence. The reforms were revolutionary, and intentionally so.

A full biography of Creech Jones is long overdue. This article has concentrated on his approach to the African colonies. There is much which can be said about his role in relation to other colonies for which he had ministerial responsibility, and in the transition of the British Empire into the British Commonwealth. However in relation to policy on the African colonies, we can conclude that while his approach may in hindsight appear paternalistic and at times patronising, his support for Africans governing themselves was indeed novel in a leading British politician and, given his ability to bring his ideas into practice, was revolutionary in terms of both objective and effect.

It is time Creech Jones's positive contribution to decolonisation was recognised. He was a quiet and serious man, clear in his aims but collaborationist and incremental in his means. He had respect for the African populations. He regarded them as friends and partners rather than objects of policy, and as citizens rather than colonial subjects. He lacked the racist and supremacist prejudices held by many colonial governors and administrators and by many of his British political and colleagues across the party-political spectrum. He was consistent in his politics across his political career, whether in or out of parliament, as Minister or backbencher. In his later years he was happy to collaborate with more radical extra-parliamentary initiatives, but was never tempted to support the use of violent means to achieve political change.

It was of course the African nationalist movements and leaders who played the crucial part in achieving independence for their countries. But we should recognise that there was at least one senior British politician who did much to assist and enable these goals to be achieved. Creech Jones helped to initiate a process of decolonisation which subsequent British governments were unable to halt or reverse.

Notes

- 1 Patricia Pugh, 'Arthur Creech Jones' in *Dictionary of National Biography* (accessed online). There is no entry for Creech Jones in the 15-volume *Dictionary of Labour Biography*.
- 2 For the background of radical and socialist politics in Camberwell and Dulwich in this period see Duncan Bowie, *200 Years of Dulwich Radicalism*, London, 2022, pp.13-20.
- 3 John Taylor, 'Against the tide, against the war: conscientious objection in South London 1914-18', on <https://sslh.org.uk/2022/02/12/against-the-tide-against-the-war-conscientious-objection-in-south-london-1914-1918/>
- 4 Arthur Creech Jones, *Prison Reform Now*, London, 1959.
- 5 *The Rubr: Report of a Deputation from the TGWU*, London, 1923, on <https://cdm21047.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/collection/tav/id/2523>
- 6 Clements Kadalie, *My Life and the ICU*, London, 1970, pp.129, 138-140.
- 7 Marion Shaw, *The Clear Stream: A Life of Winifred Holtby*, London, 1999, pp.176-187; Henry Dee, *Militant Migrants*, Liverpool, 2025, pp.175-177, 184, 216-217.
- 8 P. S. Gupta, *Imperialism and the British Labour Movement 1914-64*, London, 1975, p.226.
- 9 Tingfu Tsiang, *Labor and Empire*, New York, 1923, p.95.
- 10 For a detailed analysis of these statements, see Gupta, *Imperialism*, chapters 1-4.
- 11 Labour Party, *The Empire in Africa: Labour's Policy*, London, 1920.
- 12 Labour Party, *Labour and the Empire in Africa*, London, 1926.
- 13 Labour and Socialist International, *The Colonial Problem*, London and Zurich, 1928. For discussion of Labour Party colonial policy in this period see also Paul Kelemen, 'Modernising Colonialism: The British Labour Movement and Africa', *The Journal of Commonwealth and Imperial History*, Vol. 34 No. 2, June 2006, pp.223-244; Paul Kelemen, 'Planning for Africa: The British Labour Party's Colonial Development Policy 1920-1964', *Journal of Agrarian Change*, Vol. 7 No. 1, January 2007, pp.76-98.
- 14 Robert Gregory, *Sidney Webb and East Africa*, Berkeley CA, 1962.
- 15 Labour Party, *The Demand for Colonial Territories and the Equality of Economic Opportunity*, London, 1936.
- 16 Labour Party, *Commonsense about the Colonies*, London, 1938.
- 17 Arthur Creech Jones, *Trade Unionism Today*, London 1928; John Holford, 'Britain's Forgotten Minister of Education: Arthur Creech Jones and a Socialist Strategy for Development and Education in Africa', *Proceedings of the 36th Annual Adult Education Research Conference May 19-21, 1995, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada*, pp.171-176.
- 18 See J. F. Horrabin, 'The Break with Imperialism', in Dr. Christopher Addison, Major C. R. Attlee, H. N. Brailsford, H. R. Clay, G. D. H. Cole, Sir Stafford Cripps, J. F. Horrabin, W. Mellor, Sir Charles Trevelyan, E. F. Wise, *Problems of a Socialist Government*, London, 1933, p.112.
- 19 Gupta, *Imperialism*, p.243.
- 20 Conrad Noel, *The Meaning of Imperialism*, League Against Imperialism, London, n.d.

- 21 Gupta, *Imperialism*, pp.229-230.
- 22 Ibid., pp.250-251.
- 23 Ibid., pp.252-254; Stephen Howe, *Anticolonialism in British Politics: The Left and the End of Empire 1918-64*, Oxford, 1993.
- 24 Howe, *Anticolonialism*, pp.104, 107, 127.
- 25 Quoted in Gupta, *Imperialism*, p.264.
- 26 Ibid., p.265.
- 27 David Goldsworthy, *Colonial Issues in British Politics 1945-1961*, Oxford, 1971, pp.123-129.
- 28 Patricia Pugh, *Educate, Agitate, Organise: 100 Years of Fabian Socialism*, London, 1984, pp.188-199.
- 29 Goldsworthy, *Colonial Issues*, p.120.
- 30 National Peace Council, *Freedom for Colonial Peoples*, London, 1942.
- 31 Suki Wolton, *Lord Hailey, the Colonial Office and the Politics of Race and Empire in the Second World War*, Basingstoke, 2000, p.122.
- 32 Wolton, *Lord Hailey*, pp.97-100; William Roger Louis, *Imperialism at Bay*, New York, 1978, pp.10-12.
- 33 Labour Party, *The Colonies: The Labour Party's Post-War Policy for the African and Pacific Colonies*, London, 1943.
- 34 Gupta, *Imperialism*, p.275.
- 35 Rita Hinden, *Plan for Africa*, London, 1941, pp.13-14.
- 36 *African Affairs*, Vol. 43 No. 173, October 1944, pp.159-171.
- 37 Pugh, *Educate, Agitate, Organise*, pp.189-195; Rita Hinden, *Socialism and Empire. Five Years Work of the Fabian Colonial Bureau*, London, 1945.
- 38 Arthur Creech Jones and Rita Hinden, *Colonies and International Conscience*, London, 1945; Arthur Creech Jones, *International Trusteeship of Colonies*, London, 1945.
- 39 Pugh, *Educate, Agitate, Organise*, p.192.
- 40 Fabian Society, *Fabian Colonial Essays*, London, 1945, pp.82-83.
- 41 Quoted in R. D. Pearce, *The Turning Point in Africa*, London, 1982, pp.91-92.
- 42 Hinden, *Socialism and Empire*.
- 43 Clyde Sanger, *Malcolm MacDonald. Bringing an End to Empire*, Liverpool, 1995, p.26. See also John Charmley, *Lord Lloyd and the Decline of the British Empire*, London, 1997, pp.251-256. Lloyd was Colonial Minister between May 1940 and February 1941, but Charmley's biography covers this very briefly and has no substantive material on his role as Minister.
- 44 Quoted in J. M. Lee, *Colonial Development and Good Government*, Oxford, 1967, p.67.
- 45 There are several papers by Ronald Robinson examining the role of Andrew Cohen, including his relationship with Creech Jones: Ronald Robinson, 'Andrew Cohen and the Transfer of Power in Tropical Africa', in W. H. Morris-Jones and Georges Fischer, eds, *Decolonization and After: The British and French Experience*, London, 1980, pp.50-72; Ronald Robinson, 'Sir Andrew Cohen: Proconsul of African Nationalism' in L. H. Gann and P. Duignan, *African Proconsuls*, New York, 1978, pp.353-366. Cohen also wrote a book setting out his views, based on a set of lectures given in America: Andrew Cohen, *British Policy*

- in a *Changing Africa*, Evanston, 1959. Robinson had intended to write a biography of Cohen, but this was never completed.
- 46 Quoted in R. D. Pearce, *The Turning Point in Africa*, London, 1982, p.100.
- 47 Quoted in *ibid.*, p.102.
- 48 Ronald Hyam, ed., *British Documents on the End of Empire. Series A Volume 2. The Labour Government and the End of Empire 1945-1951. Part 1 High Policy and Administration*, London, 1992, pp.119-129.
- 49 *Ibid.*, p.130.
- 50 *Ibid.*, p.131.
- 51 Quoted in Pearce, *Turning Point in Africa*, p.179.
- 52 As shown in a government propaganda film, the delegates visited a farm, a tractor factory and the Bournville chocolate factory in Birmingham. See <http://www.colonialfilm.org.uk/node/1007>
- 53 Quoted in Pearce, *Turning Point in Africa*, p.181.
- 54 *Ibid.*, pp.188-195.
- 55 See Holford, *Britain's Forgotten Minister*.
- 56 Pearce, *Turning Point in Africa*, pp.186-188.
- 57 Arthur Creech Jones, *Labour's Colonial Policy*, London, 1947; see also Arthur Creech Jones, *Some Current Colonial Problems*, London, 1946.
- 58 James Griffiths, Arthur Creech Jones, Rita Hinden, *The Way Forward*, London, 1950, p.15.
- 59 *Ibid.*, p.25.
- 60 Arthur Creech Jones, ed., *New Fabian Colonial Essays*, London, 1959, pp.36-37.
- 61 Michael Collins, 'Decolonisation and the "Federal Moment"' in *Diplomacy and Statecraft* Vol. 24 No. 1, 2013, pp.21-40; Anne Yates, and Michael Chester, *Troublemaker: A Biography of the Rev Michael Scott*, London, 2006; Pugh, *Educate, Agitate, Organise*, pp.223-224; Gupta, *Imperialism*, pp.339-340; Arthur Creech Jones, *African Challenge: The Fallacy of Federation*, London, 1952.
- 62 Pugh, *Educate, Agitate, Organise*, p.234; Howe, *Anticolonialism*, pp.196-197; Susan Williams, *Colour Bar*, London, 2006, p.265.
- 63 Gupta, *Imperialism*, p.361; Goldsworthy, *Colonial Issues*, pp.276-278.
- 64 Pugh, *Educate, Agitate, Organise*, p.234.
- 65 Daniel Smith, *The Influence of the Fabian Colonial Bureau on the Independence Movement in Tanganyika*, Athens OH, 1985.
- 66 Gupta, *Imperialism*, p.368; Labour Party, *Labour's Colonial Policy: The Plural Society*, London, 1956.
- 67 Howe, *Anticolonialism*, pp.231-267; Stan Newens, *Commemorating the 50th anniversary of Liberation, formerly the Movement for Colonial Freedom*, London, 2004.
- 68 Goldsworthy, *Colonial Issues*, p.233.
- 69 Pearce, *Turning Point in Africa*, p.209.